



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 19, 2007

No. 47

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 19, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CORRINE BROWN 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 Maryland, the majority leader, Mr. STENY HOYER.

AFTER FOUR YEARS, NO MORE BLANK CHECKS

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, 4 years ago tonight, our Commander in Chief, President Bush, gave the orders that instigated Operation Iraqi Freedom. Whether they supported the President's decision or not, all, and I emphasize "all" patriotic Americans prayed for our success as well as the safe return of our brave service men and women. And 4 years later, we still do. However, today our success in Iraq is as elusive as it ever was and has ever

been over the past 1,460 days. More than 3,200 American soldiers have given the ultimate measure of sacrifice, and more than 24,000 have been injured. The American taxpayers have spent more than \$400 billion on this war, and the President asked for an additional \$245 billion, including a \$100 billion wartime supplemental spending bill that will be considered on the floor later this week. And thousands of Iraqis have been killed, while literally millions have fled to neighboring countries, triggering a refugee crisis.

Yet despite the sacrifice and hardship, how much progress has been made? Just last week, the Department of Defense reported record levels of violence and hardening sectarian violence in the fourth quarter of 2006, stating, "Some elements of the situation in Iraq are properly descriptive of a civil war."

Administration officials themselves admitted last week that political goals that were to have been met by the Iraqi government this month will take significantly longer to achieve, said the administration. The National Intelligence Estimate tells us the war has increased the global terror threat rather than reduce it. And General Schoomaker, the Army Chief of Staff, has issued strong warnings about the effect of this war on America's overall military readiness and our ability to respond to emerging strategic threats. Indeed, IKE SKELTON of Missouri, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said that the situation with respect to America's readiness of its Armed Forces is grave and troubling. Meanwhile, the American people have wearied of administration claims that are divorced from reality. "Mission accomplished" and "the insurgency is in its last throes" are just two of the assertions that have proved, sadly, very badly mistaken.

From the outset, the administration refused to commit a force commensu-

rate with the threat it articulated, and now it asks for patience while a fourth troop escalation seeks to accomplish what three others could not. It profoundly miscalculated the cost of this war. It went to war without a plan for postwar stabilization and security. And perhaps most egregiously, the administration sent our troops into battle without proper equipment.

Madam Speaker, given the repeated miscalculations by the administration over the last 4 years, and given the situation on the ground in Iraq, today it is past time, way past time for the United States Congress, the people's representatives, to insist on accountability and a new direction in Iraq.

As one who supported the authority of the President of the United States to remove Saddam Hussein, and in listening to the President's State of the Union when he said not one of us who voted voted for failure, that was accurate. I certainly did not vote for failure. And I want success and seek success, but the administration's policies have not garnered success. Therefore, more blank checks and questioning obeisance by this Congress would constitute, in my opinion, a dereliction of our responsibility and our constitutional duty. Thus, this Congress, for the first time in 4 years, will have the opportunity this week to change America's course in Iraq and to insist that the Iraqis take control of their own destiny.

The U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act offers the best way forward in Iraq. I urge Members of both sides of the aisle to support it. And I would call the attention to many of our Members to a vote in June of 1997, where so many Members on the Republican side of the aisle voted to set a timetable, set a date certain for withdrawal or exit strategy in amendments sponsored by Mr. BUYER of Indiana in which all the present leaders of the Republican

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.

H2625

Party who were in the Congress at that time voted for.

In short, the legislation that will come before us is saying much the same, but after 4 years of a lack of success, why do I say a lack of success? Secretary Gates in his confirmation hearing said that we are not winning in Iraq. That was just a few months ago, and he was right. Again, I would reiterate in my opinion because we have never, not at the outset, not over the last 4 years has this administration deployed assets sufficient to meet the challenge. This legislation is designed to protect our troops, requiring troop deployment to adhere to the Defense Department's current standards for training, not new standards, not new timelines, not new requirements, but the Department of Defense currently articulated standards to keep our troops safe, trained and well equipped, standards for equipment and armor, with the President required to certify if he believes the Nation's security requires DoD standards be waived. None of us want to stand in the way if a crisis is imminent and deployment must be accomplished. However, all of us want to see our troops safe, equipped and trained.

The bill also holds the Iraqi government accountable, measuring its performance by the benchmarks President Bush outlined in his January 10 speech, again, the President's benchmarks, not those imposed by Congress, but the administration's own benchmarks for the Iraqis.

In addition, the legislation provides a responsible strategy for a phased redeployment of U.S. forces, provides greater protections for our troops and veterans, and refocuses our efforts on fighting al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan.

There are those of course who will claim that this legislation attempts to micromanage the war. They are wrong. There is nothing in this legislation that will be considered this week that micromanages this war. Neither General Petraeus nor any of his commanders on the ground or at CENTCOM will in any way be constrained from the tactics or the strategies that they deem best to employ on the ground in Iraq. The only strings attached are those benchmarks and standards endorsed by the President himself, our Commander in Chief. And let me add, is there anyone who believes that Congress would be strongly asserting itself today if the President's policy was succeeding. The answer, I think, is clear.

This legislation is the justified response of the people's representatives to a policy that is failing and a President who insists that we must continue to stay the course. There is not a new policy here. As I said before, we have increased troops on three different occasions. Unfortunately, lamentably, it did not bring the stability and security that it was planned to bring.

There are others who will argue that this bill will compromise our position

in the war on terror. To them I say that this legislation goes above and beyond the President's funding request, supporting our troops deployed at the tip of the spear, and reaffirming our commitment to fighting and defeating al Qaeda. And there certainly are those who will argue that this bill doesn't go far enough, that even one more day of fighting is one too many. To them I say respectfully that this legislation for the first time sets a date for the responsible redeployment of American troops from Iraq. It is not tomorrow, it is not the day after, but it is a date, a date that provides the Iraqis with the time they need to ready themselves for the responsibility they must assume.

Madam Speaker, the Iraq war is already longer than our participation in World War I, World War II and the Korean War. The specter of 5½ years in Iraq, if our troops remain deployed until August 31, 2008, can hardly be called a precipitous cut and run.

As we enter the fifth year of this war, let us insist on a policy designed to achieve success. As we enter the fifth year of this war, let us respond to the plea of the American people for a new direction in Iraq. And as we enter the fifth year of this war, let us demonstrate to the world that American strength and American wisdom are not set in opposition. I urge my colleagues, vote for a new direction in Iraq, support the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act.

Mr. President, I did not vote for failure. I pray for the safety of our troops and for their success, but I also strongly believe that the legislation we will bring to this floor on Thursday is a reasoned, thoughtful way forward, a way forward that was initially suggested by the Iraq Study Group, five Republicans and five Democrats, headed up by former Secretary of State and adviser to this administration and previous administrations, James Baker. It is time that the Congress of the United States does not simply rubber-stamp the President's request, but on behalf of the American people exercises its best judgment to make policy for a change, to make policy for success, and make policy to ensure victory against those who would terrorize Americans, terrorize our Nation, and terrorize the rest of the world through the employment of their terrorist acts.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WATSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord of goodness and harbinger of peace, be with the Congress of the United States this week. Guide decisions that will resist evil, establish good order, and strengthen relationships between people of good will. May the impulse toward reconciliation empower Members that they may lead this Nation to transform unjust structures and restore respect for the dignity of all men and women created in Your likeness.

Lord, through rational argument, may our government and others across the globe reawaken the spiritual energy in people that is needed to become true promoters of peace and justice throughout the world. We pray, calling upon Your Holy Name, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

HEAR YOUR GENERALS, MR. PRESIDENT, AND END THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. We are at the anniversary of the beginning of the war in Iraq. Things are not going well. Our troops are strained. Our generals are speaking to the President of the United States, who does not seem to be listening. I would like to read this to the President of the United States on this day.

General Peter Pace, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked last month by a House panel whether he was comfortable with the preparedness of Army units in the United States, he stated simply: "No, I am not comfortable." Mr. President, that is one of your generals. General Peter Schoomaker, Army Chief of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Thursday: "We have a strategy right now that is outstripping the means to execute it." Mr. President, that is one of your generals.

The Army Vice Chief of Staff, General Richard Cody, described as

“stark” the level of readiness of Army units in the United States which would be called on if another war breaks out. The readiness continues to decline of our next-to-deploy forces, Cody told the House Armed Services Committee Readiness Panel last week.

Mr. President, hear your generals and end this war now.

IN SUPPORT OF 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. Madam Speaker, as we stand here today, the Iraqi people enjoy a freedom and sense of self-government they were not afforded 4 years ago. Since the United States originally liberated the Iraqis, they have established a democracy, ratified a constitution, and elected a representative government. Such rights were denied under the totalitarian regime of Saddam Hussein.

General David Petraeus, the new commander of coalition forces in Iraq, is an expert in fighting insurgencies by murderers who defy laws of war. Our military officials have made necessary adjustments, and we are seeing signs of progress. Cutting funding, limiting reinforcements and setting artificial timetables only serve to undermine this end. Together, as Democrats and Republicans, we must achieve victory in Iraq to achieve victory in the global war on terrorism to protect American families. We must face the terrorists overseas, or we will face them again in the streets of America.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. RICK LARSEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Luke Loeffler, Community Representative, Office of the Honorable Rick Larsen, Member of Congress:

OFFICE OF RICK LARSEN,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Municipal Court of the City of Bellingham, Whatcom County, Washington, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

LUKE LOEFFLER,
Community Representative.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICK LARSEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Honorable Rick Larsen, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena, issued in the Municipal Court of the City of Bellingham, Whatcom County, Washington, for testimony in a criminal cases.

I do not appear to have any relevant or material testimony to offer. Accordingly, after consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoenas is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

RICK LARSEN,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Don Kellaheer, Assistant Sergeant at Arms, Office of the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with an administrative subpoena for testimony issued by the Office of Compliance of the U.S. House of Representatives.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by House Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DON KELLAHER,
Assistant Sergeant at Arms.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK ON ITS 175TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 138) recognizing the importance of Hot Springs National Park on its 175th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 138

Whereas the concept in the United States of setting aside a nationally significant

place for the future enjoyment of its citizens was first implemented 175 years ago in Hot Springs, Arkansas, with the creation of the Hot Springs Reservation, which protected 47 area hot springs;

Whereas the Act that created the Hot Springs Reservation, entitled “An Act authorizing the governor of the territory of Arkansas to lease the salt springs, in said territory, and for other purposes”, approved April 20, 1832 (4 Stat. 505), required that “the hot springs in said territory, together with four sections of land, including said springs, as near the centre thereof as may be, shall be reserved for the future disposal of the United States, and shall not be entered, located, or appropriated, for any other purpose whatever”;

Whereas the Hot Springs Reservation was the first protected area in the Nation;

Whereas the Act creating the Hot Springs Reservation preceded both the establishment of the Department of the Interior in 1849 and the establishment of Yellowstone National Park as the first national park in 1872;

Whereas the Hot Springs Reservation was renamed Hot Springs National Park in 1921 and became America’s 18th national park; and

Whereas the tradition of preservation and conservation that developed into the National Park System, which now includes 390 units, began with the Act that created the Hot Springs Reservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on this 175th anniversary of the Act of Congress that created the Hot Springs Reservation, the House of Representatives recognizes the important contribution of the Hot Springs Reservation and Hot Springs National Park to the history of conservation in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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. House Resolution 138, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative MIKE ROSS, would express a recognition by the House of Representatives of the importance of the Hot Springs National Park on its 175th anniversary.

Most people know that Yellowstone is our first national park, but more than 40 years before Yellowstone was established as a park, Congress set aside 2,529 acres in the Ouachita Mountains of Arkansas to preserve 47 hot springs located there.

The law was enacted at the request of the General Assembly of the Territory of Arkansas and signed by President Andrew Jackson on April 20, 1832. That made the Hot Springs Reservation the first nationally protected parkland.

The reservation was turned over to the Department of the Interior when

that Department was established in 1849. However, it took another quarter of a century, a ruling from the U.S. Supreme Court, and the protection of Federal troops to settle the bogus land claims and chase off overeager entrepreneurs seeking to make profit from the springs. Notably, the 1916 Organic Act which established the National Park Service mentioned only the Hot Springs Reservation by name, even though by that time several other national parks and monuments had been designated by Congress. The Organic Act placed all these units under the supervision, management, and control of the new agency.

On March 4, 1921, Congress elevated Hot Springs to a national park status, apparently with the personal interest of the first director of the National Park Service, Stephen Mather.

Bathhouse Row, the Hot Springs street lined with opulent bathhouses and hotels, was added to the National Register of Historic Places on November 13, 1974. The most elegant of these bathhouses, the Fordyce, has since been adapted to use as a visitor center and museum.

The park currently totals 5,550 acres and attracts over 1 million visitors a year. The park plans a 175th anniversary celebration on Friday, April 20; and this resolution will be a fitting commemoration of the role Hot Springs played in National Park history.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend and congratulate my colleague, Representative ROSS, for his commitment and leadership on this matter. We strongly support the passage of House Resolution 138 and urge its adoption by the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 138 was adequately explained by the majority, and we support this resolution and we urge its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Chairman GRIJALVA.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 138, a resolution honoring and recognizing the importance of Hot Springs National Park on its 175th anniversary. I am pleased that the entire Arkansas congressional delegation is supporting and cosponsoring this bipartisan bill.

April 20, 2007, will mark the 175th anniversary of Hot Springs National Park in Hot Springs, Arkansas. This resolution will write into history the important role that Hot Springs National Park has played in the formation of the Department of the Interior and the National Park System.

The very idea of setting aside special places in the United States for the future enjoyment of its citizens originated in Hot Springs, Arkansas, when on April 20, 1832, President Andrew Jackson and the United States Congress established Hot Springs Reservation to protect the 47 hot springs in Garland County, Arkansas. That year, Hot Springs Reservation became the first protected area in the Nation and was the only Federal area mentioned by name in the act that established the National Park System.

The Hot Springs Reservation was then officially renamed Hot Springs National Park on March 4, 1921, becoming America's 18th national park, joining many other national landmarks.

For more than 200 years, Hot Springs National Park has remained an area of exceptional beauty and magnificence. People have used the hot spring water and therapeutic baths to treat a variety of ailments, and the reservation eventually developed into a well-known resort nicknamed "the American Spa." Well, today Hot Springs National Park protects eight historic bathhouses, and the Bathhouse Row area in Hot Springs National Park is a national historic landmark district that contains the largest collection of bathhouses of its kind in North America. It provides visitors from around the country and the world with leisure activities such as hiking, picnicking, and scenic drives and remains a national treasure to be enjoyed by generations of Americans.

□ 1415

Hot Springs National Park has played a crucial role in the formation of the United States National Park System. I am proud to sponsor a resolution commemorating its 175th anniversary, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Resolution 138 today.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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 agree to the resolution, H. Res. 138.

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. GRIJALVA. Madam 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.

MORE WATER AND MORE ENERGY ACT OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 902) to facilitate the use for irrigation and other purposes of water produced in connection with development of energy resources.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 902

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, FINDINGS, AND PURPOSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "More Water and More Energy Act of 2007".

(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Development of energy resources, including oil, natural gas, coalbed methane, and geothermal resources, frequently results in bringing to the surface water extracted from underground sources.

(2) Some of this produced water is used for irrigation or other purposes, but most of it is returned to the subsurface.

(3) Reducing the amount of produced water returned to the subsurface, and increasing the amount that is made available for irrigation and other uses—

(A) would augment water supplies;

(B) could reduce the costs to energy developers for disposing of such water; and

(C) in some instances could increase the efficiency of energy development activities.

(4) It is in the national interest to remove or reduce obstacles to use of produced water for irrigation or other purposes in ways that will not adversely affect water quality or the environment.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to facilitate the use of produced water for irrigation and other purposes without adversely affecting water quality or the environment, and to demonstrate ways to accomplish that result.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) PRODUCED WATER.—The term "produced water" means water from an underground source, that is brought to the surface as part of the process of exploration for or development of oil, natural gas, coalbed methane, or any other substance to be used as an energy source.

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

(3) UPPER BASIN STATES.—The term "Upper Basin States" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

(4) LOWER BASIN STATES.—The term "Lower Basin States" means the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada.

SEC. 3. IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall conduct a study to identify—

(1) the technical, economic, environmental, legal, and other obstacles to increasing the extent to which produced water can be used for irrigation and other purposes without adversely affecting water quality or the environment; and

(2) the legislative, administrative, and other actions that could reduce or eliminate such obstacles.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate regarding the results of the study required by this section.

SEC. 4. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) GRANTS.—Within existing authorities and subject to the availability of funds appropriated for the purpose, the Secretary shall provide financial assistance for the development of facilities to demonstrate the feasibility, effectiveness, and safety of processes to increase the extent to which produced water may be recovered and made suitable for use for irrigation, municipal or industrial uses, or other purposes without adversely affecting water quality or the environment.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Assistance under this section—

(1) shall be provided for—

(A) at least one project in one of the Upper Basin States other than New Mexico;

(B) at least one project in either New Mexico or one of the Lower Basin States other than California;

(C) at least one project in California; and

(D) at least one project in Texas;

(2) shall not exceed \$1,000,000 for any project;

(3) shall be used to pay not more than 50 percent of the total cost of a project;

(4) shall not be used for operation or maintenance of any facility; and

(5) may be in addition to assistance provided by the United States pursuant to other provisions of law.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION, ADVICE, AND COMMENTS.

In implementing this Act, including preparation of the report required by section 3 and the establishment of criteria to be used in connection with award of financial assistance pursuant to section 4, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and appropriate Governors and local officials;

(2) review any relevant information developed in connection with research carried out by others, including research carried out pursuant to section 999 of Public Law 109-58, and to the extent the Secretary considers advisable include such information in the report required by section 3;

(3) seek the advice of individuals with relevant professional or academic expertise and of companies or individuals with industrial experience, particularly experience related to production of oil, natural gas, or other energy resources, including geothermal resources; and

(4) solicit comments and suggestions from the public.

SEC. 6. RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding, modifying, abrogating, or limiting—

(1) the effect of any State law or any interstate authority or compact with regard to any use of water or the regulation of water quantity or quality; or

(2) the applicability or effect of any Federal law or regulation.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated—

(1) \$1,000,000 to implement section 3; and

(2) \$5,000,000 to implement section 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to re-

verse 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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend our colleague, Representative MARK UDALL, for his hard work on this issue.

As many of us know, clean water is one of the most precious commodities in the West. The bill before us, H.R. 902, has a promise of providing more clean water to western communities.

In oil and gas fields with thousands of producing wells, millions of gallons of so-called produced water will be brought to the surface along with oil or gas. To those who operate oil and gas wells, produced water is a waste product. In some cases, the produced water can be injected into the wells to force more oil to the surface. If the water quality is good enough, a well operator might be allowed to discharge the water down the nearest stream, but there may also be opportunities to treat the water and make it useful for irrigation or even domestic purposes. H.R. 902 authorizes a study of the opportunities and the obstacles to beneficial and environmentally safe use of this produced water.

I again commend Mr. UDALL for his hard work on this legislation. In the 109th Congress, the Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on similar legislation. This legislation was subsequently passed by the House. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am here to support H.R. 902 introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL). I have cosponsored legislation authorizing the Department of the Interior to study the potential use of extracted water from oil and gas production for irrigation and other purposes.

It will not surprise anyone in this Chamber that water is the most important resource in the West. Water is the lifeblood of the American West and the foundation of its economy. Yet it is also the scarcest resource in some of the fastest-growing areas of the country. But we can go beyond that and declare that water is the most strategic asset in the entire world. It may surprise some in this Chamber that the potential source of good-quality water lies just beneath the surface and is being wasted every day.

During the process of oil and gas development, approximately 924 billion gallons of water is extracted throughout the year, with most of that water being pumped back underground. Some

significant share of that water is already being used for irrigation and livestock watering, but converting just 1 percent more of that total to additional beneficial use would yield over 75 billion gallons of more usable water for irrigation, ranching, fish and wildlife enhancement, stream augmentation or drinking water. The produced water that contains the lowest concentration of total dissolved solids, or TDS, less than 10,000 parts per million, is found in the western United States where water is a critical resource.

Often the largest hurdle to beneficial use of water produced from oil and gas production is finding the technology to accomplish water treatment in a cost-effective manner. Water treatment must compete with the lower-cost option of deep well injection. And while deep well injection is the most environmentally sound method of disposal, it forgoes the opportunity to use millions of gallons as a resource.

Beneficial use of this water in these arid environments will be a win-win situation for the energy industry, water consumers, and oil and gas consumers. This legislation will facilitate the potential use of this abundant water for irrigation uses and other beneficial purposes. It could potentially help us find new water from what is now a virtually untapped water resource.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for introducing this legislation, and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, let me begin by first thanking the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) for his excellent explanation of what is in this bill. I will not repeat all of the details of this bill, but the bottom line of this legislation is that America needs energy, America needs clean energy, and America needs clean water.

My district in central and north Texas basically is in the heart of one of the largest natural gas fields in American history, the Barnett Shale, and we are blessed to be in that situation where we are producing natural gas for not only Texas citizens, but families and businesses throughout the country.

Natural gas is one of the cleanest forms of energy for this country to run our factories and to heat our homes. Because it is priced on a regional basis rather than on a world basis, every extra thousand cubic feet of natural gas we can produce is going to make America more competitive in the world market by bringing those prices down.

This legislation is going to help us continue utilizing great natural resources such as the Barnett Shale by establishing pilot projects whereby we can learn how to more efficiently recycle the massive amounts of water that are used to, in effect, crack the shale,

divide the shale where this Barnett Shale field exists.

It is estimated that one well alone can require 3½ to 5 million gallons of water to basically break up that shale so we can bring the natural gas to the surface and utilize it in our homes and businesses. Right now much of that water is either being injected back down into the earth or literally carted away at great expense to be disposed of at other sites.

What a great benefit to the natural gas industry and families and businesses and communities all across America if we can recycle that water in an environmentally friendly way for the benefit of our farmers and ranchers, for the benefit of local communities that could use that water.

Seldom do we see in this House and on this floor a bill that businesses, the oil and gas industry, and environmentalists can be behind. I commend the gentleman and his coauthor, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), for having developed this legislation. It is nice to see bipartisanship on the floor of the House.

This is good for America. It does what its title says, More Water, More Energy. That is what this bill is all about. That is why I enthusiastically support it.

I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for agreeing to my request to add Texas to the possible list of pilot sites for this project. Again, the home of the Barnett Shale in Texas is, I think, the largest producing gas field today. I think it is appropriate that Texas be included in this list of potential pilot projects. This is good legislation not just for Texans, it is good for America.

I thank the gentleman and all of those involved who put this legislation together.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, many times people have asked exactly how does this work on the ground. For instance, in my home county of Lea County, New Mexico, we have the Ogallala Aquifer. We are right at the very edge of it. And in the 50 years we have been pumping out of the aquifer, we have used about 50 percent of the water that is available to us. There is no surface water available, only that aquifer water is available. We have used 50 percent of it, and it would take 1,900 years to recharge what has been used, and so we understand that we are on the downward slide for having water available to us.

In Lea County, New Mexico, we produce over 150,000 barrels of water yearly, and that water is reinjected. If that water were available to be cleaned up, that water would be available for development, industry and jobs. It is a very important thing.

The county right next is Eddy County. Water is produced there that is fresher than water in the Pecos River, and yet law and regulation requires the disposal of that water back down into salt zones. Everyone in the West under-

stands that at some point we are going to go back and repump that water to the surface, this time for use as water. Right now it is free at the surface. It is a by-product of the oil and gas exploration, and yet we are required to put that water back down into wells, into the salt zones, where it is going to be very much harder to clean up the next time we use it.

So this bill represents a great opportunity for us to take a step forward to benefit the industry in the West, to benefit the residents of the West, and to help lower the cost of production of oil and gas. It seems to be a win-win situation every way that we look at it.

I compliment the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Colorado for introducing this legislation.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 902, the "More Water and More Energy Act, and to express my thanks to Chairman RAHALL and Ranking Member DON YOUNG of the Natural Resources Committee for making it possible for the House to consider it today.

The bill's purpose is to facilitate the use of water produced in connection with development of energy resources for irrigation and other uses in ways that will not adversely affect water quality or the environment.

It is similar to a bill I introduced in the 109th Congress that passed the House last year but on which the Senate did not complete legislative action. It is cosponsored by Representative PEARCE of New Mexico, who is the ranking Republican member on the Natural Resources Committee's Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources and also by Representative EDWARDS of Texas. I greatly appreciate their support.

I think the bill may help change an energy-industry problem into an opportunity, not just for oil and gas producers but for everyone else who would benefit from increased supplies of useable water.

Especially in the arid west, that covers everyone—not least our hard-pressed ranchers and farmers.

The focus of the bill is the underground water extracted in connection with development of energy sources like oil, natural gas or coalbed methane. It would do two things:

First, it would direct the Bureau of Reclamation and the USGS to identify the obstacles to greater use of produced water and the how those obstacles could be reduced or eliminated without adversely affecting water quality or the environment.

Second, it would provide for Federal help in building 3 pilot plants to demonstrate ways to treat produced water to make it suitable for irrigation or other uses, again without adversely affecting water quality or the environment.

At least one of these pilot plants would be in Colorado, Utah, or Wyoming. At least one would be in New Mexico, Arizona or Nevada. And there would be at least one each in California and Texas. This is to assure that, together, the plants would demonstrate techniques applicable to a variety of geologic and other conditions.

Under the bill, the federal government could pay up to half the cost of building each plant, but no more than \$1 million for any one plant. No federal funds could be used for operating the plants.

The bill's goal is reflected in its title—the "More Water and More Energy Act of 2006."

The extent of its potential benefits was shown by the testimony of Mr. David Templet at a hearing on the similar bill of mine the House considered last year.

Mr. Templet testified in support of that bill on behalf of the Domestic Petroleum Council and several other groups, including the Colorado Oil & Gas Association. He noted that produced water is the most abundant byproduct associated with the production of oil and gas, with about 18 billion barrels being generated by onshore wells in 1995.

And he pointed out that if only an additional 1 percent of that total could be put to beneficial use, the result would be to make over 75 billion gallons annually available for use for irrigation or other agriculture, municipal purposes, or to benefit fish and wildlife.

Now, remember that in the west we usually measure water by the acre-foot—the amount that would cover an acre to the depth of one foot—and an acre-foot is about 32,856 gallons, so an additional 75 billion gallons is more than 230,000 acre feet—more water, indeed.

And at the same time making produced water available for surface uses, instead of just reinjecting it into the subsurface, can help increase the production of oil and gas.

At last year's hearing, this was illustrated by the testimony of Dr. David Stewart, a registered professional engineer from Colorado. He cited the example of an oil field in California from which an estimated additional 150 million barrels of oil could be recovered if water were removed from the subsurface reservoir. And he pointed out that where oil recovery is thermally enhanced, a reduced amount of underground water means less steam—and so less cost—is needed to recover the oil.

The potential for having both more water and more energy is also illustrated by the example of a project near Wellington, Colorado, that treats produced water as a new water resource. I had the opportunity to visit it just last week, and found it very interesting.

An oil company is embarking on the project to increase oil production while a separate company will purchase the produced water to supplement existing supplies, eventually allowing the town of Wellington and other water users in the area to have increased water for drinking and other purposes.

In view of its potential for leading to both "more water" and "more energy" I was pleased but not surprised that last year the Administration, through the Interior Department, testified that it "agrees that the goals of the bill are commendable and the needs that could be addressed are real" and that the roles the bill would assign to the Bureau of Reclamation and the USGS are consistent with the missions and expertise of those agencies.

In view of all this, Madam Speaker, I submit that this bill—and its promise of helping provide our country with both more water and more energy—deserves the support of the House, and I urge its approval.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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. 902.

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.

**TAUNTON, MASSACHUSETTS,
SPECIAL RESOURCES STUDY ACT**

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1021) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1021

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 "Taunton, Massachusetts Special Resources Study Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The city of Taunton, Massachusetts, is home to 9 distinct historic districts, with more than 600 properties on the National Register of Historic Places. Included among these districts are the Church Green Historic District, the Courthouse Historic District, the Taunton Green Historic District, and the Reed and Barton Historic District.

(2) All of these districts include buildings and building facades of great historical, cultural, and architectural value.

(3) Taunton Green is the site where the Sons of Liberty first raised the Liberty and Union Flag in 1774, an event that helped to spark a popular movement, culminating in the American Revolution, and Taunton citizens have been among the first to volunteer for America's subsequent wars.

(4) Robert Treat Paine, a citizen of Taunton, and the first Attorney General of Massachusetts, was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

(5) Taunton was a leading community in the Industrial Revolution, and its industrial area has been the site of many innovations in such industries as silver manufacture, paper manufacture, and ship building.

(6) The landscaping of the Courthouse Green was designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, who also left landscaping ideas and plans for other areas in the city which have great value and interest as historical archives and objects of future study.

(7) Main Street, which connects many of the historic districts, is home to the Taunton City Hall and the Leonard Block building, 2 outstanding examples of early 19th Century American architecture, as well as many other historically and architecturally significant structures.

(8) The city and people of Taunton have preserved many artifacts, gravesites, and important documents dating back to 1638 when Taunton was founded.

(9) Taunton was and continues to be an important destination for immigrants from Europe and other parts of the world who have helped to give Southeastern Massachusetts its unique ethnic character.

SEC. 3. STUDY.

The Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate State historic preservation officers, State historical societies, the city of Taunton, and other appropriate organizations, shall conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System. The study shall be conducted and completed in accordance with section 8(c) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)) and shall include analysis, documentation, and determinations regarding whether the historic areas in Taunton—

(1) can be managed, curated, interpreted, restored, preserved, and presented as an organic whole under management by the National Park Service or under an alternative management structure;

(2) have an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that together represent distinctive aspects of American heritage worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use;

(3) reflect traditions, customs, beliefs, and historical events that are valuable parts of the national story;

(4) provide outstanding opportunities to conserve natural, historic, cultural, architectural, or scenic features;

(5) provide outstanding recreational and educational opportunities; and

(6) can be managed by the National Park Service in partnership with residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and State and local governments to develop a unit of the National Park System consistent with State and local economic activity.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 3 fiscal years after the date on which funds are first made available for this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study required under section 3.

SEC. 5. PRIVATE PROPERTY.

The recommendations in the report submitted pursuant to section 4 shall include discussion and consideration of the concerns expressed by private landowners with respect to designating certain structures referred to in this Act as a unit of the National Park System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1021 directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study to determine if certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, are suitable

and feasible for designation as a unit of the National Park System. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BARNEY FRANK.

Taunton is a city rich in cultural and historic resources. The city is home to nine historic districts, with more than 600 properties on the National Registry of Historic Places. A comprehensive study of these resources will help to determine if inclusion within the National Park System is appropriate. This study will be completed in consultation with the State historic preservation officer, State Historical Society, and the city of Taunton and other appropriate organizations.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate Representative FRANK for his efforts on behalf of this legislation and this community. I would note that identical legislation was approved by the House in the last Congress, and we urge our colleagues to support the measure today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1021 has been adequately explained by the majority, and we have no objection to this legislation. We also have no other speakers.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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. 1021.

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.

**NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION
COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT ACT**

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 658) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements to protect natural resources of units of the National Park System through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 658

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 "Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act".

SEC. 2. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR NATIONAL PARK NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”) may enter into cooperative agreements with State, local, or tribal governments, other Federal agencies, other public entities, educational institutions, private nonprofit organizations, or participating private landowners for the purpose of protecting natural resources of units of the National Park System through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of National Park System units.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A cooperative agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall provide clear and direct benefits to park natural resources and—

(1) provide for—

(A) the preservation, conservation, and restoration of coastal and riparian systems, watersheds, and wetlands;

(B) preventing, controlling, or eradicating invasive exotic species that are within a unit of the National Park System or adjacent to a unit of the National Park System; or

(C) restoration of natural resources, including native wildlife habitat or ecosystems;

(2) include a statement of purpose demonstrating how the agreement will—

(A) enhance science-based natural resource stewardship at the unit of the National Park System; and

(B) benefit the parties to the agreement;

(3) specify any staff required and technical assistance to be provided by the Secretary or other parties to the agreement in support of activities inside and outside the unit of the National Park System that will—

(A) protect natural resources of the unit of the National Park System; and

(B) benefit the parties to the agreement;

(4) identify any materials, supplies, or equipment and any other resources that will be contributed by the parties to the agreement or by other Federal agencies;

(5) describe any financial assistance to be provided by the Secretary or the partners to implement the agreement;

(6) ensure that any expenditure by the Secretary pursuant to the agreement is determined by the Secretary to support the purposes of natural resource stewardship at a unit of the National Park System; and

(7) include such other terms and conditions as are agreed to by the Secretary and the other parties to the agreement.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary shall not use any funds associated with an agreement entered into under subsection (a) for the purposes of land acquisition, regulatory activity, or the development, maintenance, or operation of infrastructure, except for ancillary support facilities that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the completion of projects or activities identified in the agreement.

(d) FUNDING.—Funds available to carry out the provisions of this Act shall be limited to programs and amounts specified in the statute for such use in the annual appropriation Act for the National Park Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

H.R. 658 is an administration proposal introduced by Representative JON PORTER of Nevada. The bill would authorize the National Park Service to enter into cooperative agreements to spend Park Service funds outside of existing Park boundaries.

According to a report from the Government Accountability Office, the National Park Service is the only Federal land management agency that does not currently have that authority.

While there are several areas in which such cooperative agreements would be useful, the ability to participate in coordinated plans to eradicate invasive species in and around national parks is the primary reason that the National Park Service is seeking this authority.

Under the terms of this legislation, the National Park Service could enter into such agreements with State, local or tribal governments, with other public entities, educational institutions, private nonprofit organizations, or participating private landowners. The legislation requires that any such cooperative agreements provide clear benefits to park resources.

Madam Speaker, I would note this legislation does not authorize any new funding.

I thank my colleague from Nevada for his effort, and we support passage of H.R. 658 by the House today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 658, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 658 was introduced by the very effective Congressman from Nevada, JON PORTER, and would authorize the National Park Service to enter into a cooperative agreement with willing partners to protect park natural resources through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of units of the National Park System. This was recommended by the Government Accountability Office, as the Park Service is still the only land management agency without this particular authority. So we expect this will help control the spread of invasive species and increase the protection of parks and wildlife.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I would like to engage the majority bill manager, Mr. GRIJALVA, in a colloquy to clarify an issue related to this bill, if he would.

I understand that the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies has brought to the committee's attention their concern that H.R. 658 not be interpreted to give the National

Park Service authority to manage fish and wildlife outside park boundaries.

Management authority for fish and wildlife resources within State boundaries has customarily been held in trust by the respective States. Congress has repeatedly affirmed this. This trust responsibility has been implemented primarily through State fish and wildlife agencies. In general, these principles are expressed in relevant fish and wildlife policies of the Department of the Interior found in volume 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 24.

Can the chairman of the subcommittee please clarify that the States' existing authority to manage fish and wildlife is not affected by H.R. 658?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the gentleman, and I agree with the gentleman from Utah on his description of Federal and State authorities to manage fish and wildlife resources.

I also agree that we should promote better coordination and cooperation between the Federal Government and the States to enhance our fish and wildlife resources for future generations, especially for the control of invasive species. I assure my colleague that nothing in H.R. 658 diminishes or enlarges the authority of the Federal Government or any State for the conservation and management of fish and wildlife.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his assurances, and with that, I urge adoption of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), the author of this very good piece of legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, invasive animal and plant species know no boundaries. That is why I introduced H.R. 658, the Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act.

The passage of this legislation today has significance to my district, given the recent infestation at Lake Mead of quagga mussels. These are a species capable of causing massive destruction and billions of dollars in damages. The quagga mussel is a resilient species that multiplies at exponential rates and can cause enormous ecological, recreational, and economic damage. In recent years, the mussel has caused an estimated \$5 billion in damages to the Great Lakes region.

As the law currently exists, the National Park Service does not have the legal authority to enter into cooperative agreements with neighboring States and local governments or private entities. Rather, the Park Service

must wait until invasive species cross into their lands and waterways before they can be dealt with.

Part of responsible stewardship of our local environment is being proactive and not merely responsive to new ecological challenges. H.R. 658 enables the National Park Service to take preventative measures in order to preserve our lands and natural resources.

By entering into cooperative agreements with State and local experts, we will be able to eradicate invasive species before they encroach onto Federal lands. We have an obligation to our children and to our community to be responsible stewards of our local environment.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working in a bipartisan manner on this very important issue.

I also want to thank my constituent Ann Schreiber in Nevada who has worked so hard to eradicate invasive plant life in my district and recognizes the importance of meeting these challenges head-on.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our 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. 658.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TO PARK CITY, UTAH

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 838) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 838

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF LAND BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TO PARK CITY, UTAH.

(a) LAND TRANSFER.—Notwithstanding the planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey, not later

than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to Park City, Utah, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two parcels of real property located in Park City, Utah, that are currently under the management jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and designated as parcel 8 (commonly known as the White Acre parcel) and parcel 16 (commonly known as the Gambel Oak parcel). The conveyance shall be subject to all valid existing rights.

(b) DEED RESTRICTION.—The conveyance of the lands under subsection (a) shall be made by a deed or deeds containing a restriction requiring that the lands be maintained as open space and used solely for public recreation purposes or other purposes consistent with their maintenance as open space. This restriction shall not be interpreted to prohibit the construction or maintenance of recreational facilities, utilities, or other structures that are consistent with the maintenance of the lands as open space or its use for public recreation purposes.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the transfer of the land under subsection (a), Park City shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior an amount consistent with conveyances to governmental entities for recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act; 43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

SEC. 2. SALE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN PARK CITY, UTAH, AT AUCTION.

(a) SALE OF LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall offer for sale any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to two parcels of real property located in Park City, Utah, that are currently under the management jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and are designated as parcels 17 and 18 in the Park City, Utah, area. The sale of the land shall be carried out in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701) and other applicable law, other than the planning provisions of sections 202 and 203 of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), and shall be subject to all valid existing rights.

(b) METHOD OF SALE.—The sale of the land under subsection (a) shall be consistent with subsections (d) and (f) of section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1713) through a competitive bidding process and for not less than fair market value.

SEC. 3. DISPOSITION OF LAND SALES PROCEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All proceeds derived from the sale of the lands described in this Act shall be deposited in a special account in the treasury of the United States and shall be available without further appropriation to the Secretary of the Interior until expended for—

(1) the reimbursement of costs incurred by the Bureau of Land Management in implementing the provisions of this Act, including surveys, appraisals, and compliance with applicable Federal laws; and

(2) environmental restoration projects on Bureau of Land Management administered public lands within the Salt Lake City Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) INVESTMENT OF SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—Any amounts deposited in the special account shall earn interest in an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities, and may be expended according to the provisions of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gen-

tleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

H.R. 838, sponsored by the ranking member of the National Parks, Forests and Public Lands Subcommittee, Representative Rob Bishop, is intended to preserve existing open space in Park City, Utah. The bill would transfer two parcels of land owned by the Bureau of Land Management to Park City, with a deed restriction that the land be maintained as open space. Park City will pay fair-market value for the land.

Two other parcels in the area owned by the BLM are encumbered with unpatented mining claims. The bill directs that these parcels, which the BLM had previously identified for disposal, be sold at auction, subject to any valid existing rights, to resolve these outstanding issues. Park City is expected to bid for these properties at the auction.

It is our understanding that Park City has undertaken an aggressive campaign to maintain open space and that the citizens of Park City have proven their commitment by approving a local bond initiative to fund this project.

We applaud Park City's efforts and congratulate Representative BISHOP for working hard to bring this legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, identical legislation was approved by the House in the 109th Congress. We support passage of H.R. 838 and urge its adoption by the House today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 838 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 838 conveys to Park City about 110 acres of Bureau of Land Management land that was previously marked for disposal. This land would be used by Park City as recreational open space. The residents of Park City have placed a premium on preserving this space for the character of their resort town; and as the chairman accurately said, they have approved a \$20 million bond to purchase this environmentally sensitive land. The conveyance of this is consistent with Park City's long-range plan to protect its sensitive landscape.

Park City hosted many of the events of the 2002 Olympics, and visitors from around the world visit there to ski and

partake of the scenic vistas, which will be enhanced by this bill. As was stated, this bill, as passed by the 109th session of Congress and as considered today, enjoys the support of both Republicans and Democrats and does have a companion bill that has been introduced in the United States Senate.

I ask for your support of this particular bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers, and we yield back the balance of our 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. 838.

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.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS DAM ENLARGEMENT ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 839) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 839

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 "Arthur V. Watkins Dam Enlargement Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Arthur V. Watkins Dam is a feature of the Weber Basin Project, which was authorized by law on August 29, 1949.

(2) Increasing the height of Arthur V. Watkins Dam and construction of pertinent facilities may provide additional storage capacity for the development of additional water supply for the Weber Basin Project for uses of municipal and industrial water supply, flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF FEASIBILITY STUDY.

The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, is authorized to conduct a feasibility study on raising the height of Arthur V. Watkins Dam for the development of additional storage to meet water supply needs within the Weber Basin Project area and the Wasatch Front. The feasibility study shall include such environmental evaluation as required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and a cost allocation as required under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485 et seq.).

SEC. 4. COST SHARES.

(a) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of the study authorized in section 3 shall not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of the study.

(b) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary shall accept, as appropriate, in-kind contributions of goods or services from the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District. Such goods and services accepted under this section shall be counted as part of the non-Federal cost share for the study.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$1,000,000 for the Federal cost share of the study authorized in section 3.

SEC. 6. SUNSET.

The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this Act shall terminate 10 years 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 gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

H.R. 839, introduced by our colleague, Representative ROB BISHOP of Utah, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility of enlarging the Arthur V. Watkins Dam. The dam is one of the main features of the Bureau of Reclamation's Weber Basin Project located along the shore of the Great Salt Lake near Ogden, Utah.

□ 1445

Recent drought and a growing population in Utah have highlighted water supply needs in the area. The feasibility study authorized by this legislation will help local water agencies and the Bureau of Reclamation to decide whether we should consider raising the dam to improve water storage capacity.

In the 109th Congress, the Subcommittee on Water and Power held hearings on similar legislation. That legislation was subsequently reported by the committee and passed by the House.

We have no objection to this legislation and urge its passage.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 839. The Bureau of Reclamation's Weber Basin Project, which is located in northern Utah only a short distance from the historic Brigham City, stores and delivers water from the Weber River into its tributaries.

The Arthur V. Watkins Dam, which is part of the Weber Basin Project, is

part of an off-stream reservoir on the northeastern edge of the Great Salt Lake. It is formed by a roughly rectangular perimeter dam that is about 14.5 miles long. Water from the Weber River near its outlet to the Great Salt Lake is diverted into the reservoir by the Willard Canal and pumped from the reservoir by that same canal for multiple purposes. In addition to providing water supply, the reservoir is a popular recreation facility.

Recent drought and a growing population of Utah have highlighted the need for additional water storage. As a result, the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, a water user which manages the Arthur V. Watkins Dam and Reservoir, desires the Bureau of Reclamation's assistance in determining the feasibility of adding water storage capacity to the reservoir.

H.R. 839 authorizes such assistance. This bill passed in the 109th Congress by voice vote. I again ask for your support.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our 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. 839.

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. GRIJALVA. Madam 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.

MARINE MAMMAL RESCUE ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1006) to amend the provisions of law relating to the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1006

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 "Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Amendments of 2007".

SEC. 2. STRANDING AND ENTANGLEMENT RESPONSE.

(a) COLLECTION AND UPDATING OF INFORMATION.—Section 402(b)(1)(A) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1421a(b)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting "or entangled" after "stranded".

(b) ENTANGLEMENT RESPONSE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 403 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421b) is amended—

(A) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

“SEC. 403. STRANDING OR ENTANGLEMENT RESPONSE AGREEMENTS.”;

and
(B) in subsection (a) by inserting “or entanglement” before the period.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents at the end of the first section is amended by striking the item relating to section 403 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 403. Stranding or entanglement response agreements.”.

(c) LIABILITY.—Section 406(a) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421e(a)) is amended by inserting “or entanglement” after “stranding”.

(d) ENTANGLEMENT DEFINED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 410 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421h) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) in order as paragraphs (2) through (7); and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) The term ‘entanglement’ means an event in the wild in which a living or dead marine mammal has gear, rope, line, net, or other material wrapped around or attached to it and is—

“(A) on a beach or shore of the United States; or

“(B) in waters under the jurisdiction of the United States.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 408(a)(2)(B)(i) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f-1(a)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “section 410(6)” and inserting “section 410(7)”.

(e) JOHN H. PRESCOTT MARINE MAMMAL RESCUE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 408(h) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f-1(h)) is amended—

(A) by striking “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003” and inserting “\$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010”; and

(B) in paragraph (1) by striking “\$4,000,000” and inserting “\$6,000,000”.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND EXPENSES.—Section 408 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f-1) is amended—

(A) by adding at the end of subsection (a)(1) the following: “All funds available to implement this section shall be distributed to eligible stranding network participants for the purposes set forth in this paragraph and paragraph (2), except as provided in subsection (f).”; and

(B) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

“(f) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND EXPENSES.—Of the amounts available each fiscal year to carry out this section, the Secretary may expend not more than 6 percent or \$80,000, whichever is greater, to pay the administrative costs and administrative expenses to implement the grant program under subsection (a). Any such funds retained by the Secretary for a fiscal year for such costs and expenses that are not used for such costs and expenses before the end of the fiscal year shall be provided as grants under subsection (a).”.

(3) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.—Section 408 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f-1) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary may also enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, or such other agreements or arrangements as the Secretary considers appropriate to address stranding events requiring emergency assistance.”;

(B) in subsection (d) by inserting “(1)” before the text, and by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Funding for emergency stranding projects shall not be subject to the funding limit established in paragraph (1).”;

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1) by striking “The non-Federal” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (2), the non-Federal”;

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.—No non-Federal contribution shall be required for funding for a response to an emergency stranding event.”; and

(D) in subsection (g) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3) and inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.—The term ‘emergency assistance’ means assistance provided for a stranding event that—

“(A) is not an unusual mortality event as defined in section 409(6);

“(B) leads to an immediate increase in required costs for stranding response, recovery, or rehabilitation in excess of regularly scheduled costs;

“(C) may be cyclical or endemic; and

“(D) may involve out-of-habitat animals.”.

(4) CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 408 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Secretary may solicit, accept, receive, hold, administer, and use gifts, devises, and bequests.”.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MARINE MAMMAL UNUSUAL MORTALITY EVENT FUND.—Section 409(3) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421g(3)) is amended by striking “fiscal year 1993” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

I commend the ranking Republican on the Committee on Natural Resources, Congressman DON YOUNG, for introducing H.R. 1006, the Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Amendments of 2007. The bill would extend through fiscal year 2010 the authorization of appropriations for the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Fund and the Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Event Fund.

H.R. 1006 would direct the relevant Secretary to collect and update procedures for rescuing and rehabilitating marine mammals entangled in fishing gear, rope, line, net or other material. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to enter into agreements for marine mammal stranding events requiring emergency assistance.

In the 109th Congress, the House passed a similar provision in H.R. 4075,

by voice vote, on July 17, 2006. We support this bill and commend Congressman DON YOUNG for his leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1006, the Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Act amendments.

This legislation, introduced by the distinguished Ranking Republican on the Natural Resources Committee, DON YOUNG, and the ranking Republican on the Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans Subcommittee, HENRY BROWN, will extend the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program.

The Prescott Grant program was first authorized in 2000 to assist the National Marine Fisheries Service with recovery and rehabilitation of stranded marine mammals. The Prescott Grant program has been very successful in supporting facilities around the Nation which volunteer space and staff time to rehabilitate these sea creatures and return many of them to the wild.

The National Marine Fisheries Service has received \$4 million in appropriations each year for the Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grants. In 2006, the Service issued 42 grants to facilities in coastal States. While the Prescott Grant program has been successful in these areas, there are still areas of the country that do not have appropriate coverage; the Alaska region and the Southeast region are two examples.

This legislation will increase funding for the Department of Commerce to address this lack of coverage and will also increase the number of grants that can be issued each year. The legislation will also cap administrative costs and roll over any unused funds into the grant program. The administration will have the authority to enter into cooperative agreements with trained personnel to allow for removal of floating debris from marine mammals to prevent the stranding and/or the death of those animals.

This legislation also authorizes emergency assistance funding. In addition, it will reauthorize funding for the Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Event Fund, which allows the agency to respond to mass stranding events and reimburse facilities that have assisted in the response activity.

This is an important conservation bill. I urge an “aye” vote on H.R. 1006.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our 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. 1006.

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.

BOB HOPE MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 759) to redesignate the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, as the "Bob Hope Memorial Library".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 759

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

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION.

The Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, shall be known and redesignated as the "Bob Hope Memorial Library".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Bob Hope Memorial Library".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, H.R. 759, introduced by my colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL) redesignates the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum as the Bob Hope Memorial Library.

Bob Hope immigrated to the United States with his family in 1907. Like millions of other immigrants, he entered the United States through Ellis Island in New York Harbor. Bob Hope went on to have an illustrious career as a comedic entertainer and is remembered by many for his work over nearly six decades traveling the globe to entertain American servicemen and women.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from New York, Representative ENGEL, for his work on this legislation. I would note that identical legislation passed the House in the 109th Congress. We support the passage of H.R. 759 and urge its adoption today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 759, which has been well explained by the subcommittee chairman. We support the designation of the Bob Hope Memorial Library. We urge the adoption of this particular bill.

In 1940, Bob Hope starred, with Paulette Goddard and Richard Carlson, in a remake of the movie "The Ghost Breakers." In that picture, as they are talking about zombies that would be attacking the house that is owned by Paulette Goddard, she said, "Zombies! That's horrible." Richard Carlson said, "It's worse than horrible because a zombie has no will of his own. You see them sometimes walking around blindly with dead eyes, following orders, not knowing what they do, not caring." At which time Bob Hope said, "Oh, you mean like Democrats."

I am very grateful that the other side of the aisle has taken this opportunity to recognize and reward both the wit and the wisdom of Bob Hope with this piece of legislation. I firmly support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, at this point I extend as much time as he may consume to my colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona in whose district my son Jonathan is enjoying himself as a sophomore at the University of Arizona. I would like to thank all concerned for the opportunity to speak about my bill, H.R. 759, a bill which will name the third floor library at Ellis Island in New York Harbor the Bob Hope Memorial Library.

I would also like to thank Representative GALLEGLY for his assistance with this bill, and I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the committee for their help in bringing this bill expeditiously to the floor.

Most Americans remember Bob Hope for his work in the entertainment business as a comedian, actor, dancer and singer, as well as his work with the American troops abroad. Perhaps his work with American troops abroad is the thing that he is most remembered for. But what few know is that Bob Hope was actually an immigrant from England, came here when he was very, very young. He is sometimes even referred to as America's most famous immigrant, whose life epitomizes the American Dream. Bob Hope embodies the American Dream, and the Ellis Island Restoration Commission even called naming the library a fitting tribute.

After a long period of restoration, Ellis Island, where my grandparents, all four of them, came through about 100 years ago, Ellis Island was turned into a museum in 1990 with the purpose of allowing people to come and remember the 16 million immigrants who passed through Ellis Island from 1892 through 1954 to pursue the American Dream.

Like many of the other 16 million immigrants who passed through Ellis Is-

land, Bob Hope arrived in America in 1907, which is actually the same year that my grandmother, my mother's mother, came to this country, and Bob Hope arrived in 1907 with little in the way of worldly possessions. Bob Hope described himself upon arrival as, and I quote him, "a 4 year-old boy in knickers who had no idea of the opportunities that lay ahead."

He went on to become a household name in the United States and around the world. After arriving in the United States, the Hope family moved to Ohio, and he later studied and started his career in radio.

He moved on to appear in numerous movies and even Broadway plays, and is perhaps best known, as I mentioned before, for his unwavering commitment to entertaining our Nation's troops abroad. For nearly six decades, often during holidays in World War II, through Vietnam and until the Gulf War, Bob Hope traveled the globe, bringing a little bit of America to U.S. troops during times of peace and war.

Troops abroad even took calling him "GI Bob." In 1997, Congress named him an honorary veteran. Bob Hope has been recognized in many ways for his work. He has been honored with over 1,500 awards, but this award or reward is perhaps the most fitting.

Some notable awards include several Academy Awards, a Congressional Gold Medal in 1962, an Emmy and a Golden Globe. Despite all the awards that Bob Hope received, he had a special place in his heart for Ellis Island. In 1990, when the Ellis Island Restoration Commission suggested naming the third floor library of the museum in his honor, he stated it would be, and I quote him, "one of the single most important high points of my career."

Sadly, Bob Hope passed away in 2003 at the age of 100 and did not see this project finished. But today I hope we would move, as the first step, in seeing this come to fruition.

The Bob Hope Memorial Library will serve as a daily reminder to Ellis Island's visitors of Bob Hope's great contributions to the American people, the American culture and the American Dream. After all, it is Bob Hope. It's Bob Hope.

Madam Speaker, I ask to insert into the RECORD two statements, a letter from Bob Hope back in 1990 expressing his support of the museum, as well as a letter from the Ellis Island Restoration Commission expressing their support for this project.

BOB HOPE,
October 24, 1990.

Mr. PHILIP LAX, President,
Mr. NORMAN LISS, Chairman of Development,
Ellis Island Restoration Commission,
New York, NY.

DEAR PHIL AND NORMAN, I was both thrilled and gratified to receive your letter announcing the establishment of "the Bob Hope Family Heritage Center" at Ellis Island. What a great honor for someone who just 83 years ago saw the first glimmer of this great nation of ours as a 4-year old boy in knickers and had no idea of the opportunities that lay ahead. Frankly, my only concern back then was running away as fast as

my little legs would carry me from the doctor who came to inoculate me before landing at Ellis!

A great many wonderful things have happened to me since that day. However, I assure you that the honor bestowed on me by you and your commission is one of the single most important highpoints in my life and career. That it will be cherished by the Hope Family for generations to come is a true understatement.

With deep appreciation and warm personal regards to each and every member of your commission who made this honor possible. I just want to add that I admire and respect all you've been doing to restore this great symbol of the American dream.

Regards,

BOB HOPE.

ELLIS ISLAND RESTORATION COMMISSION,
New York, NY, Nov. 27, 2003.

Mr. WARD GRANT,
Burbank, CA.

DEAR MR. GRANT: The Ellis Island Restoration Commission, together with the National Park Service, are desirous of naming the third floor of the National Museum at Ellis Island in New York Harbor, the Bob Hope Memorial Library in honor of that great American legend.

The ship's manifest, which we have in our possession, reflects that Bob Hope emigrated to America through Ellis Island with his mother and siblings on March 28, 1908, at the age of four. He is probably the most famous immigrant to come through Ellis Island of the sixteen million who so emigrated. Forty percent of the current United States population has roots in Ellis Island.

The Museum is owned and administered by the National Park Service on behalf of the Department of Interior. Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty, to which it is connected, are the most sought after destinations for tourists visiting New York. The Library contains, among other rooms, the Oral History Room, in which the stories of immigrants who arrived through Ellis Island are recorded and computerized, and the Ellis Island Archives.

As reflected in the letters we have enclosed, Mr. Hope in 1990 and 1991, showed great interest in the Island and reflected sincere appreciation for the honor of having the Library named after him. Unfortunately, at that time, bureaucratic complications did not permit the project to move ahead.

It would be our intention, if the family approves, to seek a bill passed by Congress and have it signed into law by the President. We would not be seeking any funds from the Bob Hope Foundation or any family members, but this would simply be in recognition of the great contributions to America's life, culture and entertainment by Bob Hope.

Ironically, we were in London at the time of Mr. Hope's passing and took the opportunity to visit his childhood home and the Bob Hope Theatre in Eltham.

We were provided your contact information by WOR's Joe Franklin and his producer, Richard Orenstein, in New York, both of whom enthusiastically encouraged this idea.

We look forward to hearing from you after you have communicated with the family and if the response is in the affirmative, make appropriate arrangements for a formal announcement by the Commission, Congressional representatives. National Park Service, as well as family members.

We eagerly await your response.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL LAX,
President.

NORMAN LISS,
Chairman of Development.

□ 1500

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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. 759.

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. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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. Res. 138, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 658, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 839, by the yeas and nays.

The vote on H.R. 759 will be taken tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK ON ITS 175TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 138, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 138.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Johnson, Sam
Ackerman	DeGette	Jones (NC)
Aderholt	Delahunt	Jones (OH)
Akin	DeLauro	Jordan
Alexander	Dent	Kagen
Allen	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur
Altmire	Diaz-Balart, M.	Keller
Andrews	Dicks	Kennedy
Arcuri	Dingell	Kildee
Baca	Doggett	Kilpatrick
Bachmann	Donnelly	Kind
Bachus	Doolittle	King (IA)
Baird	Doyle	King (NY)
Baker	Drake	Kingston
Baldwin	Dreier	Kirk
Barrett (SC)	Duncan	Klein (FL)
Barrow	Edwards	Kline (MN)
Bartlett (MD)	Ehlers	Knollenberg
Barton (TX)	Ellison	Kuhl (NY)
Bean	Ellsworth	LaHood
Becerra	Emanuel	Lamborn
Berkley	Emerson	Lampson
Berman	Engel	Langevin
Berry	English (PA)	Lantos
Biggert	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Bilbray	Etheridge	Larson (CT)
Bilirakis	Everett	Latham
Bishop (GA)	Fallin	LaTourrette
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lee
Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Levin
Blackburn	Ferguson	Lewis (CA)
Blumenauer	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Blunt	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Boehner	Fortenberry	Linder
Bonner	Fox	Lipinski
Bono	Frank (MA)	LoBiondo
Boozman	Franks (AZ)	Loehsack
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren, Zoe
Boswell	Gallely	Lucas
Boucher	Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel
Boustany	Gerlach	E.
Boyd (FL)	Giffords	Lynch
Boyd (KS)	Gillibrand	Mack
Braley (IA)	Gillmor	Mahoney (FL)
Brown (SC)	Gingrey	Mahoney (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Gohmert	Manzullo
Brown-Waite,	Gonzalez	Marchant
Ginny	Goodlatte	Markey
Burgess	Gordon	Marshall
Burton (IN)	Granger	Matheson
Butterfield	Graves	Matsui
Buyer	Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)
Calvert	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)
Camp (MI)	Grijalva	McCaul (TX)
Campbell (CA)	Hall (NY)	McCollum (MN)
Cannon	Hall (TX)	McCotter
Cantor	Hare	McCrery
Capito	Harman	McDermott
Capps	Hastert	McGovern
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	McHenry
Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Carnahan	Hayes	McIntyre
Carney	Heller	McKeon
Carter	Hensarling	McMorris
Castle	Herger	Rodgers
Chabot	Herseth	McNerney
Chandler	Higgins	McNulty
Clarke	Hill	Meek (FL)
Clay	Hinche	Melancon
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Mica
Clyburn	Hirono	Michaud
Coble	Hobson	Millender-
Cohen	Hodes	McDonald
Cole (OK)	Hoekstra	Miller (FL)
Conyers	Holden	Miller (MI)
Cooper	Holt	Miller (NC)
Costa	Honda	Miller, Gary
Costello	Hooley	Miller, George
Courtney	Hoyer	Mollohan
Cramer	Hulshof	Moore (KS)
Crenshaw	Hunter	Moore (WI)
Crowley	Inglis (SC)	Moran (KS)
Cuellar	Inslee	Moran (VA)
Culberson	Israel	Murphy (CT)
Cummings	Issa	Murphy, Patrick
Davis (AL)	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim
Davis (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Murtha
Davis (KY)	(TX)	Musgrave
Davis, David	Jefferson	Myrick
Davis, Lincoln	Jindal	Nadler
Davis, Tom	Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)
Deal (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Neugebauer

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS DAM ENLARGEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 839, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 839.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—394

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
Biggert
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler

Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey

Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Henger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hookey
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood

Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
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
McCreery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
 Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
 McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha

Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
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
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
 T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays

Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
 Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Paul
NOT VOTING—38

Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Carson
Castor
Cleaver
Cubin
Cuellar
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Duncan
Fattah
Flake

Fossella
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Gutierrez
Johnson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Lowey
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mitchell
Napolitano

Pence
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Terry
Townes
Wamp
Weiner
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1920

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 157, 158, and 159.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I was regrettably absent from the Chamber on March 19 during rollcall votes 157, 158, and 159. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 157, "nay" on rollcall 158, and "nay" on rollcall 159.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 253) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 253

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Ms. Moore of Wisconsin.

Mr. HODES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I object. I ask the Clerk to read the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued reading the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMARKS ON FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF IRAQ WAR

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Iraq enters its fifth year, we take time to reflect on those who have made the greatest sacrifices because of this war, our troops. We all salute them because of their courage, their patriotism and the sacrifices they are willing to make. They have done everything asked of them, and we are forever in their debt.

That debt extends to their families, who have also made sacrifices. The missed family events, births of children, deaths of loved ones, graduations, anniversaries, birthdays are losses which cannot be replaced. We owe to these families a renewed commitment

to support them in whatever way may be required and to make sure that our troops have everything they need to do their job and to come home safely and soon.

To those who have been wounded, our Nation has promised to care for you as you have protected us. This is a solemn promise, and it will be honored.

The debt which can never be repaid is to those whose lives have been lost in the war, and as a Nation we mourn them. Their absence is felt each day, each and every one of them; but on this day in particular, their sacrifice should be remembered in a special way. I therefore salute our colleague, Congressman PATRICK MURPHY, for leading us in a moment of silence in memory of his colleagues who were lost in the war and all others as well.

Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago today, our Nation launched a war of choice in Iraq. The war has claimed the lives of over 3,200 American troops and wounded tens of thousands more, some of them permanently.

Any U.S. military engagement has to be judged in three ways: does it make our country safer, our military stronger, and the region in which we are engaged in the conflict more stable. The war in Iraq has failed on all three counts.

In fact, the administration's policy in Iraq has diminished the safety of our country by reducing the strength of our military. The readiness has sunk now to levels lower than Vietnam, it has failed to hold the Iraqis accountable for the future of their own country, and it has dishonored our commitment to our veterans. It has cost billions of dollars and significantly damaged our reputation in the eyes of the world.

When our young men and women are placed in danger, we owe it to them to provide them with the best training and equipment possible and a strategy worthy of their sacrifice.

The generals have told us over and over again, across the board, generals on active duty, General Petraeus as recently as last week, and many retired generals: there is no military solution to the war in Iraq. It cannot be won solely militarily. Instead, we must leverage all of our political, economic, and diplomatic strengths.

Again and again Senator REID, the Democratic leader in the Senate, and I have urged President Bush to adopt a plan for Iraq that contains the following elements:

Change the mission. Transition the mission from combat to training. That will enable us to responsibly redeploy our troops.

Third, we must build consensus for political accommodation in Iraq. They must amend the constitution to be more inclusive to end the civil strife.

Fourth, we must encourage a robust diplomatic effort, primarily involving Iraq's neighbors. The first meeting of neighbors was held. That is a good step. It was at a low level, appro-

priately, and now it has to move to the ministerial level.

We then must reform and reinvigorate the reconstruction effort. \$10 billion is unaccounted for. \$10 billion in thin air of the reconstruction effort is unaccounted for. How do we answer to the American taxpayer, when this war is costing \$2 billion a week on the military side, and on the reconstruction side we can't account for the money?

When we do this, when we transition, when we change the mission, redeploy the troops, build political consensus, engage in diplomatic efforts and reform and reinvigorate the reconstruction effort, then we can turn our attention to the real war on terror, in Afghanistan.

I hear the voice of the future in the Chamber. What a beautiful sound. What a beautiful sound.

Later this week, Mr. Speaker, we will debate a plan to bring the war to an end. The U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act will rebuild our military, protect our troops, provide for our veterans and hold the Iraqi Government accountable.

The benchmarks for the Iraqi Government set forth in this bill are the benchmarks endorsed by President Bush on January 10. They are: improvement in the performance of the Iraqi security forces; a greater commitment by the Iraqi Government to national reconciliation; and reductions in the level of sectarian violence in Iraq.

After 4 years of war, it is reasonable to expect these benchmarks to be met this year. Four years. We are in this war longer than World War II. There is no end in sight. There is no end in sight. There is an unlimited commitment, with no strategy to match the sacrifice of our troops.

Democrats will be offering later in the week, and hopefully with Republican support, we will pass a supplemental that will, that will, place a time frame. And I am really pleased that so many retired generals have come out in support of a time certain that relates to the performance that the President himself established, that the Iraqi Government themselves agreed to.

This isn't anything we created. It is the President's benchmarks. The Iraqis agreed to it. We want to see progress. But if we don't, we will begin the redeployment of our troops out of Iraq in 6 months from that date. Then we will leave troops there for training, for protecting our diplomats, for fighting terrorism, for force protection, but only for those purposes.

I welcome the debate over this bill and the opportunity it provides for Members of Congress to express themselves in what I consider is the greatest ethical challenge to our country, how we send our young men and women into battle; how we send them without the training, without the equipment, without the rest time at home, and overextend them when they are there.

□ 1930

How we send them into battle without plans to honor our commitment to them.

In the military they say: On the battlefield, we will leave no soldier behind. We say: And when they come home, we will leave no veteran behind.

Apparently our country, our great country, has to make a decision for greatness on how we are viewed in the world, on how we project our power and our ideals to make the world a more peaceful place, to honor our commitment to our troops, to honor our commitment to the future, and to honor the sacrifice and the vision of our Founding Fathers.

This is a very important decision for our caucus, for our Congress, for our country, and I hope that the debate will be in the spirit as it was a few weeks ago. It was a great commitment to our troops with knowledge of substance, based on values and respecting the patriotism of each and every person who serves in the Congress.

I know for certain as Speaker of the House that every single person who serves here is patriotic and wants to honor our veterans. I know for certain because I have seen every single person here take an oath of office to protect and defend our Constitution and our country. It is in that spirit that we offer this supplemental that makes America safer, that strengthens our military, and brings stability to the world.

OIG PROTESTS ITS INNOCENCE TOO MUCH

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, today 6 months after meeting with Members of Congress and with the staff of OIG of Homeland Security about Ramos and Compean, Richard Skinner of the Office of the Inspector General is now saying his staff did not lie to Members of Congress, but his staff was just mistaken about certain facts when it briefed us.

He also is saying the meeting was confidential. I am sure the OIG staff wishes it had been since the staff misled Congress on what occurred at the border.

Is Skinner saying it is okay to mislead Congress in a confidential meeting? Sounds like it to me. The meeting was only confidential in the fantasy world of OIG. And how would Skinner know; he wasn't even there.

His staff not only told Congress inaccurate things about the case, they said they have the documents to prove their assertions. Even after repeatedly asking for such documents, they were never produced. Why? Because they don't exist.

Now that the transcript of the trial is completed, we find out about the inaccurate statements of OIG to Congress.

OIG would do well to simply tell the truth and get accurate information in public and private rather than use slick Madison Avenue press releases to justify their misstatements to Congress.

And that's just the way it is.

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME WITH DIGNITY

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some semblance of security in Baghdad, but chlorine bombs in Anbar province and other parts of Iraq, the fourth-year anniversary of this country's offensive on the nation state of Iraq.

It is interesting that as we continue to watch our young people fall in battle, heroes that they are, and veterans come home, that the executive in this body, this Congress, this House and the other body cannot come to grips with a forward path for solving and reconciling the war in Iraq.

It is interesting that our Commander in Chief desires to tell us that we must stay the course, a refrain that we have heard over and over again.

My plea would be let us sit down at the table of reconciliation. Let us not suggest that people who stand for conscience are unpatriotic, and let us resolve to bring our troops home together in dignity and with success.

HONORING REV. RAYMOND MOSS

(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, I rise today to recall the exceptional life of Reverend Raymond Moss of Marietta, Georgia. Reverend Moss passed away this month at the age of 79, leaving behind a long legacy as an advocate of social justice and civil rights.

Reverend Moss was a fixture in Cobb County. After a brief stint in Minor League Baseball and a job as draftsman at Lockheed Martin, Moss found his true calling, and in 1959 he started Back to the Bible Holiness Church, the first homegrown Black church in Cobb County.

He went on to build 14 more churches in Georgia and Alabama, and helped lead the Cobb community during the turbulent civil rights era.

Reverend Moss was a compassionate father not only to his own 14 children, but to any member of the Marietta community in need of a mentor.

In fact, I first came to know the Reverend 30 years ago while practicing medicine with one of his dear friends, Dr. Douglas Glover. Indeed, many of Reverend Moss' faithful came to my office for care, and all had been deeply touched by the Reverend's compassion.

I know these members of our community will carry on his dedication to compassionate service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in honoring the life of Reverend Raymond Moss.

APPLAUDING TENNESSEE BASKETBALL

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Tennessean, I am proud of the success of my three schools that have reached the Sweet Sixteen.

In America, there is nothing going on with greater import on the local scene than March Madness; and there is no place more happy about the madness than the State of Tennessee, the Volunteer State.

Three of our schools have teams in the Sweet Sixteen: Our land grant university, the University of Tennessee; and my two alma maters, Vanderbilt University and the University of Memphis.

On Thursday, the University of Tennessee and the University of Memphis will both be playing in the Sweet Sixteen in San Antonio, Texas. Everybody in Texas knows if it weren't for Tennessee, there wouldn't be a Texas. So we bring basketball to Texas, and we brought liberty and independence to Texas. We have a lot of pride in our basketball teams and our universities.

SUPPORTING COLEMAN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to commend the men and women serving in the Federal Correction Complex in Coleman, Florida, in my district. This Federal complex serves our Nation by housing prisoners in low-, medium- and high-security facilities. It has provided countless jobs in my district and helped our growing economy.

The people who fill those jobs truly are a testament to the array of wonderful people in my district. Even with the struggles in funding and thinly stretched staff, the officers at Coleman are cheerful, positive, and professional people. Staffing a prison complex is no easy job, and many of the officers there literally have scars to prove it. Yet they know their job is to keep our families safe.

I have had the opportunity to tour this facility several times and meet with the staff, and I am proud to serve alongside such honorable public servants. I want to take this opportunity to give them all my heartfelt thanks.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). 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.

HEARING REQUESTED ON RAMOS AND COMPEAN PROSECUTION

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, today I had the pleasure of meeting with Congressman JOHN CONYERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I shared with him information from myself and other Members of Congress who are requesting a hearing on the case of Border Patrol Agents Ramos and Compean.

Many of us in Congress are concerned about the Federal prosecutor in this case and his decision to bring criminal charges against these agents. Agents Ramos and Compean were convicted last spring for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our border into Texas.

These agents never should have been sent to prison, yet today is their 62nd day behind bars. There are legitimate legal questions about how this prosecution was initiated, and how the U.S. Attorney's Office proceeded in this case. Members of Congress and the American people want to know why the Federal prosecutor is on the wrong side in this case.

To prosecute the agents, the U.S. Attorney's Office granted immunity to a known drug smuggler. He is not an American citizen, he is a criminal. Drug enforcement reports have confirmed that the Mexican drug smuggler brought a second load of marijuana, 752 pounds, into the United States after he was granted immunity to testify against our border agents, but this information was kept from the jury and the public.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that Chairman CONYERS will review the information that I and other Members of Congress have brought to his attention concerning the prosecution of these two heroes.

Before closing, I ask the President to use his authority and pardon these two Hispanic Americans who were doing their job to protect the American people; and, more importantly, I call on the President to listen to the American people and to the thousands of citizens who have asked for a pardon for these two men.

IRAQ IN CIVIL WAR

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise with deep concern that on this very day 4 years ago, our Nation inaugurated a conflict, an unnecessary war, a war of choice, not a necessity.

The most comprehensive intelligence we have, the National Intelligence Estimate and the latest Pentagon report, tells us that Iraq had descended into a state of civil war. Over 3,000 Americans have died, and hundreds of thousands, some even say up to 1 million citizens of Iraq, have lost their lives in this unnecessary conflict.

And while we are telling our veterans of this war, the elderly, the poor, and the sick that there is no room in the budget for them, the American people have spent over \$400 billion on a failed policy. We cannot do more of the same. Mr. Speaker, violence begets violence. It does not lead to peace.

President John F. Kennedy once said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable." My greatest fear is that the young people of Iraq and of the Middle East will never forget this war. My greatest fear is they will grow up hating our children and our children's children for what we have done. Mr. Speaker, the Bible is right. Even a great nation can reap what it sows.

Nothing troubles me more than to see the young faces of these soldiers who have been led to their death.

□ 1945

Some are only 18, 19, 21, 22, 23. It is painful; it is so painful to watch. Sometimes I feel like crying and crying out loud at what we are doing as a Nation and what this administration is doing in our name. Our children do not deserve to die as pawns in a civil war.

They do not deserve to pay with their lives for the mistakes of this administration. They never had a chance.

When I was their age, when I was 23 years old, I was leading the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, soon to speak in Washington on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, but then we were involved in a nonviolent revolution to transform the soul of America, to create a beloved community.

Forty years ago, I was there in New York City in Riverside Church when Martin Luther King, Jr., gave one of the most powerful speeches he ever made against the war in Vietnam. If he could speak today, he would say this Nation needs a revolution of values that exposes the truth that war does not work. If he could speak today, he would say that war is obsolete as a tool of our foreign policy.

He would say there is nothing keeping us from changing our national priority so that the pursuit of peace can take precedence over the pursuit of war.

He would say we must remove the causes of chaos, injustice, poverty and insecurity that are breeding grounds for terrorism. This is the way towards peace.

As a Nation, can we hear the words of Gandhi, so simple, so true, that it is either nonviolence or nonexistence? Can we hear the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., saying that we must learn to

live together as brothers and sisters or perish as fools?

Tonight I must make it plain and clear that as a human being, as a citizen of the world, as a citizen of America, as a Member of Congress, as an individual committed to a world at peace with itself, I will not and I cannot in good conscience vote for another dollar or another dime to support this war.

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

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

A FAILED STRATEGY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, Vice President CHENEY, on the looming war in Iraq, of which he was a principal architect, he and his staff are responsible for the manipulation and manufacturing of intelligence that misled people into believing there was a threat of weapons of mass destruction or there was some ties to 9/11. Neither of those things was true. Vice President CHENEY said we will, in fact, be greeted as liberators. I think it will go relatively quickly. Weeks, rather than months, said Vice President CHENEY, and he still does not believe that he was wrong.

He is still a principal architect of the surge, of an escalation of the war in Iraq, of continuing a war without end, a war that President Bush said last November it will be up to the next President to determine when U.S. troops might come home.

A failed strategy, a strategy that fails our troops. Our troops have done all that we have asked and more under difficult conditions. They started with inadequate equipment, and Congress had to push the administration to give them the equipment they needed. They have been put on brutal rotations, stop/loss orders, and they have done more than was asked.

But the leadership has failed. Donald Rumsfeld is gone. He should have gone a very long time ago. Vice President CHENEY is still there pulling the strings. We will be greeted as liberators, he said.

Then the President two months later said major combat operations have ended, 1st of May. Nearly 3,000 American troops have died since the President gave that speech. Over 12,000 have been seriously wounded, very seriously wounded; and yet their answer is more of the same, stay the course, to escalate the conflict. They will not engage in meaningful diplomacy, and they will not change direction in Iraq. Their strategy will not bring a successful end to this war.

They are now again trying to tie it to 9/11 and al Qaeda. Yet they are contradicted, in fact, by the Director of National Intelligence, a Bush appointee. When he was asked, Mike McConnell, if al Qaeda would establish itself in Iraq and they would launch attacks from there, I would not go so far as to say al Qaeda would necessarily believe that. They want to reestablish their base and their objective would be in Afghanistan.

Remember Afghanistan? Remember Osama bin Laden? Remember 9/11? Remember the Taliban? They are still out there. They are planning and plotting. Afghanistan is going in a bad direction because the President diverted our attention, our troops, our resources away from a battle that was supported by all the major nations in the world to eradicate those who had attacked us so grievously on 9/11 into a discretionary war in Iraq, and still, the President would put the emphasis on Iraq.

His National Security Adviser says this is a charade what they would do in the House of Representatives, a charade. If it is a charade, why are they fighting so hard? For the first time, Congress is going to exert its constitutional responsibility as a third and co-equal branch to say enough failed leadership is enough and we want a new direction.

The Speaker came to the well earlier and laid that out in detail, what that new direction would be, and this bill that we will vote on later this week would move us in that new direction. That is not a charade. That is the first meaningful challenge to the failure of leadership by Vice President CHENEY and George Bush that have put that region at risk, that has put American troops in the middle of a civil war, which is now admitted by the Pentagon.

We did not go there to be referees in the middle of a 1,400-year-old sectarian conflict in a civil war. The Iraqis are going to have to resolve those issues themselves.

I wrote to the President 2 years ago February and said you need to set meaningful timelines to force the Iraqis to come together and begin to resolve their differences. They still do not want to do that.

Americans should not be the surrogates. We should not be in the middle. Our troops should not be in the middle.

This bill is extraordinarily important. Yes, the President might veto it, but we are going to challenge him again and again and again until we get a new direction that better serves our country, our troops, that region and the world.

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

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

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

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. Mr. Speaker, as you have heard our colleagues coming down to the well and talking passionately on the anniversary of the Iraq war and the debate that will go later on in this week and a vote that will come on to the floor of the House, I think that this is what certainly the American people want to see; but tonight, Mr. Speaker, I also want to talk about something else.

We in Congress must keep our eyes and ears open on all things that are happening around us; and today I want to talk about the tens of thousands of Federal Aviation Administration employees that are working without a contract.

Most of these workers are represented by the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, Professional Airways System Specialist, and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

The FAA under the Bush administration has attacked the collective bargaining process. The FAA has not implemented a single negotiated and ratified contract with any of its contract unions. FAA employees need a fair collective bargaining process restored.

Just as this House gave collective bargaining rights to TSA employees in the 9/11 bill, which was the right thing to do, we must do no less for the employees of the FAA. Let me be very clear on this point. Our air traffic controllers do not have a contract with the FAA.

The FAA imposed work and pay rules on these individuals last September. There is no Federal law that recognizes imposed work and pay rules as a contract. Morale among FAA employees is extremely low. Retirements are far exceeding FAA's planning. Fatigue among those employees who remain is a major concern, and these are all direct effects of the unilaterally imposed work rules.

In 2003, there were over 15,000 air traffic controllers. At the end of 2006, there were barely 14,000. Of the 14,000 working today, almost 2,000 of them are trainees and not fully certified. At the same time, and by no means by coincidence, operational errors are on the rise at the FAA's busiest facilities, including Atlanta-Hartsfield and the Southern California TRAY-CON.

Current FAA projections are that by the year 2010, which is only a few years away, 40 percent of the air traffic control workforce will have 4 years or less on the job.

This House has a duty to these individuals to a fair process. That is all they are asking for, nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people do not understand the job that air traffic controllers have, yet they have the control of the thousands and thousand of lives

on a daily basis. Every single day that people fly, it is the air traffic controllers that are basically controlling the skies to make us safe.

And being that we are talking about 9/11, think about what our air traffic controllers did on that day. They brought down thousands and thousands of planes without one incident. They saved so many lives, and yet here the administration is taking away the right for them to earn a decent pay.

The pressure that is up in those towers is unbelievable. I have spent time there just to see what that job was like. They are not asking for more or less. All they are asking for is a contract.

This House has a duty to make sure that those workers have what is due them.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1227, GULF COAST HURRICANE HOUSING RECOVERY ACT OF 2007

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-53) on the resolution (H. Res. 254) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1227) to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution calling on the Government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Patrick Finucane, as recommended by Judge Peter Cory as part of the Weston Park Agreement, in order to move forward on the Northern Ireland peace process.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously.

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 85th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a leading association for the 1,300,000 United States citizens of Greek ancestry and Philhellenes in the United States.

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

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

LACK OF POLITICAL PROGRESS IN IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the New York Times reported that Iraq is falling well short of the political progress they were supposed to have made by now. Still no constitutional reform. Still no local elections. Still no final action on a law governing distribution of oil revenues. Still no reversal of the de-Baathification laws.

The Bush administration is now saying that their military escalation needs time to work and that these political goals will not be met until the end of the year.

I think it is clear what is going on here. What we have is another tactic by the White House in an attempt to run out the clock until January of 2009 when they can hand over the reins and make Iraq look like someone else's problem.

The President has said that the military commitment to Iraq is not open-ended; yet all evidence is to the contrary.

□ 2000

The supporters of this war, a group whose numbers are dwindling by the day, tell us the next 6 months are critical. This really is the last chance for success. Time and time again, deadlines are established and not met, but there are no consequences, nor is there accountability. I am of the belief that the Iraqi Government won't get its act together until it is forced to govern on its own, until it is no longer propped up by the presence of more than 150,000 American soldiers.

As it is now, as long as we continue with this military occupation, Iraqis have absolutely no incentive to push for democratic reform. As the Times article indicated, the President has waved off these concerns, accusing those of us who want to apply deadlines, pressure of being part of a culture of instant results.

Instant results? I am sorry, the President has had 4 years and more than \$400 billion to make this work. Besides, it is this administration that assured us we would be greeted as liberators, that democratizing Iraq would be a cinch, that there would be hardly any sacrifice at all. Now that they have turned out to be monumentally wrong, they are wanting to know why we are demanding answers 4 years later.

I, for one, am tired of being told to be patient, especially when this body is asked to write another enormous check for this war, especially when my country is becoming a global pariah, especially when we learn that our Iraq policy has increased the threat of terrorism, especially when Americans are dying by the thousands, and those lucky enough to make it home alive

face a mountain of red tape, substandard care, rodent-infested living quarters at Walter Reed.

I believe we must move toward a fully funded military withdrawal now, not in August of 2008, not at some future date to be determined by the President. End the occupation and start bringing the troops home so that every last one of them can be out of Iraq and with their families in time for the holidays.

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.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION, 110TH CONGRESS

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(3) of Rule XI, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit the rules of the Committee for the 110th Congress for publication at an appropriate place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

RULE NO. 1

General provisions

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a privileged motion in the Committee. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the chair and to its rules as far as applicable.

(b) The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under House Rule X and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by House Rule X, clause 6, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) The Committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee, and to make such information available to the public. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee shall be paid from the appropriate House account.

(d) The Committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the committee under House Rules X and XI during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

(e) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE NO. 2

Regular and special meetings

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee on House Administration shall be the

second Wednesday of every month when the House is in session in accordance with Clause 2(b) of House Rule XI. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair of the Committee as she or he may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with Clause 2(c) of House Rule XI. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chair subject to Clause 2(c) of House Rule XI. A regularly scheduled meeting may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chair, there is no need for the meeting.

(b) If the Chair is not present at any meeting of the Committee, or at the discretion of the Chair, the Vice Chair of the Committee shall preside at the meeting. If the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee are not present at any meeting of the Committee, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE NO. 3

Open meetings

As required by Clause 2(g), of House Rule XI, each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee in open session and with a quorum present determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House: Provided, however, that no person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and such other persons as the Committee may authorize, shall be present in any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

RULE NO. 4

Records and rollcalls

(a)(1) A record vote shall be held if requested by any member of the Committee.

(2) The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available for inspection by the public at reasonable times at the Committee offices, including a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and against; and the members present but not voting.

(b)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2), the Chair may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chair may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time.

(2) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (1), the Chair shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

(3) 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.

(c) All Committee and subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as Chair; and such records shall be the property of the House and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

(d) House records of the Committee which are at the National Archives shall be made available pursuant to House Rule VII. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision to withhold a record

pursuant to the rule, and shall present the matter to the Committee upon written request of any Committee member.

(e) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE NO. 5

Proxies

No vote by any member in the Committee may be cast by proxy.

RULE NO. 6

Power to sit and act subpoena power

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI, the Committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph)—

(1) 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; and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, documents and other materials as it deems necessary, including materials in electronic form. The Chair, or any member designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subparagraph (a)(2) may be delegated to the Chair pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the Committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chair or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(2) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or a subcommittee may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

RULE NO. 7

Quorums

No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. For the purposes of taking any action other than reporting any measure, issuance of a subpoena, closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders, or changing the rules of the Committee, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

RULE NO. 8

Amendments

Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the Committee or a subcommittee must be made available in written form when requested by any member of the Committee. If such amendment is not available in written form when requested, the Chair will allow an appropriate period of time for the provision thereof.

RULE NO. 9

Hearing procedures

(a) The Chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one (1) week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member,

determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present, the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) Unless excused by the Chair, each witness who is to appear before the 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 his or her proposed testimony and shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of his or her statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(d) All other members of the Committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall count for a quorum or offer any motion or amendment or vote on any matter before the subcommittee.

(e) Committee or subcommittee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chair for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended as provided by House Rules. The questioning of a witness in Committee or subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chair, followed by the ranking minority member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chair shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority. The Chair may accomplish this by recognizing two majority members for each minority member recognized.

(f) The following additional rules shall apply to hearings of the Committee or a subcommittee, as applicable:

(1) The Chair at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the Committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness as provided by clause 2(k)(2) of Rule XI.

(3) Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The Chair 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) If the Committee determines that evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall—

(A) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness;

(B) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session; and

(C) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (f)(5), the Chair shall receive and the Com-

mittee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Committee.

(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.

RULE NO. 10

Procedures for reporting measures or matters

(a)(1) It shall be the duty of the Chair to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Chair notice of the filing of that request.

(b)(1) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

(2) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) The report of the Committee on a measure or matter which has been approved by the Committee shall include the matters required by Clause 3(c) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) Each report of the Committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the Committee shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

(e) If, at the time any measure or matter is ordered reported by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than two additional calendar days after the day of such notice, commencing on the day on which the measure or matter(s) was approved, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the Committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the Committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(1) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views, in the form submitted, by the time of the filing of the report, and

(2) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subparagraph (c)) are included as part

of the report. This subparagraph does not preclude—

(A) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by paragraph (c); or

(B) the filing of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee upon that measure or matter.

(3) shall, when appropriate, contain the documents required by Clause 3(e) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(f) The Chair, following consultation with the ranking minority member, is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House, relating to going to conference with the Senate, whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

(g) If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the Committee shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings published and available to the members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House.

(h) The Chair may designate any majority member of the Committee to act as "floor manager" of a bill or resolution during its consideration in the House.

RULE NO. 11

Committee oversight

The Committee shall conduct oversight of matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee in accordance with House Rule X, clause 2 and clause 4. Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall, in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present, adopt its oversight plan for that Congress in accordance with House Rule X, clause 2(d).

RULE NO. 12

Review of continuing programs; budget act provisions

(a) The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriation for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirement, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph a Government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in Clause 4(e) of Rule X of House Rules.

(b) The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) The Committee shall, on or before February 25 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) 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 which are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) 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 which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the Committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocation made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and

promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RULE NO. 13

Broadcasting of committee hearings and meetings

Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, as provided in Clause 4 of House Rule XI, subject to the limitations therein. Operation and use of any Committee Internet broadcast system shall be fair and non-partisan and in accordance with Clause 4(b) of rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

RULE NO. 14

Committee and subcommittee staff

The staff of the Committee on House Administration shall be appointed as follows:

A. The staff shall be appointed by the Chair or her or his designee except as provided in paragraph (B), and may be removed by the Chair and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair;

B. All staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed by the ranking member or her or his designee, and may be removed, by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member;

C. The Chair shall fix the compensation of all staff of the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party staff, within the budget approved for such purposes for the Committee.

RULE NO. 15

Travel of members and staff

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of Committee members and staff. Travel for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chair or her or his designee. Travel may be authorized by the Chair for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance at hearings conducted by the Committee and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the travel;
- (2) The dates during which the travel will occur;
- (3) The locations to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each; and
- (4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the Committee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chair. Before such authorization is given, there

shall be submitted to the Chair, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

- (A) the purpose of the travel;
- (B) the dates during which the travel will occur;
- (C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;
- (D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and
- (E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, members and staff attending meetings or conferences shall submit a written report to the Chair covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(c) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel.

RULE NO. 16

Number and jurisdiction of subcommittees

(a) There shall be two standing subcommittees, with party ratios of members as indicated. Subcommittees shall have jurisdictions as stated by these rules, may conduct oversight over such subject matter, and may consider such legislation as may be referred to them by the Chair. The names and jurisdiction of the subcommittees shall be:

(1) Subcommittee on Capitol Security—(2/1). Matters pertaining to operations and security of the Congress, and of the Capitol complex including the House wing of the Capitol, the House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and other policies and facilities supporting congressional operations; the U.S. Capitol Police.

(2) Subcommittee on Elections—(4/2). Matters pertaining to the Federal Election Campaign Act, the Federal Contested Elections Act, the Help America Vote Act, the National Voter Registration Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, the Federal Voting Assistance Program, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act (accessibility for voters with disabilities), the Federal Elections Commission (FEC), the Elections Assistance Commission (EAC), and other election related issues.

(b) The Chair may establish and appoint members to serve on task forces of the Committee, to perform specific functions for limited periods of time, as she or he deems appropriate.

RULE NO. 17

Referral of legislation to subcommittees

The Chair may refer legislation or other matters to a subcommittee, or subcommittees, as she or he considers appropriate. The Chair may discharge any subcommittee of any matter referred to it.

RULE NO. 18

Powers and duties of subcommittees

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it. No subcommittee shall meet during any Committee meeting.

RULE NO. 19

Other procedures and regulations

The Chair may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be nec-

essary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the committee.

RULE NO. 20

Designation of clerk of the committee

For the purposes of these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives, the staff director of the Committee shall act as the clerk of the Committee.

THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the fourth anniversary of our invasion of Iraq. We still don't necessarily know why we went to war in Iraq; I certainly don't. This is my first year in Congress, and we have a very serious and important matter coming up this week which we have to vote on. I haven't decided exactly how I am going to vote. I know I want us out of Iraq. I want our troops to be safe, but be protected, and I want our veterans to be looked after.

There is a proposal to come up to suggest we should have a definite date, September 1 of 2008, to have our troops out of Iraq, and to have certain benchmarks which the Iraqi Government has to meet, and have our President certify they have met them at different times in the summer and next fall.

There are certain restrictions on the troops that says that the military can't send folks in if they haven't had a year off, they are not properly trained and don't have proper equipment, which is kind of hard for me to fathom, that after 4 years of war, we are only now getting around to saying our troops should have proper equipment, proper training and proper rest. It's hard for me to imagine what's gone on the last 4 years, what type of oversight or undersight has taken place in this Congress, and what type of concern that the administration has had for our troops, sending them into Iraq without proper training and without proper equipment.

It borders on malfeasance, and it makes me wonder, in voting for \$100 billion in the supplemental budget, if it's not negligence, and Mr. Speaker knows as a lawyer it may be beyond that. It may be gross negligence of this administration, which has shown it doesn't know how to handle money, particularly in sending it to Iraq, where \$10 billion is totally missing, other monies have just disappeared, to give them \$100 billion and to give them the care and custody of American men and women, great patriots who have volunteered for military duty.

We have had 3,200 Americans die in Iraq, over 3,200 now, and casualties in the area of 20,000. For every day we stay there longer, there will be more and more casualties and more and more deaths.

I understand the proposal being put forth is an advancement, and it's more than the Senate will do, and it's more

than the administration will permit, because they have said they will veto anything with a date, anything with conditions, anything that is reasonable, that reflects what the American people want to have, which is the same policy in Iraq to get our troops home and to find a way to end America's nightmare, which has, indeed, been a nightmare.

We were told the mission was accomplished. I don't know what has been accomplished. I have read newspapers today, and everybody, people in Iraq, have no medical care, they have very little electricity, they are living in squalor, and they say life was better with Saddam Hussein than it is now. We have not improved the lives of the Iraqi people. We have pretty much destroyed their country, and we claim we did it for freedom.

But one of the conditions upon which we will measure the benchmarks is if they give us their oil and give it to some of our multinational companies, which makes you wonder if they hate us because of our love for freedom, or if they hate us because we want to take their oil. Maybe that is what it was all about was oil, blood for oil.

It's hard for me not to support a progressive measure, which I know Speaker PELOSI and I know my party's leadership is going to advance, to try to bring some end to this nightmare. But at the same time it's difficult for me to give another dollar and another life to the care and custody of this administration. I do think it's gross negligence probably to do so when you look at what they have done over the last 4 years.

I read about death this weekend in Iraq, soldiers who died who were 20 years old, 19 years old, 21 years old, and I thought about how young they were. They are children basically, children with guns, going over to Iraq, and they are dying because they fall, they have an IED blow them up. It's not *mano a mano*, it is not being shot by Iraqis. It's IEDs. Every day we stay, there will be more and more American men and women being blown up, being sent to inadequate facilities such as Walter Reed because we haven't gotten out.

I don't know that the situation there will get any better. The President today called a press conference and spoke and said we need to keep going forward; we won't know in weeks, we won't know in months, we won't know until longer if this surge or escalation will work.

It's not going to work. You learn from history. If you don't learn from history, you are a fool. The fact is you look at the past, you can look at the Sunnis and the Shi'a and the situation over there and the insurgents, and our being there has not made a difference. It just means that American men and women have died, and the dollars that should have been spent in cities in America to help children with education and health care hasn't been spent.

I am conflicted. I hope the people in my district will let me know what they think. Should we spend another dollar and sacrifice another life, or should we get out as soon as possible?

PETRODOLLARS AND THE IRAQ WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal reported last week what most Americans may not realize, that for the first time in history, our U.S. military is now guarding the major Iraqi oil pipeline that leads to its major refinery in Bayji. Yes, our brave soldiers from the 82nd Airborne are now maintaining around-the-clock presence at Iraq's largest oil pipeline and refinery to fight the corruption, smuggling and sabotage that characterize Iraq's oil industry, its premier industry.

The article talks about the flourishing market in stolen Iraqi oil. It says U.S. military officials estimate that as much as 70 percent of the fuel processed at the plant is lost to the black market, an amount valued at more than \$2 billion. Iraq's oil reserves may be the largest in the world. Future access to them is now being determined by a group of people we generally don't see on the evening news.

Do you know them? It's important to figure out who those people are and who exactly is now involved in writing Iraq's hydrocarbon law. How transparent are these oil deliberations?

Indeed, it is amazing how little we hear about them, as trillions of dollars are at stake. Meanwhile, oil smuggling has earned lots of shady characters hundreds of millions of dollars since the beginning of the war. Why did we let this go on? Until now, we can catch Saddam Hussein in the spider hole, and yet somehow we could not figure out who is smuggling Iraqi oil?

Americans deserve answers to so many questions. Who has been earning the money from the oil smuggling? Which global oil companies will benefit once the U.S. leaves Iraq? What percent of oil resources in Iraq will be left for the Iraqi people?

Traveling to Iraq and Kuwait a few weeks ago, I had the chance to witness how technology and power systems transformed endless deserts into oil supply lines. It is an awesome sight. Yet I couldn't help but ask, what is America doing in these deserts? Who does our oil addiction benefit? How have we let ourselves become tied to oil dictatorships? Why do we pay nearly \$400 billion a year to import petroleum rather than become energy-independent ourselves here at home?

Our able colleague, Congressman BILL DELAHUNT of Massachusetts, gave me a book last week, and I looked on page 96. This is called "The Price of Loyalty," by Ron Suskind. It explains

how Donald Rumsfeld used our Defense Intelligence Agency to map Iraq's oil fields and lists companies that might be interested in leveraging the precious asset long before the Iraqi war was declared.

Judicial Watch obtained Mr. Rumsfeld's map through a Freedom of Information request because Mr. Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz would not share it voluntarily. Imagine that. Our taxpayers footed the bill for this map to benefit private firms.

The book attests Rumsfeld and his cohorts in the Bush administration were not concerned with legitimate reasons to go to war; they only concerned themselves with how and how quickly to penetrate Iraq's oil fields. Mr. Wolfowitz had written as early as 1999 that the United States should be committed, should be prepared to commit ground forces to protect a sanctuary in southern Iraq where the opposition could safely mobilize. As we pay dearly for this violent war, and our soldiers die in Iraq, just coincidentally we have to remember the world's largest untapped oil reserves are in Iraq.

Most other nations in the Middle East have guarded their oil reserves as national treasures, but I will tell you what: Halliburton, ExxonMobil, ConocoPhillips, ChevronTexaco and foreign companies like Total, Royal Dutch Shell and British Petroleum have been identified by reporters like Antonia Juhasz, who said last week in the New York Times, these oil companies would not have to invest their earnings in the Iraqi economy, partner with Iraqi companies, hire Iraqi workers or share their new technologies. In fact, she says, only 13 of the 80 oil wells, oil fields in Iraq would be for the Iraqi people. The other ones are being bargained away as the hydrocarbon law is written. Why do we hear so little about this on our evening news?

John Perkins, in his book "Confessions of an Economic Hit Man," talks about how Saudi oil money through petrodollars has been reinvested in our economy, holding up so many of our equities and certainly our U.S. Treasury securities. Why can't America become energy-independent at home? Why do we have to be dependent on the 20th century view of dependency on foreign oil?

"Almost immediately after the [1973 oil] embargo ended," Perkins writes, "Washington began negotiating with the Saudis, offering them technical support, military hardware and training and an opportunity to bring their nation into the twentieth century, in exchange for petrodollars and, most importantly, assurances that there would never be another oil embargo." Congress did not negotiate this—the overall management and fiscal responsibility lay with the Department of the Treasury, and according to the book, the ensuing agreement, which was negotiated in intense secrecy, "fortified] the concept of mutual interdependence." The very goal of this agreement was to "find ways that would assure that a large portion of petrodollars found their way back to the United States" so that "Saudi Arabia would be

drawn in, its economy would become increasingly intertwined with and dependent upon ours" and, of course, we on them. It is a ride-in economy.

Is this the America you want? Do you want U.S. soldiers risking their lives guarding Iraqi oil? I want an America free of counter-productive foreign entanglements. I want an America free of support for dictatorships, no matter how tempting their treasures. I want an America free of foreign oil. I want to invest our dollars here at home in energy independence—in solar, wind, hydrogen, clean coal, new turbine systems, fuel cells and so much more.

I think most Americans, if they understood the extent to which we are hurting ourselves, would want the same. Some global interests are getting so filthy rich year after year, that they would risk a free America for the sake of their bloodied oil profits. It's worth changing how we do business in order to regain our freedom.

[From the Wall Street Journal Europe, Mar. 15, 2007]

IRAQ'S OIL SMUGGLERS ARE TARGETED

(By Yochi J. Dreazen)

BAYJI, IRAQ—Adding another facet to Washington's new pacification plan for Iraq, U.S. and Iraqi forces have launched an aggressive campaign to curb the oil smuggling that is destabilizing the fragile Baghdad government and helping to fund insurgents.

In concert with stepped-up military and reconstruction initiatives across Iraq, U.S. troops for the first time are maintaining a round-the-clock presence at the sprawling oil refinery here, Iraq's largest. Soldiers from the Army's 82nd Airborne Division are cracking down on illegal gas stations, arresting refinery workers suspected of corruption and using sophisticated data-sifting methods to identify which senior Iraqi officials might have ties to black-market oil rings.

The Iraqi government, meanwhile, has begun what it calls Operation Honest Hands, which puts the entire refinery under Iraqi military control. Iraqi Army soldiers are physically monitoring each of the facility's pumps and entrances, assuming many of the responsibilities previously held by a paramilitary security force employed by the Oil Ministry that was widely considered corrupt and ineffectual. Iraqi troops are also escorting many convoys of fuel trucks from the refinery to destinations around the country.

The move represents another course change for the administration of U.S. President George W. Bush as it struggles to craft a new approach for stabilizing Iraq. U.S. and Iraqi officials have long been aware of the flourishing market in stolen Iraqi oil but largely turned a blind eye because Washington feared that stationing American soldiers in major refineries would spark a nationalist backlash and renew accusations that the U.S. invaded Iraq for its oil. The Iraqi government, meanwhile, felt its modest security resources were better used directly fighting insurgents.

But officials from both governments have concluded recently that oil smuggling had become too big a problem to ignore any longer. The loss of so much output to the black market is sharply reducing the Iraqi government's main source of revenue: About 94% of Iraq's \$32 billion budget last year came from oil revenue. The stolen oil also gives Iraq's insurgent groups a ready source of income, helping to perpetuate the country's civil war.

"Disrupting the insurgent funding is our main job," said 30-year-old Capt. Kwenton Kuhlman, who is leading the antismuggling

operation at the Bayji refinery. "I'm under no illusions—we can't stop it. It's too big. But we can try to disrupt it."

Iraq produces some 2 million barrels of oil a day, but U.S. and Iraqi officials believe the figure could rise as high as 5 million barrels a day with improved security and new infrastructure.

Former Iraqi President Saddam Hussein helped create the black market in oil in response to economic sanctions imposed in the wake of the 1990-91 Persian Gulf War. Mr. Hussein used smuggling, as well as kick-backs on oil sold legitimately through the United Nations' oil-for-food program, to generate cash for his regime and to reward allies at home and abroad.

The stepped-up fight against smuggling has no guarantee of success—and risks triggering more political and economic turmoil. Senior Iraqi officials regularly pressure the Americans to call off specific investigations or release individuals detained for suspected involvement in the black market, feeding Washington's suspicions that oil-related corruption extends deep into the government.

The enormity of the task facing the soldiers from the 82nd Airborne was evident on recent visits, and underscores the broader challenge Americans face in turning more security over to their Iraqi counterparts. Several tanker drivers said Iraqi soldiers at the plant had already begun asking for bribes. The drivers also said they don't want to be escorted by Iraqi troops for fear of attracting insurgent attacks. "I want coalition forces to guard this place, not the Iraqi Army," driver Suhaib Adil Kareem said. "The Iraqis don't care about the law."

Widespread oil smuggling siphons off as much as \$5 billion per year. At the Bayji refinery—one of three in the country [U.S. military officials estimate that as much as 70% of the fuel processed at the plant is lost to the black market, an amount valued at more than \$2 billion per year.]

Iraq's parliament will soon debate a landmark petroleum law that would clear the way for direct foreign investment in the battered oil sector and set out rough guidelines for distributing oil revenue among Iraq's 18 provinces. But U.S. and Iraqi officials warn the new law will have little substantive impact unless the smuggling is brought under control.

The endemic oil-sector corruption is a financial boon to insurgent operations. A classified U.S. government report in November estimated Iraqi militants earn \$25 million to \$100 million every year by stealing tankers full of fuel, smuggling oil to other countries, carrying out kidnappings for ransom, and charging protection money from truckers and gas station owners.

"The fuel that is stolen comes back as bombs, mortar shells and Katyusha rockets," said Hamad Hamoud al-Shakti, the governor of the Salahaddin province, home to the Bayji refinery.

The black market is fueled by three factors. Baghdad heavily subsidizes gasoline and other oil products, and the resulting low prices mean they can be resold at enormous profit in neighboring countries. The government also doesn't verify that gas-station owners—who are entitled to receive 100,000 liters of fuel per week—sell to retail customers instead of on the black market.

The biggest issue, though, is pervasive corruption. U.S. and Iraqi officials say refinery workers routinely allow tankers to pick up fuel without any paperwork, which makes it easy to sell off the books. Police officers demand bribes of as much as \$1,000 to let tankers pass through checkpoints or for "protection" along routes, the officials say. And some government officials work directly with smugglers or secretly own gas stations

and fuel trucks, giving them a share of money earned through illicit sales, U.S. officials say.

"You're talking about corruption at basically every level," says Maj. Curtis Buzzard, the Harvard-educated executive officer of the brigade conducting the interdiction push. "And it's deeply entrenched."

As part of the campaign, the U.S. in coming months will spend more than \$12 million to install video cameras to monitor the refinery's pumps and new digital scales to weigh trucks, making it easier to see if truckers are carrying more fuel than they were meant to receive. The money will also be used to build parking lots designed to protect drivers from extortion and insurgent attack.

Over the past few months, U.S. and Iraqi forces already have quietly begun arresting officials suspected of playing central roles in black-market rings. As far back as September, Iraqi forces arrested Ibrahim Muslit, who ran the Bayji refinery's oil-distribution operation, after he allegedly allowed 33 tankers in a single day to receive fuel without any paperwork. In January, U.S. troops arrested Ahmed Ibrahim Hamad, a senior transportation official at the refinery, after he allegedly tried to help smuggle out seven tankers of heavy-fuel oil. Both men are in custody and unavailable for comment.

Now, U.S. commanders say they are conducting investigations of senior officials from the Bayji city council, the local police force and the provincial and national governments. The American officers say they have made about 40 arrests since the crackdown began in earnest in early February, when the Iraqis formally joined the campaign, and they hope to make additional arrests in coming weeks.

During a surprise inspection of the refinery's gasoline and diesel pumps one afternoon, Sgt. Stephen Truesdale noticed that the analog display on one of the machines showed it had pumped 4,000 liters more than the facility's handwritten records indicated.

"He helped steal 4,000 liters of gas," Sgt. Truesdale, a former North Carolina police officer, said of the heavy-set Iraqi man who had been manning the pump. "The pumps don't lie."

The refinery worker insisted he was innocent, but Capt. Kuhlman, the brigade leader, told his men they had enough evidence to arrest him.

On the way back to their base, the U.S. forces saw a large fuel truck parked on the side of the road, surrounded by pickup trucks carrying overflowing oil barrels. The 18 Iraqis at the site freely admitted they had purchased the fuel from a tanker driver who had left the refinery a short time earlier. The men said they made such purchases several times a week and resold the oil to factory owners and other small businesses in neighboring towns.

The American forces ordered the Iraqis to drive their pickups back to the refinery, where the men were searched, photographed and escorted onto a pair of open-backed military vehicles for transport to holding cells at the U.S. installation.

The following day, Capt. Kuhlman told a room full of refinery officials and trucking-company executives about the arrests. Shakir Hamid, a businessman who said his partner had been kidnapped from the refinery months earlier, shook his head.

"In Saddam's time, oil smugglers were hung," he said.

"And I release them after two days," Capt. Kuhlman replied, shrugging his shoulders. "But it's a start."

Beneath the surface was a battle O'Neill had seen brewing since the NSC meeting on

January 30. It was Powell and his moderates at the State Department versus hard-liners like Rumsfeld, Cheney, and Wolfowitz, who were already planning the next war in Iraq and the shape of a post-Saddam country.

Documents were being prepared by the Defense Intelligence Agency, Rumsfeld's intelligence arm, mapping Iraq's oil fields and exploration areas and listing companies that might be interested in leveraging the precious asset.

One document, headed "Foreign Suitors for Iraqi Oilfield Contracts," lists companies from thirty countries—including France, Germany, Russia, and the United Kingdom—their specialties, bidding histories, and in some cases their particular areas of interest. An attached document maps Iraq with markings for "supergiant oilfield," and "other oilfield," and "earmarked for production sharing," while demarcating the largely undeveloped southwest of the country into nine "blocks" to designate areas for future exploration. The desire to "dissuade" countries from engaging in "asymmetrical challenges" to the United States—as Rumsfeld said in his January articulation of the demonstrative value of a preemptive attack—matched with plans for how the world's second largest oil reserve might be divided among the world's contractors made for an irresistible combination, O'Neill later said.

Already by February, the talk was mostly about logistics. Not the why, but the how and how quickly. Rumsfeld, O'Neill recalled, was focused on how an incident might cause escalated tensions—like the shooting down of an American plane in the regular engagements between U.S. fighters and Iraqi anti-aircraft batteries—and what U.S. responses to such an occurrence might be. Wolfowitz was pushing for the arming of Iraqi opposition groups and sending in U.S. troops to support and defend their insurgency. He had written in *Foreign Affairs* magazine in 1999 that "the United States should be prepared to commit ground forces to protect a sanctuary in southern Iraq where the opposition could safely mobilize."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 2007]

WHOSE OIL IS IT, ANYWAY?

(By Antonia Judasz)

Today more than three-quarters of the world's oil is owned and controlled by governments. It wasn't always this way.

Until about 35 years ago, the world's oil was largely in the hands of seven corporations based in the United States and Europe. Those seven have since merged into four: ExxonMobil, Chevron, Shell and BP. They are among the world's largest and most powerful financial empires. But ever since they lost their exclusive control of the oil to the governments, the companies have been trying to get it back.

Iraq's oil reserves—thought to be the second largest in the world—have always been high on the corporate wish list. In 1998, Kenneth Derr, then chief executive of Chevron, told a San Francisco audience, "Iraq possesses huge reserves of oil and gas—reserves I'd love Chevron to have access to."

A new oil law set to go before the Iraqi Parliament this month would, if passed, go a long way toward helping the oil companies achieve their goal. The Iraq hydrocarbon law would take the majority of Iraq's oil out of the exclusive hands of the Iraqi government and open it to international oil companies for a generation or more.

In March 2001, the National Energy Policy Development Group (better known as Vice President Dick Cheney's energy task force), which included executives of America's largest energy companies, recommended that the United States government support initia-

tives by Middle Eastern countries "to open up areas of their energy sectors to foreign investment." One invasion and a great deal of political engineering by the Bush administration later, this is exactly what the proposed Iraq oil law would achieve. It does so to the benefit of the companies, but to the great detriment of Iraq's economy, democracy and sovereignty.

Since the invasion of Iraq, the Bush administration has been aggressive in shepherding the oil law toward passage. It is one of the president's benchmarks for the government of Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki, a fact that Mr. Bush, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Gen. William Casey, Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad and other administration officials are publicly emphasizing with increasing urgency.

The administration has highlighted the law's revenue sharing plan, under which the central government would distribute oil revenues throughout the nation on a per capita basis. But the benefits of this excellent proposal are radically undercut by the law's many other provisions—these allow much (if not most) of Iraq's oil revenues to flow out of the country and into the pockets of international oil companies.

The law would transform Iraq's oil industry from a nationalized model closed to American oil companies except for limited (although highly lucrative) marketing contracts, into a commercial industry, all-but-privatized, that is fully open to all international oil companies.

The Iraq National Oil Company would have exclusive control of just 17 of Iraq's 80 known oil fields, leaving two-thirds of known—and all of its as yet undiscovered—fields open to foreign control.

The foreign companies would not have to invest their earnings in the Iraqi economy, partner with Iraqi companies, hire Iraqi workers or share new technologies. They could even ride out Iraq's current "instability" by signing contracts now, while the Iraqi government is at its weakest, and then wait at least two years before even setting foot in the country. The vast majority of Iraq's oil would then be left underground for at least two years rather than being used for the country's economic development.

The international oil companies could also be offered some of the most corporate-friendly contracts in the world, including what are called production sharing agreements. These agreements are the oil industry's preferred model, but are roundly rejected by all the top oil producing countries in the Middle East because they grant long-term contracts (20 to 35 years in the case of Iraq's draft law) and greater control, ownership and profits to the companies than other models. In fact, they are used for only approximately 12 percent of the world's oil.

Iraq's neighbors Iran, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia maintain nationalized oil systems and have outlawed foreign control over oil development. They all hire international oil companies as contractors to provide specific services as needed, for a limited duration, and without giving the foreign company any direct interest in the oil produced.

Iraqis may very well choose to use the expertise and experience of international oil companies. They are most likely to do so in a manner that best serves their own needs if they are freed from the tremendous external pressure being exercised by the Bush administration, the oil corporations—and the presence of 140,000 members of the American military.

Iraq's five trade union federations, representing hundreds of thousands of workers, released a statement opposing the law and rejecting "the handing of control over oil to foreign companies, which would undermine

the sovereignty of the state and the dignity of the Iraqi people." They ask for more time, less pressure and a chance at the democracy they have been promised.

VIEW FROM AN O'BRIEN COUNTY, IOWA, SOLDIER

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to read into the RECORD an editorial that was published in the O'Brien County Newsletter, O'Brien County, Iowa. It is from Sean P. O'Brien, First Lieutenant, Field Artillery, United States Army and Purple Heart recipient.

It reads like this: "There are few things that a professional military officer can attribute to editorial statements. However, I would like to share some of the ideas that more than represent what our tour of duty in Afghanistan meant to me. This ethos is to help put these personal feelings, which all soldiers have, into a tangible rallying point.

"I am an American soldier. I am a warrior and a member of a team. I serve the people of the United States and live the Army values. I will always place the mission first, I will never accept defeat, I will never quit, I will never leave a fallen comrade.

□ 2015

"I am a disciplined, physically and mentally tough trained and proficient warrior in my tasks and drills. I always maintain my arms, my equipment, and myself. I am an expert and I am a professional. I stand ready to deploy, engage, and destroy the enemies of the United States of America in close combat. I am a guardian of freedom and the American way of life. I am an American soldier.

"This is called the Warrior Ethos. Every soldier can recite it. It means everything. I cringe when I say this aloud. These words have such weight. As far as service, I understand now. When I shake hands with a veteran, there is a silent conversation that takes place that transcends all words. You can never understand this without experiencing it.

"I cannot deny the power of facing the enemies of truth with truth. The population was the center of gravity, and we systemically engaged in separating these bullies from the population, usually by simply not leaving. The stability created by our presence allowed civil leadership to stop focusing on being brutalized and start focusing on fostering a better way of life for the people, education, medical aid, and commerce. When the population realized that these ideas were worth having, they would generally take on the responsibility of denying safe havens for the bad guys.

"These people, the Afghans, are just like you and me. They want their children to have a safe place to grow. They

are extremely thankful that we are making the sacrifice we are for their nation. It is very humbling to be told that by a common villager. These people have known war as a way of life for 2,000 years. That being said, it is important to know that in every town there is an elder that stated, "The U.S. was just different. You are respectful and you want to help us."

"If you have ever held the ideal of compassion for your neighbor, then it is easy to understand that Afghanistan and her people are well worth the sacrifice. I am thankful to have been a part of a stronger future for Afghanistan."

And here he says some complimentary things about me which I will leave from my presentation but leave in the printed RECORD and conclude with:

"As I said before, our efforts in this region are worth it. I encourage all to take a longer view. The compassion and the patience of the American servicemember make up a large part of their sense of duty. This is a fight between good and evil." Sean P. O'Brien, First Lieutenant, Field Artillery, United States Army, Purple Heart Recipient.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully enter this into the RECORD.

For: O'Brien County Republican Newsletter, Iowa

There are few things that a professional military officer can attribute to editorial statements; however, I would like to share some of the ideas that more than represent what my tour of duty in Afghanistan meant to me. This "ethos" is to help put these personal feelings—which all soldiers have—into a tangible rallying point.

I am an American Soldier.

I am a Warrior and a member of a team. I serve the people of the United States and live the Army Values.

I will always place the mission first.

I will never accept defeat.

I will never quit.

I will never leave a fallen comrade.

I am disciplined, physically and mentally tough, trained and proficient in my warrior tasks and drills. I always maintain my arms, my equipment and myself.

I am an expert and I am a professional.

I stand ready to deploy, engage, and destroy the enemies of the United States of America in close combat.

I am a guardian of freedom and the American way of life.

I am an American Soldier.

This is called the Warrior Ethos. Every soldier can recite it. It means everything.

I cringe when I say this aloud. Those words have such weight. As far as service, I understand now. When I shake hands with a veteran, there is a silent conversation that takes place that transcends all words. You can never understand this without experiencing it.

I cannot deny the power of facing the enemies of truth with truth. The population was the center of gravity, and we systematically engaged in separating these bullies from the population; usually by simply not leaving.

The stability created by our presence allowed civil leadership to stop focusing on being brutalized and start focusing on fostering a better way of life for the people; education, medical aid, commerce. When the population realized that these ideas were worth having, they would generally take on

the responsibility of denying safe-havens for the bad guys.

Those people (the Afghans) are just like you and me. They want their children to have a safe place to grow. They are extremely thankful that we are making the sacrifice we are for their nation. It is very humbling to be told that by a common villager.

These people have known war as a way of life for 2,000 years. That being said, it is important to know that in every town, there was an elder that stated:

"The U.S. was just different, you are respectful and you want to help us". If you have ever held the ideal of compassion for your neighbor, then it is easy to understand that Afghanistan and her people are well worth the sacrifice. I am thankful to have been a part of a stronger future for Afghanistan.

I was honored by the personal efforts of 5th District Congressman Steve King. He actively followed our efforts and through personal correspondence offered his support. I enjoy the fact that there is adequate moral "top cover" that actively engages in seeking the truth. Thank you Steve, you are as much a patriot as I ever hope to be.

As I said before, our efforts in this region are worth it. I encourage all to take a longer view. The compassion and the patience of the American Service Member make up a large part of their sense of Duty. This is a fight between good and evil.

Sean P. O'Brien, 1st Lieutenant, Field Artillery, U.S. Army, Purple Heart Recipient.

THE COUNTDOWN CREW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 months, myself and others have been coming to the floor to talk about the impending tax increase that we face in this country if the majority doesn't act in something just under 1,400 days, and we will see this huge tax increase and all the majority has to do is run out the clock. They have to do nothing to see this tax increase be put back in place when the tax cuts that we passed in early 2001, 2002, 2003 will expire.

But tonight we are coming to the floor, and we think it is fitting to talk about the fourth anniversary of Iraq and what is happening in Iraq and, most importantly, what is going to happen on this House floor we think this week but maybe not until next week.

It was fitting tonight that we had a moment of silence for our men and women in harm's way. It was very fitting. But it is also fitting that the United States Congress is very clear to the men and women in harm's way that we support them. And we don't just support them in standing up on the House floor talking about it, but we support them in a concrete way, and that is making sure that they are getting the funds that they need, making sure that the United States Congress is sending a message to our enemies around the world that we are behind

them; that we are not going to short-change them; that we are not going to pull the rug out from under them; that we are not going to put a time line in place that is going to allow our enemies to know when and what we are going to do, we let our enemies know that they just have to run out the clock.

And if they run out the clock, that we are going to be gone and they are going to be able to be back in Iraq, they are going to be back in other places around this world doing harm to many people, including Americans. So it is absolutely important that our men and women know, and this supplemental is going to be the key. It is going to be the key for our men and women to know that we are behind them. And what the majority party is putting forth, at least we think what the majority party is putting forward, has created a confusing and inflexible timetable for the Americans' withdrawal from Iraq.

From what they have said, and we only know in press accounts and I will read many of those press accounts, and I would encourage you to go to www.gop.gov and see last week's press conference with the leadership of the majority party, the Democratic leadership talk about their plan, and just watch it for about a minute and you will see just how confusing it was to not only the American people but to the leadership of the majority party.

As I said, they have put in place timetables for withdrawal, with forces leaving as early as July 1 and concluding their removal no later than August 2008. Now, we can talk and talk and talk, but our enemies see that, and they will just go back into the shadows and they will just wait until we are gone to be able to wreak havoc on Iraq and the Iraqi people.

An example of what is in the supplemental, at least that is what we have heard, we are not sure but this is what we have heard: that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other act may be used to deploy any unit of the Armed Forces to Iraq unless the chief of the military department concerned has certified in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and on Armed Services at least 15 days in advance of deployment that this unit is fully mission capable.

Now, if that is not micromanagement, I don't know what is. I think the lessons of Vietnam have been lost on the majority party. That is micromanaging the war. That is what caused us great detriment in Vietnam.

The next thing is: the President certifies in writing to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services that the deployment to Iraq of a unit that is not assessed fully mission capable, he is required to fill a report detailing the particular reason or reasons why that unit's deployment is necessary. If that is not micromanagement, I don't know what is.

We have one Commander in Chief, clearly stated in the Constitution, not 535 commanders looking to micromanage a war. This requirement ties the hands of the President in committing more troops to fighting required by red tape and lengthy explanations, cost of time, and the risk of lives. That is micromanaging the war. I think it is very, very clear. And, again, I would urge anybody that is interested to go to the Web site and see the Democratic House leadership's press conference last week, and you will see just how clearly they are confused.

So how can the American people not be confused? How can our men and women in harm's way not be confused about what this Congress, what this House is about to do?

Just a couple of press accounts talking about the supplemental. The Washington Post, The Washington Post described the Democrat plan as: an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard to the war itself. Micromanagement. The Los Angeles Times. The Los Angeles Times called for the bill to be vetoed. Imagine that. And I quote the Los Angeles Times saying this, not me: It is absurd for the House Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, Democrat, San Francisco, to try to micromanage the conflict and the evolution of Iraqi society with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks. The Los Angeles Times is saying that; it is not the Washington Times. If it were the Washington Times, my friends on the other side of the aisle would say that is a conservative paper. But it is the Los Angeles Times and The Washington Post saying this.

Now, my friends on the other side like to talk about the Iraqi Study Group, and the bipartisan Iraqi Study Group did not advocate, I repeat, did not advocate a firm timetable for withdrawal in its December 2006 report, because those folks knew that it was a bad idea to give our enemies a time certain as to when we would be out of Iraq.

The National Intelligence Estimate released in January warned of the perils of an early troop withdrawal. And it said: If Coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this estimate, we judge that this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq. More death, more destruction.

Now, you can't have it both ways. You can't stand up and quote the Iraqi Study Group and the National Intelligence Estimate and pick out bits and pieces of it. There are certainly things in there that they said that we all need to pay attention to, but these are extremely important statements that were made.

I am sure I can go on and on quoting newspapers around this country that say similar things that The Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times are saying. And, again, I want to remind people what the Los Angeles

Times said: It is absurd for the House Speaker to try to micromanage the conflict and the evolution of Iraqi society with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks. It is absurd for us to give our enemies a timetable for them to know when to lay back so they can regroup and wait until we leave, so that they can go back into the country of Iraq, set up bases, and wreak havoc on the people of Iraq.

The other thing about this supplemental that is distasteful to me and I believe others on the other side is that they have loaded this supplemental with spending. They have used our troops as a bargaining chip to increase domestic spending. Now, our troops deserve better than that, not to be used as a bargaining chip. This is a supplemental. This is for emergency spending, this is for the war, this is for something that our troops need. And I hope that those on the other side that have talked on the this floor night after night about irresponsible domestic spending, that they won't stand for it to be put in a supplemental that is to be used for emergency spending on this war.

Republicans rejected last year \$14 billion of domestic spending not related to the war. We had a clean supplemental. And I hope my friends on the other side will reassess what they are about to do and use this supplemental, use our men and women in harm's way as a bargain chip.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Would the gentleman yield for one second?

Mr. SHUSTER. I most certainly will.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I just want to share, those who are joining us tonight have joined the Countdown Crew. We meet the first night of votes each legislative week. We can be reached by e-mail at CountdownCrew@mail.house.gov.

And the one thing that I would like to share from my perspective, we hear a lot of statements about a desire to support the troops. And I have said for the last 2½ years that, if we say we support the troops, it is important that we listen to what they have to say. As a former member of the 82nd Airborne Division and other military units with comrades serving in all the major line Army units, commanding brigades, serving on the senior staffs, receiving e-mail reports on a weekly basis, even from a platoon leader who is in Sadr City right now, we get a somewhat different perspective on the politics and debates that are going on back here in the House Chamber. And I would say this from a perspective of looking at the fiscal implications of decisions.

When we talk about the supplemental spending, the vast majority of money, and the original clean bill before politics got involved was designed for one thing, it was designed for troop support, it was designed for equipment reset, it was designed to provide support for provincial reconstruction teams for the transition of Iraqi security forces to be effective in their mission on the ground.

Unfortunately, due to the Hatch Act, the troops themselves don't have a voice where they can come into this Chamber and debate, and so as we have seen on numerous occasions, opinion is often substituted for fact. And it is an honest opinion; it is an honest viewpoint. I think we have honest disagreements. I think one thing that both sides can agree on is that there were strategic mistakes that were made early in the campaign due to institutional infrastructure and process issues that are endemic in the United States Government and need to be reformed.

But the truth of the matter, at the moment, is we have people in harm's way that are deployed forward who actually watch C-SPAN, who watch these debates. Many of them are friends of mine that I have known for well over 30 years and we have served together, a number of us served together in the Middle East. And the perspective that I would bring is this when we talk about emergency supplemental spending, and it comes back to an aspect of fiscal responsibility, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania's point earlier: a supplemental spending bill is designed specifically to augment needs that were not covered in regularly budgeted, authorized, or appropriated lines.

□ 2030

And to put this into context, there are many divisions in the Congress, particularly in the Democratic Caucus, regarding the war. We are all well aware of them. I have many friends on both sides of the aisle. There are honest disagreements and disputes. But the one thing, to quote my friend, HAL ROGERS from Kentucky, where he said, "Attention K-Mart shoppers," at the end of the appropriations hearing last week. "A variety of spending provisions have been placed in a military supplemental bill that have nothing to do with national security in order to encourage those to vote for it."

And I want to put this into context, that over \$20 billion in nonmilitary, nonnational security spending has been included. They include \$283 million in milk subsidies that are already funded in other programs. It includes \$74 million for peanut storage.

Now, when I went to flight school at Fort Rucker, Alabama, at the U.S. Army Aviation Center, there were two great economic engines in the area. One was the United States Army Aviation Center that trained the pilots for the U.S. Army, the rotary wing force that provides our air assault and attack helicopter capability worldwide today, and also the peanut industry. The last time I checked, the peanut industry was not directly related to American national security.

Twenty-five million dollars are in payments to spinach producers on a national security supplemental bill. And this also rescinds \$89 million in homeland security funding that allegedly would have lapsed in fiscal year 2006.

The reason that I bring these up, and the billions of dollars in spending, is

not to highlight honest disagreements about policy issues which have a rightful place in this Chamber.

And my friends on the other side are certainly entitled to their views, the basis of their perception. I certainly have my views on the subject which are different from many in the administration and on my side of the aisle as well. But the one thing that I will share is let's translate these dollars into reality from a fiscal perspective.

When Secretary Gates came over to testify before the Armed Services Committee in his first hearing in January of 2007, the first major request, and I was very heartened by this, was a request to increase the end strength of the United States Army by 96,000 soldiers. Now, why that number is important, I have advocated for nearly 5 years for a 100,000 soldier increase to the end strength to deal with and augment the operations tempo that our troops have experienced since the draw-downs in the mid-1990s. The rate and the pace of that transition is very significant upon our soldiers. And as a matter of fiscal responsibility for the investment that we have made in them and the commitment that we have made to them, I think it is important that we see that increase. And I was very heartened to see an acceptance of that need in the civilian appointed leadership of the Defense Department.

But here is the fiscal issue. When we talk about \$20 billion in nonmilitary spending that were put on that supplemental bill, here is what \$1 billion means. Regardless of your views on national security, \$1 billion roughly translates into 10,000 fully equipped light infantry soldiers and fully trained and accessed into the military.

The reason that that number is important to keep in mind, at the end of the day, as we talk about force structure and staffing, I would ask my friends, would it have not been a more prudent use of our national security dollars and emergency supplemental, rather than going for programs or peanuts and spinach and the milk program, which I think would be more appropriately addressed jurisdictionally in the farm bill, to use that money, if there was a need, to assess it for troop training, to augment the needs for the conflicts that we are going to be facing in the 21st century, which are going to be significant. And I think that those conflicts would have come regardless of our policies there.

But nonetheless, this approach, I believe, is a poor use of fiscal stewardship and begs the real question at the end of the day of what we actually have voted for from a policy change, a world view change when we changed Speakers in January. As I have shared with many when we get asked about how is this going to be paid for, every working family in America making between \$30- and \$50,000 will have a \$2,098 tax increase if those tax cuts are not extended and made permanent by 2010.

And with that I will yield back to the gentleman, but I just wanted to clarify

that point from a national security perspective. Understand that it would be helpful for, I think, the American people to understand there are many nongermane issues and spending lines that have been added on this bill that have nothing to do with our current national security situation.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate the gentleman pointing that out. And with your background, you are most qualified to do that, point out some of the things you pointed out.

I would now like to yield my friend from Texas, Mr. CONAWAY.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for hosting this hour tonight. It is particularly important, given it is the first of these hours for the week in which rumor has it that the war supplemental will be on the House floor this week up for debate. We don't even have really good rumors as to whether or not the other side will recognize the normal order of business with appropriations bills and bring it to the floor as an open rule, as has been the tradition certainly under the 12 years of Republican leadership. And so we are anxious to see the arrival of this first spending bill, if the other side brings it with a modified closed rule or a closed rule.

Mr. SHUSTER. May I interrupt the gentleman for a second? Did you say we are not going to have an open rule? Because I was under the impression that the Speaker and the leadership of the Democratic Party campaigned that they were going to have open rule after open rule, and they weren't going to put bills on the floor that didn't give the minority their rights. Are you telling me that it is not going to be an open rule on this supplemental?

Mr. CONAWAY. If the gentleman will yield back. We don't know for sure. I know that, during the debate last week, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee could not confirm his instructions from his leadership as to what he should be doing. In other words, were we going to have an open rule, as has been the tradition. Well beyond the 12 years' takeover that the Republican's experienced, it has just been a tradition on each floor that we bring an appropriations bill to the floor with open rules. And as late as last week, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a guy that you would think would be in the know, would be in the inner circle, in the inside skinny with respect to the Democrat leadership, even he didn't know what the Speaker had decided in this arena.

So the caveats placed in there, the restrictions on our ability to fight this fight, the instructions to the President, I want to speak at from a little different angle. You yourself talked about the advantages that gives our enemies if we have a date certain that we have to be out of Iraq. That is pretty obvious. It doesn't take a lot of common sense, it doesn't take a lot of warfighting experience to understand that if you give your enemy that kind

of an advance notice, that that is a clear advantage to the enemy.

I want to look at it from the other side. I want to look at it from the side of our troops. How do we ask good men and women who defend this country with their lives to fight under those considerations?

One of the great lines that the other side has used to argue about the war is, well, if we would have just known in 2002 what we know today, we would have voted differently. Well, yeah. Right. Well, let me maybe take a bit of a twist on that. How do we face that mom and dad in March of 2008 whose son or daughter has been maimed or killed? How do we look them in the eye and say, yeah, you know, if we had known in March of 2007, when we were setting the arbitrary and artificial dates, that your son was going to get killed in March of 2008, gee, we would have set the date at March 28 or January 31.

And so what we are doing to our troops is that we are undermining their morale, their strength of purpose by asking them to do things that are just unbelievably untenable. Night after night after night we listen to these floor speeches and we hear people build a case that in their mind we need to get out. We have had a couple earlier tonight, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that went through a litany of information they have used, they have gleaned to make their decision that we have lost this fight and that we need to get out.

Well, this body, from time to time, like daily, has its integrity challenged. Each one of us has a challenge to our integrity all the time; whether it is from a campaign contribution that we got and they are trying to link it to some sort of official act, all those integrity issues play out in the media constantly, and we rarely get our day in court. We rarely have an opportunity to stand tall and vote our conscience. I am going to argue, Mr. Speaker, that the Out of Iraq Caucus and all those other Members who have come in here night after night after night saying we have got to get out of Iraq have got an opportunity to vote their conscience this week.

I will argue, Mr. Speaker, that there are only two legitimate positions with respect to what we are doing in Iraq. The first, that I agree with, is to fight this fight and win it. The other legitimate circumstance is to get out today. There is no half ground. There is no half-stepping it. There is no run up the white flag and retreat the way that this supplemental would argue. There are no other choices but to fight the fight or get out.

And so all of these colleagues of ours that have night after night after night preached about getting out of Iraq have got an opportunity to demonstrate their integrity to their convictions. We will see how they vote. Will they vote the party line, come down here, 233 of them strong, vote in favor of this supplemental with these restrictions on

them that are unworkable in the extreme, but that put our men and women in harm, that make it very difficult for our combat leaders?

Our good colleague tonight is an experienced pilot in the Airborne. How do you ask a sergeant, how do you ask a first lieutenant to go do a dangerous mission in the last half of March of 2008, knowing that by the end of the month we are getting out of there? And how do you ask people to do that? You simply can't. You can't ask people to do that. You can't ask people to put their lives on the line under that kind of a restriction.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think, to the gentleman's point, I received some correspondence from a colonel who came back from Iraq recently, and he shared this perspective. He shared that he had worked for General Abizaid, and he just made the comment, General Abizaid, the Central Command Commander, made the comment that dealing with Islamic radicalism is something that you want to do as an away game. And unlike different times in our history that, again, regardless of perceptions of the decisions that were made before you and I came here to be engaged in this conflict, there are second- and third-order effects that will be inherited by a precipitous withdrawal.

And when I go back, I listen to so many different voices with so many different perspectives, but the one unity of purpose that they say is that there would be profound consequences. In fact, one of the ones most recently was a friend who was in Task Force Ranger in Mogadishu, which I believe President Clinton reinforced an operation in 1993 to capture a tribal leader, a warlord, Mohammed Farah Aideed. This friend and Task Force Ranger shared that at the end of the Blackhawk Down incident, where America, frankly, lost the information war despite completely removing this militia, he shared with me over coffee recently and said, you know, little did we know that there were al Qaeda technical advisers who had served in Afghanistan fighting the mujahedin and were sent by Osama bin Laden to assist these groups because they were dealing with Americans and the consequences of leaving, when, in fact, he said if we had simply been able to stay, it would have sent a very different message. We could have accomplished the mission of apprehending the foe.

And to your point, again, the troops, I think, oftentimes inadvertently are used as human shields in debate, but we don't get down to the issues of what they really see on the ground and the perspective that they bring to this discussion.

Mr. CONAWAY. I appreciate my colleague's comment. This war, this fight has been compared with Vietnam. I think it is a lousy comparison. I think it is flawed on every level. But if we look at what happened when America withdrew, under Democratic leader-

ship, withdrew, Democratic House, withdrew from Vietnam, look what happened to the people of Vietnam, the boat people exodus, the death inside Vietnam, and then the spillover into Cambodia with Pol Pot, 2 million lives lost under that ripple effect.

But the one thing that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have yet to answer, in addition to how do you face that mom and dad as a part of this artificial deadline, how do you manage the disaster in Iraq if we did pull out tonight, if we did get our guys out of there? The regional fight, the spillover into other countries, the humanitarian suffering on an incredible scale, how do, in fact, we manage that disaster if your answer is that we have to get out of Iraq tonight?

Mr. SHUSTER. And the gentleman, the point he just made is they try to compare Iraq to Vietnam, and it is not a good comparison at all. But, when the United States Congress is going to make an attempt to micromanage a war, that is going to be a comparison to Vietnam, and the same outcome is going to be not a good outcome. And like you said, the disaster that occurred, what happens after we leave and there is a disaster, human disaster of people, mass exodus from the country? So I just wanted to make that point.

Mr. CONAWAY. Let me finish off, and I will yield back for a little bit. We are talking about young men and women's lives who have volunteered to do a fight for us on our behalf, to fight an enemy that is really bad individuals, to stand between us and those bad individuals.

I even hesitate to bring this point up, but you look at this supplemental that has been proposed, an additional \$21.8 billion added to it, and I would argue, and I am, on an individual basis, were it not in this bill, I would be for it. I think we have got some disaster relief and some other kinds of things that we could be for, but it appears to be an attempt to circumvent the PAYGO rules, that this, the other side beat our heads about, beat us about the head and shoulders with all during the campaign. In other words, if you declare the milk thing a disaster, then it doesn't have to be held up to PAYGO.

All of this emergency spending is outside the PAYGO rules under the Democrat leadership. So they have spoken with forked tongue, so to speak, that they would cling to the PAYGO rules, and yet on this first big appropriations bill, they come whistling in here with an additional \$21.8 billion.

I would even question part of the \$103 billion that the President proposed. I am not sure that Katrina is still an emergency. Yeah, we have issues with what is going on in New Orleans, and we have a got a lot of money in the pipeline backed up. I think we ought to figure that out first before we throw additional moneys at it.

So the \$99 billion that is for the war fight, for the reset, for the troops that

are in harm's way, we would, I think most all of us would agree on. But beyond that we have got some real challenges from a spending standpoint. Those issues pale in comparison to putting a hard deadline on getting out of Iraq and the serious consequences that that leaves our military commanders on the ground.

□ 2045

Mr. SHUSTER. I think it is absolutely right, and I think the gentleman is right to point out that is really going to be a defining moment for many Members of this body, especially our colleagues on the other side, who, as you quite eloquently pointed out, that the choice is either stay and fight and have a strategy work to help the people of Iraq or get out.

So I hope the folks that come down here, and there were some here tonight that have come down night after night and for the last several months have talked about the need, the desire to get out immediately, we are going to see. Are they going to stand up and be true to what they have been talking about to the Nation on this House floor for the past several months, or are they going to bend to the will of their leadership?

As well there are other Members on the other side of the aisle that have said they will not stand for micromanagement of the war, they will not stand for putting timelines in to give our enemy the ability to fight a different kind of war and hurt and kill our soldiers. So this is going to be a defining moment.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think your point on that too, if I might interject, the Members of the other party, for whom I have great personal respect though I disagree in execution of the policy, are those that have been very staunch and very consistent in their opposition to the use of our troops in offensive operations overseas.

And the reason that I bring that up is that some of the statements that have been made, and I am not referring to provocative statements, simply positions that were taken, had been controversial in their own caucus as well as in the Congress in general. But the reason that I bring it up is that those convictions, I think, echo at one point where we have mutual agreement, and on a variety of issues. And the point I called for during the debate a few weeks ago on the resolution regarding whether one accepted the ability of the Commander in Chief to authorize the combatant commander to reinforce troops on the ground was this: that if we are going to have a real vote that affects real people in the field, then we need to use the power of the purse of the United States Congress to vote to cut or sequester funding related to that.

And I think that is a noble cause regardless of which side one is on in that from the standpoint of the Republic. I know where I am. I am with my former

comrades who are in a country right now to make sure they have the resources they need. But one of my friends, one of our colleagues, made a comment last Thursday night that there was a bit of a fishing expedition going on for votes, and the irony wasn't lost on me when I actually saw the list of appropriations he was talking about: \$120 million for the shrimp and Manhattan fishing industries, that would equip over 1,000 of our light infantry soldiers with what they need to do their job; \$5 million for those engaged in the breeding, rearing, or transporting of live fish, think what \$5 million can do from an operational standpoint.

We start going through this in detail, and we see \$16 million for additional office space for the House of Representatives.

Mr. CONAWAY. Here, here. All under the emergency basis. We are totally out of office space and it is an emergency that we don't have that office space sooner.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I wanted to talk a little bit more about the politics of this. And, again, I want to read something that The Washington Post wrote on March 13. I took bits and pieces out of there, but I think it is pretty consistent throughout the whole editorial. And again to remind my colleagues if they have forgotten, The Washington Post is no friend of the Bush administration, and it is no supporter of Republican causes. But I will give The Washington Post credit that it takes a position, thinks about it, and comes down many times on the different side of the issue, or at least they are thoughtful about it.

And this Washington Post editorial, "The Pelosi Plan for Iraq, it makes perfect sense if the goal is winning votes in the United States.

"The only constituency House Speaker NANCY PELOSI ignored in her plan for amending President Bush's supplemental war funding bill are the people of the country that the U.S. troops are fighting to stabilize. The Democratic proposal doesn't attempt to answer the question of why August 2008 is the right moment for the Iraqi Government to lose all support from U.S. combat units. It doesn't hint at what might happen if American forces were to leave at the end of this year, a development that would be triggered by the Iraqi Government's weakness. It doesn't explain how continued U.S. interests in Iraq, which holds the world's second largest oil reserves and a substantial cadre of al Qaeda militants, would be protected after 2008. In fact," The Washington Post says, "it may prohibit U.S. forces from returning once they leave.

"In short, the Democratic proposal . . . is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard for the war itself.

"Will Iraq collapse into unrestrained civil conflict with 'massive civilian

casualties,' as the U.S. intelligence community predicts in the event of a rapid withdrawal? Will al Qaeda establish a powerful new base for launching attacks on the United States and its allies? Will there be regional war that sucks in Iraq's neighbors such as Saudi Arabia and Turkey? The House legislation is indifferent. Whether or not any those events happened, U.S. forces would be gone.

"Ms. PELOSI's strategy leads not toward a responsible withdrawal from Iraq but to a constitutional power struggle with Mr. Bush, who has already said he will veto the legislation. Such a struggle would serve the interests of neither the Democrats nor the country."

And, again, that is coming from The Washington Post. So don't listen to a Republican Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, a conservative Republican from Pennsylvania. Listen to what The Washington Post has to say. And they are pointing it out over and over again: this is a bad plan; this is a bad war supplemental. And, again, I believe that it uses our men and women in harm's way as bargaining chips and it makes it more dangerous for those men and women in Iraq.

And it also is going to destroy their morale. If they find out they are going to be pulled out in 2 months or 6 months or 18 months or whatever the Democratic proposal is, which we are not quite sure, what is going to give a young marine or ranger the will to go kick in a door where the bad guys are when he sits back in his quarters and says, Well, I could be out of this place in 3 months or 6 months. I mean, it is going to destroy the morale of our men and women.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONAWAY. I would like to add one aspect that hasn't been discussed. We hate to engage in too much speculation, but let us assume that this thing passes and the President vetoes it or let us assume that cooler heads prevail and this thing fails this week on the floor. What next? What is this Congress going to do to actually continue to provide the funds needed, this \$99 billion that is needed right now, this year, this fiscal year to fight this fight? What will be the next step? How will we, in effect, bring this about? What kind of a scramble will go on that is totally unnecessary?

Instead of dealing with the problem now in a rational, thoughtful manner, this Democratic majority sees fit to play a giant game of chicken, it seems like, to run at this thing in what I believe is an irresponsible manner with loading another \$21.8 billion of funding on it, getting away from what the true nature of it is, trying to incite a veto by the President, trying to flex muscle and see who is the strongest as opposed to what do we need to do to deal with the troops' needs and then separate that from the broader discussion of where we should be.

So I think we are on a collision course that has the potential for being

very disruptive and very harmful to the men and women who fight this fight on our behalf.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to welcome here tonight and yield to one of our newest Members of the House from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate the chance to say a few words. I was over making phone calls in my office and clicked on C-SPAN and saw what you guys were talking about and thought I would come over and maybe just share a few things.

For those who are advocating that we just up and leave, that our military come home, that concept scares me to death because of the message. And I know you have talked about this some here on the floor this evening. The message that sends to the people who want to do us harm and want to do people harm all over the planet is a dangerous message and it scares me to death.

And I am reminded of, if folks will remember, shortly after the 9/11 attacks, that terrible day, where the President gave several speeches, where he talked about the fact that if you are a country that harbors terrorists, finances terrorists, trains terrorists, and are looking to produce weapons that are going to cause great harm to a great number of people, if you are doing those things, we, the United States of America, are putting you on notice that we are not going to tolerate that. And it was amazing that shortly after those speeches that Moamar Kadafi, a guy who hadn't necessarily been a great leader around the world and not necessarily a good guy, how quickly after those speeches Mr. Kadafi suddenly found the Lord and saw the light and said, wait a minute, I want to cooperate with the United States of America now in their fight against terrorism around the world. He saw the message. He got the message. Now, if we do what some are advocating in the Out of Iraq Caucus, some are advocating that we just up and leave and not win in Iraq, not succeed in our mission, for those who are advocating that, think about the message that sends to the Kadafis of the world and how dangerous that message is for the credibility of the greatest Nation in history, the United States of America.

That is what scares me to death about those on the other side and what they are pushing not only in this supplemental but what they have been talking about for several months now. That is a scary, scary message when it comes to our foreign policy and the success of our mission and the safety of our men and women in uniform who have been fighting the good fight, defending those principles and values that make this country great. That scares me to death.

And that is a simple point I want to make, but I think it never hurts to reinforce that point, which is so fundamental and why we are still engaged in

this struggle and why I think it is so important that we win and we continue to do what the Commander in Chief and General Petraeus want us to do over there in Iraq today.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

And I think you are right. I think it is important. I think that one of the things that we learn as citizens, we learn here in Congress, is your word. Your word is what matters, and if your word is good, then people trust you and people know they can count on you. And I think that is exactly your point. If we pull out in Iraq, our word to not only our enemy, our enemy knows that if we pull out that our word is no good to stay there and fight them, but our friends around the world are going to say you can't count on America. And I think that is an extremely important point, and that is maybe the core of this. We need to stay and make sure the Iraqi people have control of the security on the ground. And I think that while it is too early to tell if the new strategy in Iraq will succeed, there are tangible indications that it is working.

The joint U.S.-Iraqi security crackdown is fulfilling its primary objective to reduce violence in Baghdad. Bomb deaths have gone down 30 percent. Execution-style deaths have decreased by nearly half in the last month. Iraqis are taking on an increased role in security of their country. Nine of the Iraqis' 10 army divisions are taking the lead in areas of operation. And today almost 329,000 Iraq security force members are working to secure their country. And the political benchmarks are being met. Last month the Iraqi Government approved a budget, approved a national hydrocarbon law, and just last week they convened a regional conference of 13 nations to discuss these concerns. So things are moving forward. There was a poll out, the largest poll done in Iraq in the last couple of years, the London polling firm Opinion Research Business found that in a survey of over 5,000 Iraqis that by a 2-1 margin, Iraqis prefer living under the current system than they did under Saddam. So there are positive signs there.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. And the gentleman is exactly right. Of course we wish things had progressed quicker and faster. We wish all our men and women were home. But there is good news to talk about. And one fact that I think gets lost sometimes, every single life that is lost is a tragedy. We wish it didn't happen, whether it is our service men and women in uniform or whether it is an Iraqi civilian in that country, but the truth is there have been fewer American service men and women killed in 2006 than there were in 2005. There were fewer American service men and women killed in 2005 than there were in 2004. Of course, you would never know that fact if you just listened to the national news every night.

There are good things happening, as the gentleman pointed out. The other

thing I would just say is this: to get the kind of country that we need there and the kind of things happening that we need to happen, it is going to take a little time. I am reminded that in 1776 we declared independence. We made our quest for liberty and freedom here in the United States. It took us 13 years to get a Constitution that works and is still serving us well today. And we came from a culture that appreciated liberty and appreciated freedom.

It is going to take some time for this nation, which has never really known freedom or liberty, to get to that point where they can value those principles that make our country so great. So good things are happening, and we should talk about those more in our quest to make this country work.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for coming down.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that as we talk tonight about an incredibly serious matter that those listening don't have a sense that we have a callous disregard for the men and women who are fighting this fight. We stand up here night after night and talk about the sacrifices made and the dedication of this all-volunteer force, and the phrase kind of rolls off our tongue very easily.

□ 2100

I want to make sure that those listening understand that each one of those lives lost is incredibly precious.

When I am out and about in the district in Texas talking to folks, I typically ask the question, how many folks have someone they know serving in Iraq or Afghanistan, and a lot of times a lot of hands will go up.

I will then ask, no, I need to know how many people out here have somebody in harm's way that when they hear about a death in Iraq, their stomach gets in a knot until they know it is not their loved one, and most of the hands go down. So we are fighting a fight there that while it has a dramatic impact on an awful lot of lives, broadly across this country, day in and day out, most Americans aren't really affected by this sacrifice, by this magnificent fighting force that we have in place.

I typically challenge that audience to say, look, anytime you hear about sacrifice for this country, dying for this country, fighting for this country, make sure you think about it in the terms of some specific person. Not the global group, because that defuses the impact. That lessens the tugs at our hearts and helps us deal with it. I want you to think about some specific person that has given their life on behalf of this country.

For me, it is a high school buddy of mine that died in Vietnam, a Medal of Honor winner. I look at all that I have done since he and I graduated from high school. He gave up all of that so that we could live in freedom today.

We have got the exact kind of men and women fighting in Iraq today and

in Afghanistan today and in other places around this world that we don't get to talk about that are laying their lives on the line, laying their futures on the line, laying their ability to walk a daughter down the aisle at her wedding, the ability to hold a grandchild, and all those kinds of things that those of us who make it into this stage of life have gotten to do. Yet our men and women volunteer to take on these responsibilities, take these risks, and put themselves between you and I and some really, really bad people.

So as we come to this Chamber night after night to talk about this fight, we need to make sure we understand exactly who it is we are talking about, who we are talking to.

We got an e-mail 2 weeks ago, 3 weeks ago, when we were debating that nonsense on the meaningless, toothless House resolution from a buck sergeant in Mosul who made the comment, he said, you know, the professional veneer we keep in place that says that debate, that conversation going on back in America, has no impact on our ability total fight, our moral, he said that veneer is very thin. Underneath, we are angry, we are mad. We think we are being sold out.

So the things that we say in this Chamber and in front of newspapers and televisions have a deep impact on the men and women who fight this fight. It is almost as if we taunt them when we talk about, well, we are going to support you, but we don't believe in what you do. We want to support you, but we think you are screwing things up. We want to support you, but we are not going to pay for it.

All of those kinds of things are a mixed message that has deep impact, and while I would defend my colleagues' rights to continue to say those things and have those opinions and debate those things, I would also challenge them to understand the deep impact they have as they make those statements, as they talk about their positions, as they put forth their ideas on what we should and should not be doing in Iraq. It comes with a great responsibility that each one of us brings to this Chamber when we talk.

Mr. SHUSTER. I think the gentleman makes an excellent point. This country, there are people in this country, the political discourse, we agree, we disagree, we debate, but the wonderful thing about it is we can do it, and people aren't tortured and drug off to prison and killed.

As a matter of fact, I was on the Mall last week in the morning with another colleague of ours, and we went up to the war protestors. They had their tents up and their signs up. It was really quite a magnificent picture of the war protestors, and behind it was the United States Capitol.

I started to talk. We were talking about why they were opposed to the

war and why I wanted to continue to support our troops there. I said, you know, in some countries of the world, Iraq, Iran, many of those countries, almost all of those countries in the Middle East, you cannot be doing this. They wouldn't allow you to do this. In fact, they would kill you. They would take you off and kill you possibly. And you would be lucky if you were killed because most of the time they would torture you before they would kill you.

So this country is a great country, and what we are doing over there is we are trying to help a nation stabilize, trying to help a nation build a democracy, and that is not easy. That is difficult. As our colleague from Ohio pointed out, the Revolutionary War in 1776, it took 13 years for the Constitution.

A story I like to tell, because it happened in my district, during the first year of George Washington's second term, we had already got a Constitution, we elected a President, George Washington, not once, but the second time. In that first year, the Whiskey Rebellion occurred in western Pennsylvania. The farmers in western Pennsylvania didn't like the tax, so they revolted. So George Washington, it was the only time that a Commander in Chief mounted up on a horse and took the soldiers into the field, had to ride up into western Pennsylvania and put down that rebellion.

We as Americans sometimes forget that it took us a long time until we were able to establish democracy. So it is not easy. We need to remember our history, that it takes time. It takes time especially when you are a nation that has never known democracy; never known democracy, but certainly has that feeling, has that sense of wanting freedom.

I think that there is no doubt that the Iraqi people, as well as any person, any people in the world, or every people in the world, want freedom. They have a desire for freedom.

Mr. CONAWAY. If you look at our history, if you look at the year 1776 and you study George Washington that year, he got up every day thinking that was the last day of the revolution. His army in many cases was in tatters, it was unpaid, it was underequipped. He could not have made the certification that the Democrats are demanding that this President make in order to send a single unit into combat; Washington could not have made that certification and he would have had to give up.

He got up every day thinking, This is the last day of the deal. I am sure there were critics all over the place saying we are done, it is over, this grand experiment that turned into America, turned into 230 years of a beacon for liberty and democracy around the world, would have failed had he not stuck to this plan and stuck to the understanding that we could win this fight. And it was hard. Good men lost their lives every day, and it was hard.

We are there at the same place today in Iraq. It is hard and good men and women risk their lives and some lose their lives every single day. I mourn with the families and I cry with them, just as you do, when somebody from the district is killed or maimed or injured. This has serious consequences to what we do. But failure in Iraq, a disaster that would be an immediate pull-out, is simply unacceptable on every level.

Let me switch gears for a minute, and then I will let my good colleague close, with some good news, totally unrelated to the supplemental except that it does have to do with this year's financial results.

As you know, I am a CPA and I like to look at numbers and all those kinds of things. If you look at the first 5 months of fiscal 2007, our revenue collections into this Federal Government are up \$81 billion over the equivalent 5-month period in fiscal 2006. An additional \$81 billion has been collected, not because we raised taxes, not because we had any changes to the Tax Code, because we haven't implemented any of those, but it is because this economy is ginning along. Expenses are also up almost \$26 billion. So the net of those two is that we have got a deficit for the first 5 months of fiscal 2007 that is \$55.5 billion less than the equivalent 5-month deficit for fiscal 2006.

I just wanted to inject a little great news into the conversation and get that into the record. These numbers come directly from the Treasury Department's monthly financial reports that are available on the Web for anybody to look at. I wanted to highlight those numbers tonight as we finish up this Countdown hour that we spent tonight talking about Iraq.

These are grave times, tough times, hard times, and I think our resolve is firm. We will see this week the integrity of our colleagues in this Chamber as to how they vote, how they have talked in this Chamber versus how they vote on this deal.

There are only two positions: stay and fight, win this thing and be successful; or get out, get our folks out now. There is no half step in between that you can orchestrate any kind of a justification that makes any sense. It will be interesting to watch our colleagues as they struggle with this vote this week, with their own integrity and their own ideas of what is right and wrong.

With that, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will yield back. Thank you for having this Special Order tonight.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for joining me and appreciate that report on the revenues to the government. Once again it proves that tax cuts do work. It increases the economic activity in this country, which generates more revenue not only for the government, but for the good people of America that are out there working hard every day. They are able to put

more of that money into their pockets instead of sending it to the bureaucrats in Washington to spend it.

I think it is important on this fourth anniversary that we did speak about what is happening in Iraq, and most importantly what is going to happen on this House floor.

The American people, I was told by Colonel Walt Piatt in Afghanistan when I visited there a couple years ago, and I was talking to Colonel Piatt, who is from my district, and we were talking about the effort and the needs of the troops and the military equipment, and he said to me, you know, America's power is not its soldier, it is not its weaponry, it is not the bombs we create. The strength in America is the will of the American people, because if the soldiers know that the people are behind what they are doing, in support of what they are doing, they can accomplish anything.

I think what is going to be said here on this House floor, because the House, we are the people elected, we are the leaders elected from our districts, 435 districts, and what we say here is going to go a long way in whether we are going to be successful in helping the Iraqis building a democracy, in stabilizing that country and helping long term what is going to happen in the Middle East.

So it is going to be very critical what is said here on the floor in this war supplemental. Are we going to use it as a political ploy, use it as a bargaining chip, use our men and women as bargaining chips to get spending to things that don't belong in this war supplemental, or are we going to do the right thing, and that is you support our men and women with the funding that they need? Are we going to support them?

That is going to be a large step in proving to them that we are with them, that we are behind them and that we are not going to put in arbitrary deadlines that are going to give our adversaries and our enemies a leg up on us.

So this is going to be an absolutely critical week for America. It is going to be a critical week and a defining moment I believe for the majority party, because I don't believe, and I think it is pretty clear, the American people don't like conflict, don't like war, don't like death, don't like destruction. Nobody likes that. But the American people do not want to lose in Iraq. I think that is very clear. And this war supplemental, putting in these arbitrary timetables, is a prescription for that.

It is micromanaging this war by the politicians in Washington, just like many on the other side of the aisle say is what happened in Vietnam. That was wrong in Vietnam, and yet they are standing up on the House floor this week and the past couple weeks proposing that we do just that, micromanage this war. 435 Members of the House, 100 Senators, they are not the Commander in Chief.

The Constitution is clear. When you are fighting a war, you need one leader. When you are fighting a war, you leave it to the professionals, you leave it to the generals, you leave it to the colonels, you leave it to the men and women that are trained to do this, not bring it on the House floor. And as I said and as The Washington Post has said, trying to micromanage this war is the wrong thing to do for the Iraqi people, it is the wrong thing to do for the American people, and it is the wrong thing to do for the men and women that are in harm's way.

So I hope we are able to come together on this House floor and strip out many of those things that are in here that just make it unworkable and bad for the American people and the military.

MARKING THE END OF THE 4TH YEAR OF THE OCCUPATION OF IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my coming to the floor this evening, along with a number of my friends and colleagues on this side of the aisle, is to mark the fact that tomorrow will be the 4th year that our military forces instigated by the administration have attacked Iraq and engaged in what the administration has called a war in that country. Most people now have come to realize that we are not engaged in a war in Iraq, but we are engaged now in an occupation, the consequences of which are proving to be increasingly disastrous.

At 10:15 p.m. on March 19, 2003, in a televised address to the Nation, President Bush announced the start of what he refers to as "the war in Iraq."

□ 2115

The way in which the administration attempted to justify that attack has been a grave consequence for the United States, both internally and around the world. The President, of course, and others in his administration contended that there was a connection between Iraq and the attack that took place in New York and at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, that Iraq was somehow involved in that attack, when all of the evidence and information indicated that that was not the case.

In spite of that, the administration continued to make that allegation. They then went on to say that it was important that the United States invade Iraq for the safety of our country and for the safety of others because Iraq was a country that possessed what they referred to as "weapons of mass destruction," alleging that there was substantial amounts of chemical and biological weapons in Iraq.

They then went on to assert that Iraq had a nuclear weapons program, and the President of the United States in a 2003 State of the Union Address to a joint session of Congress and to the Nation here in this House asserted that the British Government had learned that Iraq had imported enriched uranium from Niger. When he included that sentence in his State of the Union Address, he was very much aware that the intelligence agencies in our country had said that there was no proof that that was the case. In fact, they had examined the documents upon which those assertions were being made, and they found those documents which had been stolen from the Nigerian Embassy in Rome were, in fact, forged.

So what we have here is an unnecessary and unjustified and consequently illegal attack on another country and a subsequent disastrous occupation which has gone on now for 4 years, and we will be beginning the fifth year starting tomorrow.

As a result of this occupation, over 3,200 American servicemen and women have been killed in Iraq since our invasion over 4 years ago. Over 24,000 troops have been wounded in action in Iraq, and the number of Iraqis killed is unknown, but the estimates range as high as 200,000 Iraqi civilians, mostly women and children, who have been killed in that country as a result of the military action.

We are spending now about \$275 million per day in Iraq. More than \$8 billion every month is being spent in that country. And as the Speaker of the House noted earlier this evening in her speech on the floor, at least \$10 billion of that money is completely unaccounted for, and much of the rest has been spent in ways that have not been productive, but have been extraordinarily wasteful.

The President in January called for what he referred to as a surge of nearly 30,000 additional soldiers into Iraq. So far that has amounted to 21,500 additional troops that have gone to Iraq in January, and 4,400 more just two weeks ago.

The circumstances there continue to deteriorate as a result of the corrupt and incompetent way in which this illegal invasion and subsequent occupation have been carried out by this administration.

Roughly half of all of the ground equipment that the U.S. Army owns is now located in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since the invasion, the Army has lost nearly 2,000 wheeled vehicles and more than 1,000 armed vehicles. To make matters worse, according to the GAO, the Army has not been keeping accurate track of what they have and what they need to reset the force, and they cannot provide sufficient detail for Congress to provide effective oversight.

Between 75,000 and 100,000 pieces of National Guard equipment worth nearly \$2 billion are now located in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is equipment that is

needed by the National Guard here in our country to carry out the obligations and responsibilities of the National Guard around the United States. And they are now increasingly being deprived of their ability to carry out their responsibilities and obligations because of the loss of their equipment.

The Regular Army has lost so much equipment which has not been replaced that they are now using the equipment of the National Guard to replace the equipment that they have lost and which this administration has failed to provide replacements for.

We have a situation that is confronting us now in Iraq which is increasingly damaging, dangerous, and on the verge of being disastrous for our country as well as for others in the Middle East.

We need this Congress to assert its obligations and responsibilities to oversee the activities of this administration, and that is clearly necessary because all through the 4 years during which this illegal invasion took place followed by this occupation, there has not been any significant oversight by this Congress, which, of course, was controlled by the Republican majority for all of that period of time.

Now that we have a Democratic majority in Congress, that oversight is beginning. Appropriate hearings are being conducted both in this House and in the Senate, and more and more information concerning the way in which this operation has been carried out is being made available to the American people, and as a result of that, more and more people across the country are realizing what a disaster this has been. More and more Americans are understanding how they were intentionally and purposefully misled and deceived by this administration in order to carry out this invasion which had absolutely nothing to do with the attack of September 11, and which cannot be justified in any way whatsoever.

This action is unlawful, and appropriate oversight and supervision based upon detailed and focused hearings by this Congress is now absolutely necessary.

We have with us this evening several of my colleagues who are interested in speaking about this issue, and I would now like to recognize my very good friend from Ohio, who will address the House at this time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) for his superb remarks and for his organizing this Special Order in order to express our opinions on behalf of our troops and for a course correction in Iraq and the Middle East in general.

When you think about it, we are being asked this week to vote an additional \$100 billion in what is called a supplemental, mainly to escalate the war in Iraq, and the money we are voting on will be just for today until the end of September of this year. This \$100 billion is put on top of what has already been appropriated to be spent on

the war, and it is typical of this administration's mishandling the war and its accounting, always underestimating every year what it will really cost to carry out the activities.

If you look at the chart that shows what we are spending in Iraq, it is absolutely escalating every single year.

The best advice we were given on a recent trip to Iraq, Afghanistan and the region was from our generals, who said: What does victory mean? Victory means one-third military, two-thirds diplomacy and good governance. The two-thirds is missing. So, therefore, we are asking our soldiers to bear all of the burden of a flawed strategy for Iraq and the surrounding regions that is ripening terrorism in every single country, and we are losing respect. The coalition of the willing has dried up. The neighbors of Iraq have not been convened in a constructive way, and we watch other nations in the region border on destabilization because of what we are doing in Iraq.

My deep concern is that the violence could spill over into Jordan, Turkey, Bahrain, Kuwait, Pakistan, Lebanon, even Saudi Arabia. And so America has to face a strategic challenge much larger than Iraq, and the administration is not leading us there.

This evening I wanted to say a word about the theater in which Iraq is operating. She is not alone. So many of our soldiers, our patriotic brave soldiers, are in Iraq, and they are the finest military in the world, but they exist in a sea of discontent. And I would like to say that the face of terrorism that we see springs from a view, fair or not, that the United States allies with the rich but not the poor across the undemocratic Islamic world. And how can America stand for democracy in Iraq, but not in all of the oil kingdoms and theocracies to which our Nation has been tethered for most of the last century and now into this century?

Why would I say that? I would say that because recent polls in the region show exactly that. It shows that America is viewed as not on the side of rising popular expectations for a more democratic way of life. Rather, we are seen as tethered to an old power structure where the poor remain poor, and the rich, outlandishly rich, and becoming more so; and where religion has become the metaphor for political change of those excluded economically and politically.

Unfortunately, the Gallup poll shows how harshly the United States is viewed across the region. Right or not, the people there view us as a promiscuous culture in moral decay, and Abu Ghraib affirmed their views.

If we look at our closest ally, Turkey, a valued ally of ours for over 50 years in NATO, the disapproval rating of our country has risen from 48 percent in 2000, and we weren't doing so well back then, to 88 percent this year. So 88 percent of the citizens of Turkey disagree and disapprove of what we are doing.

The ruling secular party of Turkey has lost control of its Parliament, and now at the local level who is winning elections in Turkey? Parties that are tending more and more religious. And I am not saying that the religious parties of Turkey are like those of Pakistan or Saudi Arabia, but we have to recognize what is happening across the region as America falls into disrepute.

In Pakistan, home to tens of thousands of madrassas, schools funded by Wahabi donors from Saudi Arabia, young boys are being turned out by the thousands to revenge against America.

America's favorability ratings in Pakistan have fallen to 27 percent. When we were visiting Pakistan a few weeks ago, a female Parliamentarian was assassinated on the western side of the country, people who are trying to relate to the broader world outside of Pakistan.

In Egypt, which signed a peace treaty with Israel three decades ago, 70 percent of the public unfavorably views the United States. And more than 90 members of the anti-American Muslim Brotherhood were elected to Parliament recently, and that Parliament has about as many members as we do. So 90-plus members is a significant number in the Egyptian Parliament.

I could go down the list. King Abdullah of Jordan was here a couple of weeks ago. What did he ask us for? Peace now, time is short; peace now, time is short. The U.S. favorability rating in Jordan dropped to 15 percent. Are we paying attention to what is going on?

My dear colleague Mr. HINCHEY talked about Saudi Arabia, where the majority of 9/11 terrorists had come from. The United States is disliked by three-quarters of the people in Saudi Arabia. So we look at our troops inside of Iraq because the Commander in Chief of this country sent them there, but if we look at what is happening in the region, America is not winning.

One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle just said, just measure the body count. Measure the American losses as a sign of how well we are doing.

It is taking us twice as much money every year just to keep the body count where it is now. Look at the casualties. Look at the Iraqi casualties that no one wants to talk about. Look at what is happening in the region. We are not being successful in the war on terrorism, as hard as our soldiers try, because they cannot do it alone.

□ 2130

Why are we asking the military to bear the full burden when the diplomatic channels of this government have crashed?

Can you believe that the neighbors of Iraq have not been assembled by our Secretary of State in any constructive way now going on 4 years? Unbelievable.

Can you believe that we have allowed nations with which we have been

friends for 50 years just to fester at the end of a failed diplomatic pipeline?

The President's job is not just to be Commander in Chief. It is to be Diplomat in Chief for this country, and yet across that region we see ties that have been forged by this country for generations just ripped into shreds. What a tragedy.

I was thinking yesterday, I grew up in an era when John Kennedy talked about the Peace Corps and the great alliance for progress across Latin America. Look at the Latin Americans demonstrating against the United States.

We cannot ask our soldiers to fill a gap, a failed diplomacy and failed politics across the region. The world wants change. The world is begging us for change. The world is demonstrating for change. It just is not America that is demonstrating for change.

So this evening, Mr. Speaker, I would thank my colleague so very much for allowing me some time to talk about regaining America's standing in the world by correcting what has gone wrong in Iraq.

I just might end by saying today in USA Today there was a major story of Poland, people risking their lives going to Iraq, asking the Iraqi people what they think. What it shows is compared to 2005, just a couple years ago, when 71 percent of people in Iraq said their life was fairly good, today it has dropped to 39 percent.

In Baghdad, where so many of our soldiers are being sent, what percentage of the people rate their basic household needs as being served by the current regime? You know what the number is? Zero. Zero. Fallen in the last 2 years from 78 percent of their basic household needs. That is like food, water, down to zero.

Electricity, you know what percent of the people in Baghdad say their service is good? Zero. Zero, down from only half in 2005.

What about clean water? In 2005, 68 percent said they could get clean water. You know what the number is? Zero.

How can this be good? How can America win this? How can we ask our soldiers to fill a failed policy? Our soldiers will do anything we ask them to do. We have the best military in the world. We have the most committed generals, the most committed soldiers. We love every single one of them, but we do not want to give them a mission impossible in a sea of discontent where the Diplomat in Chief has abdicated his responsibility to them and to the kind of strategy that can win America friends again.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and it is a real privilege to be able to participate in this Special Order this evening.

Mr. HINCHEY. Thank you very much. I very much appreciate the statement that was just made by our colleague from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR, the respect that she has given to our military, appropriately so, and her examination of the consequences that we

are confronting now in Iraq as a result of the incompetent way in which this administration has dealt with the political and economic circumstances there in that country.

I would like now to yield time to my friend and colleague from New York, JOHN HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much Congressman HINCHEY and thank Congresswoman KAPTUR for her remarks.

Today marks the start of the 5th year of the war in Iraq; and as I begin my statement, I want to recognize the honorable service of the men and women who have served our country in Iraq. I want to honor the memories of the 3,188 servicemembers who have given their lives in Iraq, including five men from my district and over 50 officers of the United States Army who graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point, which I am proud is in my district. While I believe the war in Iraq has been a mistake, I deeply respect the honor and integrity of those who have given their lives following the orders of their Commander in Chief.

In light of the sacrifices of so many of our men and women in uniform, it saddens me that I have to come to the floor of the House of Representatives and say I believe this war has been a strategic blunder in our efforts to fight terrorism.

On September 11, our Nation was attacked and many people from my district, including police and firefighters, died at the World Trade Center. The United States correctly responded by pursuing those responsible for 9/11 in Afghanistan. Unfortunately, this administration decided to change its focus and start a war of choice with Iraq, a country which had not attacked us and was not an imminent threat to the United States.

Now our military is trapped in the middle of a civil war instead of pursuing Osama bin Laden, Mullah Mohammed Omar, and other al Qaeda affiliates throughout the world responsible for 9/11 and other similar attacks and groups planning to attack the United States again.

Because we are focused in Iraq, the progress made in Afghanistan is slipping. The Karzai government does not control the territory outside its own capital. We see an increase in the drug trade that funds regional warlords. The Taliban emerges at night to terrorize the local population, and our military expects increasing attacks throughout this spring. However, because of our continuing overcommitment in Iraq, the United States has little ability to increase its troop numbers in Afghanistan and respond to that deteriorating situation.

While the administration and its allies say we are battling the terrorists in Iraq, the United States intelligence agencies say otherwise. The National Intelligence Estimate released in April 2006 stated: "The Iraq conflict has be-

come a 'cause celebre' for jihadists, breeding a deep resentment of U.S. involvement in the Muslim world and cultivating supporters for the global jihadist movement." Iraq is not the central front in the war on terror as the President likes to say. Instead, it is a rallying point, a recruiting poster that Osama bin Laden uses to recruit more terrorists.

The war in Iraq has seriously weakened our military. A recent report found that 90 percent of our National Guard youths are rated "not ready" to respond to a national disaster or terrorist attack in the United States. Further, in order to meet their recruitment goals, the military has lowered the minimum standards for being accepted into the service, and our military faces a crippling loss of mid-level officers as larger and larger numbers decide not to reenlist and face multiple deployments.

It is time for a new direction. Our intelligence agencies know it, our military commanders know it, and the American people demanded it last November. General Petraeus, commanding general in Iraq, stated on March 8: "There is no military solution to a problem like that in Iraq, to the insurgency of Iraq." And just last week, Pentagon analysts admitted that the war in Iraq is a civil war.

Unfortunately, our President refuses to face reality and the will of the American people. He wants to put more troops in the middle of a civil war. He wants an open-ended commitment to keep combat troops in Iraq indefinitely. He wants to leave the problem of Iraq to the next President. And, once again, he has returned to Congress and asked for another blank check to continue this misguided war. Unlike the President, this Congress will face reality and realize that we must change direction in Iraq.

Some of our colleagues speaking earlier from the other side of the floor criticized us for trying to, as they say, micromanage the war. There cannot be 435 or 535 Commanders in Chief. We would not need to take this kind of action to manage or, if you will, micromanage the war if the President and Commander in Chief were doing his job, if the leadership were coming from the top, as our structure of government ordinarily calls for it to come.

But because there is a vacuum in the top, because the President has continued to disregard or turn a blind eye to the reality of what is happening, not only around the world, as our Congresswoman just mentioned, in terms of the reputation of the United States, which ultimately in the long term is what will determine our security, our reputation, the approval of the United States and its policies by other peoples and other countries around the world will ultimately determine in the long run how secure we are, we do not have enough money to spend our way into security if we continue to make more enemies and lose our friends.

General Petraeus is correct. We need a political solution to the war in Iraq instead of a military escalation. It is time for a diplomatic surge. The United States must push the Iraqi Government to meet its commitments that it made to its partners in Iraq. It is time the United States reached out to our allies in the region and throughout the world.

By requiring the Iraqi Government to achieve a list of objectives and establishing a timetable for U.S. involvement in Iraq, we can end the culture of dependency developing in Iraq. We can make the Iraqi Government stand up and take control of its own fate. If they do that, we will stick by them. We will help them train police and military forces and rebuild their country. If they are unwilling or unable to take that responsibility, we will know that the United States does not have a serious partner in Iraq.

If we are to defeat the people who did attack our country on September 11, those who continue to seek to destroy us, we must pivot away from Iraq and back to Afghanistan and al Qaeda, the people who actually attacked us. We must draw down in Iraq and let our military redeploy, rebuild, and refocus.

The United States faces a gravely serious threat, and we must be prepared to defeat it. Our 4-year involvement in Iraq has seriously endangered our ability to do that. At home, our National Guard has been undermined. It is unprepared to respond to a terrorist attack or a natural disaster. Abroad, our military forces are stretched thin and unable to shift quickly.

If we really want to defeat Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda and the other terrorist groups that seek to kill us, we must return our attention to that war and leave the civil war we currently face in Iraq to the Iraqis. If we rebuild our forces and refocus on the threats in Afghanistan, Pakistan and throughout southeast Asia, we will be able to truly defeat our enemies and truly protect the United States of America.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend JOHN HALL from New York for his strong presentation and for joining us this evening in this discussion about this critical issue.

I would now like to recognize my friend and colleague from California, BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for calling this Special Order tonight and for your leadership.

Today marks the fourth anniversary of the invasion and bombing of Iraq. It is a solemn occasion that reminds me with a very heavy heart of our brave troops who we want to protect and who we want to bring home.

As the occupation now enters its 5th year, it is really an appropriate time to review some of the history. It is also an appropriate time to recall that the case for this war was false.

All the talk about aluminum tubes and yellowcake, remember that? Right.

Colin Powell's dramatic presentation to the United Nations? I still wonder why such a distinguished Secretary of State would do that.

The fact is there was no connection to al Qaeda. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and there was no connection between the horrific events of 9/11 and Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

Some of us opposed the war from the beginning. In fact, if my amendment to the authorization to use force had been used 4 years ago, the United Nations inspectors would have had the opportunity to finish their job and confirm what we believed and some of us knew at that time, what the world now knows, namely, that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction.

□ 2145

It is an appropriate time now to review the disaster that has taken place in Iraq, so that the administration does not rewrite this tragic history, and also to put the administration on notice and in check from starting a preemptive war against Iran, which many see as looming. It's appropriate tonight to review this history because the administration who brought us this debacle would now like us to accept an open-ended commitment to it.

Why is it appropriate for us to remind the country of all of this tonight? Because the same people, the same administration who brought us this disaster are now asking us to trust them again. They are saying that we should give the President another chance. They are saying, in effect, that our commitment to supporting their failed policies should be open-ended.

Think about that for a minute. The people in this administration who have been wrong about every single major decision about this war are now trying to make it seem unreasonable to suggest that we should not continue to write blank checks to support this debacle.

Well, it is not unreasonable. That is where the American people are on this issue. They know better. It is time for this unfortunate chapter of our history to close. It is time to end the occupation of Iraq and bring our troops home.

At various points the administration has told us that the mission has been accomplished, that we were turning the corner, or that the insurgency was in its last throes. As we now know, those pronouncements were all false.

The truth is that the administration's conduct of this war has been nothing short of shameful. We may never know how many of the roadside bombs that kill our troops every day are made from explosives looted from weapons depots that were left unguarded because the administration chose to ignore the advice of our military commanders on how many troops would be needed. Whatever the number is, it is too many.

It is an appropriate time tonight to review the cost of the administration's

failed policy in Iraq. The human cost of this occupation has been terrible. More than 3,200 United States servicemen and women have died, and more than 32,000 have been wounded. That is an average of 67 deaths and 500 wounded every month, not to mention the death and injuries of countless Iraqis.

The financial cost is unsustainable. Already we have spent more than \$400 billion on this invasion and occupation. We are averaging more than \$8 billion per month. That is staggering.

The cost of our security has been devastating. The Bush administration's military and foreign policy doctrine of preemptive war, like you can start a war based on perceived future threats, this was supposed to solve the problem posed by the so-called axis of evil.

Four years after putting the doctrine to test in Iraq, the results are in, and it is a total failure. Iraq posed no imminent threat to our security, but today the vast majority of our security resources are bogged down in Iraq. North Korea has obtained nuclear weapons, something the doctrine was to prevent, and Iran is empowered and emboldened. The occupation is undermining our efforts to fight international terrorism.

According to the National Intelligence Estimate of April 2006, and this is in their words, they said the Iraq conflict has been the cause celebre for jihadists, breeding a deep resentment of the United States involvement in the Muslim world and cultivating supporters for the global jihadist movement. Now, this is what the National Intelligence Estimate said.

Furthermore, the toll that the occupation is taking on our Armed Forces is stretching the military beyond the breaking point. The Washington Post reported today that Army and Marine officials are referring to a readiness death spiral in which the ever more rapid pace of war zone rotations has consumed 40 percent of the total gear, wearied troops, and left no time to train to fight anything other than insurgents now at hand.

The administration likes to talk about the situation in Iraq in terms of winning and losing, because it is convenient to portray critics of their policies as opposed to victory or supportive of defeat. The fact is you cannot win an occupation, just as there is no way for the United States to win an Iraqi civil war.

The Bush administration understands this just as they understand that there are no pretty or clean options for bringing a responsible end to our policy there. They are content to mouth the words of victory while they try to run out the clock, playing a cynical game of political chicken, where whoever acts to bring a responsible end to their failed policy will be accused of having lost Iraq.

The trouble is, though, that an average of 67 troops die in Iraq each month, and 500 are wounded, and we can't forget that. As General Petraeus and the

Iraq Study Group both pointed out, there is no military solution to this civil war and occupation. For me, the cost of going along with the President's escalation charade and risking our brave young men and women's lives is way too high. It's time to bring this war and occupation to an end. It's time for military measures to be replaced with diplomacy and engagement with Iraq's neighbors. It's time to take the target off our troops' back and to bring them home.

Thank you, Mr. HINCHEY, for this Special Order tonight, and let's hope the American people raise their voices loudly and clearly with regard to what is taking place with this war and bring it to an end very soon.

Mr. HINCHEY. I thank you for your very articulate expression of all of those facts, your leadership here and for joining us this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to recognize my friend from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. First of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for this Special Order and for including me and allowing me to speak once again on this House floor about this war and this occupation of Iraq.

On the evening of March 19, 2003, speaking from the Oval Office, the President of the United States started his address to the Nation with these very words, and I quote him.

"My fellow citizens, at this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger." Here we are, 4 years later, and it's fair to ask, indeed, it's incumbent upon us to ask, have we disarmed Iraq?

Well, first off, as we all know, there are no weapons of mass destruction to disarm, so that whole entire premise was flawed.

The question we have to ask is have we made Iraq safer? We may have deposed Saddam Hussein, but with insurgents, militias and vigilantes terrorizing Iraqi neighborhoods, some of them with the tacit support of the Iraqi Government, it's impossible to say we have disarmed Iraq or made its people and communities more secure.

Have we freed Iraq's people? Well, I can think of at least 60,000 Iraqis for starters who haven't been freed. That's the most conservative estimate of Iraqi civilian deaths over the last 4 years, at least 60,000 killed for the cause of their so-called liberation.

Many of those who have escaped death live in fear of it, afraid to go to the market or send their children to school, if there is still a school for them to attend. Too many Iraqis live in communities without electricity, without sewage or basic services. Have we freed them?

What about those who are so flush with freedom that they have chosen to flee their own country? I am talking about the 1.5 million-plus Iraqi refugees. Why don't we ask them if they feel free?

Have we defended the world from grave danger? Indeed not. One study by the Center for Security Studies at New York University Law School concludes that the rate of fatal Muslim terror attacks worldwide has increased by a factor of seven since the Iraq war began. I repeat, that is seven times as much terrorism since we started this occupation, more people call it a war, but it is really an occupation, because this occupation that they keep telling us is the central front in the war on terror is not getting rid of terror.

It's clear our Iraq policy has had a major impact in the war on terrorism. Unfortunately, it appears to be helping the wrong side.

So to go back to the President's statement of exactly 4 years ago, it would appear he has accomplished none of these three tasks, tasks he claimed to have begun that night 4 years ago. Iraq is not disarmed, its people are not free, and the world is more dangerous. It was never supposed to get to this point. You remember this was going to be quick, it was going to be painless. We are going to finish these guys off without breaking a sweat, remember.

On the very same day that President Bush spoke in front of the Mission Accomplished banner, prominent neoconservative Richard Perle actually published an op ed in a major national newspaper entitled "Relax, Celebrate Victory." The cost? Don't worry, they told us, Iraq oil revenues will cover the entire thing.

They fired the top White House economic adviser for daring to suggest that the war had cost as much as \$200 billion. What would they have done to him if they had known he was underestimating it by a few hundred billion dollars?

We have to ask our colleagues who authorized the President to launch the preemptive strike on Iraq, is this what you voted for, to invade a country that had no weapons of mass destruction, no link to 9/11; to occupy that country for 4 years, helping foster a vicious insurgency and fan the flames of civil war?

If you had known these things, and if you had known that it would cost us over 3,200 lives to date, and upwards of \$400 billion, uncounted civilian deaths, and between 35,000, as the Pentagon tells us, or over 200,000, as reported by the Veterans Administration, wounded, we have to ask, can you look the American people in the eye and say you would have done the same thing all over again knowing what you know now?

If your answer is no, if you believe the war has been a mistake, then it makes absolutely no sense to let it continue any longer, and it makes even less sense to hand the President an additional \$100 billion with which to pursue the same disastrous policy.

Our troops have done their job. They and their families have sacrificed more than enough. They have been forced to dig for scrap metal in order to armor their vehicles. They have endured sub-

standard care, bureaucratic delays and squalid conditions at Walter Reed Hospital. They have been betrayed by the grievous mistakes of their civilian supervisors and superiors.

Support our troops. Bring them home.

I have four grandchildren who weren't born 4 years ago. They have never lived in a world unclouded by this shameful, destructive and unnecessary occupation. I fear that if this Congress doesn't act, they will be living with these consequences well into their adult lives. It is for them, for the America they will inherit, that I want this war to end.

It's time to act boldly. Americans are crying out for leadership, for their elected representatives to hear their frustrations about Iraq and to move decisively in response.

This is a gut-check moment. Do you want it said about the 110th Congress that it failed the test of history, that it continued to send young Americans to kill and be killed on a mission that did nothing to enhance our national security or promote U.S. foreign interests? Do you want it said that we made a tragic mistake; even worse, that we blindly rubber-stamped a failed policy that has ignited a civil war and inspired a new generation of terrorists?

The Iraq policy of the last 4 years has proven ruinous and misguided at every turn by any objective measure. As a matter of humanitarian obligation and political accountability, it's time to change course.

In the name of national security, fiscal responsibility and basic human decency, we must get our troops out of Iraq and bring them home by the end of this year. Bring them home for the holidays.

I thank you again, Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. HINCHEY. I thank you, Lynn Woolsey, for your leadership and the way you have directed your attention to this issue over and over again on the floor of this House so many times, and done it so well.

Mr. Speaker, now I would like to yield time to my dear friend and colleague from California (Ms. WATERS).

□ 2200

Ms. WATERS. I would like to thank my friend from New York for taking this time out this evening and sharing it with those of us who feel a real need to come to the floor of this fourth anniversary of the war in Iraq and share with the people of America how we really feel about what is going on.

First, I think it is important for the people of America to know that some of us are listening. We hear what they are telling us. We know what their expectations are. The polls today are very, very clear about the overwhelming number of Americans who want us out of Iraq.

This war has truly taken a toll on this country: over 3,200 dead; 24,000 injured. And I don't mean just minor injuries. Serious injuries. It has been

documented what is happening at Walter Reed, brain injuries, eyes gouged out, limbs lost. Serious injuries. And the information that was just shared with us, about 20 percent of the returning troops with mental illness.

Not only is it taking a toll on these young men and women who are sacrificing in this war; it is taking a toll on our domestic agenda, over \$400 billion spent on this war in Iraq and Afghanistan. The President now has a supplemental appropriation before this House asking for \$100 billion more. The President recently came to us and told us he was going to increase the troops there by another 21,000, and a few days ago he added to that another 8,500. The requests keep coming: more troops, more money. And there is no end in sight.

The President has said we should listen to the generals on the ground. Whenever we try and share our feelings and give some advice, he rejects it out of hand. Well, he just got information from General Petraeus on the ground, and he said to the world there will be and can be no military solution. But this President continues to persist in increasing the military and misrepresenting to the American people what is going on.

With this request that he has made, the supplemental request, there are those who truly believe that we can ask him for progress reports and he will give us good information. I listened very carefully early this morning to what the President and all of those in his administration would say on this 4th-year anniversary. They simply are spinning the information about this war the way they have always spun the information about this war.

First of all, as it has been said over and over again, they told us we would be welcomed with open arms. They told us there were weapons of mass destruction. They told us we were making progress with the training of soldiers, Iraqi soldiers, and they were just around the corner, they would be prepared and willing to take over the security of that country.

Well, I listened as they did their spin this morning. In the middle of all of this carnage, in the middle of the fact that we wake up to more suicide bombings, more loss of American soldiers, and the expansion of the bombings in putting chlorine into the bombing and into the materials, they were spinning it again this morning saying we are making progress. And that is what I expect them to say if we give them the opportunity to tell us what progress is, come July, as it is indicated in the legislation that some would like to go forth from the floor.

We cannot depend on them to tell us the truth. We cannot depend on them to follow and honor benchmarks that a lot of people are alluding to. We cannot depend on this President to get out of Iraq as long as we are giving him the money. We said that we didn't support the surge, but there are those who could suggest that we turn around and

support the surge, \$90 billion to support the expansion of this war. Why should he get out as long as we are giving him the money?

What are we supposed to accomplish? What are we trying to do? The President would tell you that somehow we are supposed to provide the security and we are supposed to train so that the Iraqis will be able to provide security. We are supposed to make the Shites get along with the Sunnis and the Sunnis get along with the Kurds. I don't think so. I think that we don't understand the history. And I don't think that we understand, no matter who we think we are, we cannot forge the kinds of relationships that somehow we are going to stay there until we make people love and like each other and work together.

Who wants us in Iraq? They call us the occupiers. As a matter of fact, we find that legislators that are supposedly in this new democratic government, one was revealed this morning to have all kinds of weapons found at his house. All kinds of weapons. And they found traces of chemicals in his four automobiles. This is one of the so-called elected members of the parliament. They do not want us there. The Shiites don't want us there, the Sunnis don't want us there, the Kurds don't want us there. And we have our young people at risk. They are at risk. They are being attacked by the militias, and they are being attacked by the very police forces that are supposed to be on the ground helping to provide security.

Well, in the final analysis, our only response must be to have an exit strategy. The Out of Iraq Caucus that was organized 1½ years ago did not say when we should get out; it did not tell the President exactly what the strategy should be. We simply created a platform for discussion and debate so that the Members of Congress would keep their eyes on the ball so that they would understand what was going on and not have information swept under the rug. We invited in speakers. We had generals to come in; we had writers to come in. We had many people come in and talk with us about what is going on there. But this President doesn't get it. He is intending to stay there until he does something called "win," with young people losing their lives, the children of families all over America, not just from inner cities but most of them now we are finding coming from rural America. They will continue to die.

In another year we are going to have thousands that will be dead. In another year there will be thousands that will be injured. And the shame of it all is that they won't find the kind of medical care. They had a big article today and information about the homeless veterans returning from Iraq. They are homeless, they are not being cared for, they are not getting the benefits. But we are going to continue this war. I would submit to you it is time for a change. Bring our soldiers home.

Mr. HINCHEY. Ms. WATERS, I thank you very much for your dynamic leadership and for joining us this evening and for those remarks.

I yield to my good friend and colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Let me begin by thanking the gentleman from New York for this Special Order and bringing to the American people the very important issue that stands before us. And I would like to commend the Out of Iraq Caucus, but primarily the three women from California, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, Congresswoman LEE, and Congresswoman WATERS, who have kept this particular issue alive, have continued to work with us to shape a policy or keep the conscience of America focused on this situation, a situation that we gave preemptive strike authority to the President of United States, which all of us opposed, when they said there were weapons of mass destruction; and when none were found, said, well, it was regime change was the final one.

But today, we mark the fourth anniversary of the occupation in Iraq. Ironically, it was almost 4 years ago on May 1, 2003, that President Bush deemed the operation in Iraq as "mission accomplished," affirming an end to the major combat in Iraq. As you may recall, he flew in a military plane on an aircraft carrier with a big sign and a brilliant smile on his face, "Mission Accomplished."

By that time, approximately 175 Americans had lost their lives in combat. Too many, but 175. Yet 3,197 lives later, American lives later, the war continues; 3,197 more from the pronouncement of "mission accomplished." Included in this number are 50 fatalities from my home State of New Jersey.

This weekend, thousands of protesters took to the streets to demand an end to the war in Iraq. As an early and staunch opponent to this war, I have watched every single prediction made by this administration. They have boldly said what they predicted, and every time the prediction was wrong: from the duration of the war, wrong; the reception we would receive, wrong; the costs, wrong; the number of casualties, wrong; the existence of weapons of mass destruction, wrong. This administration has proven itself wrong, wrong, wrong. The countless number of Americans and Iraqis who have lost their lives is sad.

The administration should listen to the Baker-Hamilton Commission, which has offered a stinging assessment of virtually every aspect of the U.S. venture in Iraq and calls for a reshaping of the American presence and a new Middle East democracy initiative to prevent the country from slipping into anarchy.

There is a great sense of sadness among those of us who foresaw over 4 years ago the tragedy that is now unfolding in Iraq. The war that many assumed would be swift and certain now

continues to rage, but I urge my fellow colleagues to take this day and all of the days forward to push for a change, beginning with an orderly withdrawal of American forces from Iraq. This approach will send a message to Iraqis that they must take more responsibility for their own security and would reduce the strain on our military forces. For that, we will not need a surge to the war to continue and continue surge after surge.

I thank you very much for the time.

Mr. HINCHEY. I thank my friend DONALD PAYNE from New Jersey for his leadership and for joining us this evening.

Mr. Speaker, the point that we have made here tonight is that perhaps at no time in the history of this country, except for perhaps our own Civil War, have we faced the kind of circumstances that we are presently being confronted with as a result of the way in which this administration incompetently and corruptly has led us into this illegal occupation in Iraq.

We need to correct these circumstances. It is the responsibility of this Congress to do so. We need to hold this administration accountable. It is the responsibility of this Congress to do so. We need to remove our military forces from Iraq in an appropriate and timely way. And it is the responsibility of this Congress to take that kind of leadership.

I thank my friends and colleagues for joining us here on this very important 4-year anniversary of the illegal attack and subsequent occupation of Iraq. We need now to change these circumstances.

OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I discuss a black mark on this administration. And while I realize this is the fourth anniversary, and I have enjoyed the comments of colleagues, comments with which I may have some disagreement, I would like to discuss another issue. Because no matter what we do in Iraq, one way or the other, whether we succeed there or not, if our southern borders are not secure, if the southern borders are open to an invasion of illegal immigrants and open to an invasion of our country by terrorists and others who would do us harm and drug dealers and drug cartels, America is in great jeopardy. So no matter what is happening overseas, and I would grant you that the President may have made some mistakes and he may well have been well motivated, but his motives in determining the policy of what is happening at our southern borders is not what is in question. It is his actions. And what we have today is a dangerous threat to the safety of our people, the security of our country at our southern border.

□ 2215

Today I discuss a black mark on this administration in terms of the security of our country, a vile crime which has been committed against two law enforcement officers whose job it has been to protect our families and our communities by keeping control of America's borders. The sad episode started back on February 17, 2005, just another routine day for Border Patrol Agents Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean. Both were Border Patrol veterans with unblemished service records. Agent Ramos, in fact, had been nominated for Border Patrol Agent of the Year.

As they made their rounds that day 2 years ago, they checked on a tripped sensor near the border. Agent Compean discovered footprints and drag marks, the usual indication of a drug load being smuggled across the river. He spotted a vehicle, then radioed in the description and followed the suspect. The suspect realized that he had been spotted and turned around to rush back towards Mexico. Agent Ramos then observed the van driving at a very high rate of speed, and, after the driver ignored commands to pull over, Ramos gave chase.

By the way, according to the prosecuting attorney, pursuing a fleeing suspect without a supervisor's permission is against the Border Patrol policy. Now, get this. We are being told that just pursuing someone who has come across the border in a vehicle, without permission of a supervisor, is an illegal act, is against the rules for our Border Patrol agents. Whoever made that rule up? I wonder if the drug smugglers and the terrorists know about that rule?

The drug smuggler, then, in this particular instance, abandoned his vehicle and fled towards Mexico on foot, but he was intercepted by one of the agents, Agent Compean. Once again, ignoring several commands by Agent Compean to stop, a physical altercation ensued, with Compean ending up in the ditch.

Seeing his opportunity, the smuggler ran toward the border. According to Agent Compean's sworn statement, while running, the suspect turned and pointed something shiny with his left hand. Believing that his life was in danger, Agent Compean opens fire. Now, how long do you have to determine whether that is a gun in the man's hand as he runs away and aims something at you?

Hearing the gunshots, Agent Ramos came to the aid of his fellow officer. He, too, shouted for the smuggler to stop, but instead of obeying his command, the illegal drug smuggler once again turned and ran and, as he was running, again turned and pointed something shiny at Ramos, who at that moment shot his weapon once.

After disappearing into the banks of the Rio Grande, the smuggler reappeared on the Mexican side where he jumped into a waiting van, which was waiting for him. Obviously, an organized situation.

Unbeknownst to Officers Ramos and Compean, a bullet hit the illegal drug smuggler in the left buttocks. Other agents, including two supervisors, were nearby and could not see what was going on, but we have every reason to understand they heard the shots because they were that close.

When the abandoned van was examined, 743 pounds of marijuana were found. The payload was seized, and one would think that congratulations were in order. After all, Ramos and Compean were heroes, weren't they? They had been responsible for taking off the street \$1 million worth of drugs bound for our communities. Good job, fellas, right? No. Wrong. Agents Ramos and Compean, not the illegal drug smuggler, are at this moment languishing in Federal prison, serving 11- to 12-year sentences, and, in fact, they are in solitary confinement.

This is the worst miscarriage of justice that I have seen in my 25 years of public service. It is a nightmare for the two Border Patrol agents who willingly risked their lives protecting us for 5 and 10 years. For their families, this is a hellish and destructive nightmare. They are losing everything.

And just today the Compean family was sent a letter signed by Attorney General Johnny Sutton, who prosecuted their loved one, their husband, asking for them to pay court costs of \$2,800 while their husband has been sent away to prison and their family is being condemned to destitution, losing their health insurance, and then they get a letter asking for them to pay the court costs. I would offer this up for the RECORD.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
San Antonio, TX, March 14, 2007.

Re \$2,800.00 and penalties and costs; Court No. EP05CR856(2); Judgment Date: October 23, 2006, USAO #2007Z00182/001

JOSE ALONSO COMPEAN,
El Paso, TX.

DEAR MR. COMPEAN: On the date listed above, you were ordered to pay the Court. The Financial Litigation Unit of the United States Attorney's Office is in charge of collecting your criminal debt. With the following exceptions, the amount you owe is due now and will be delinquent after 30 days. Delinquency may result in certain penalties being added to the debt pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §3612. Your cashier's check or money order, payable to the Clerk, U.S. District Court, should be mailed to the United States Clerk's Office, U.S. Courthouse, 511 E. San Antonio St., Room 350, El Paso, Texas 79901. Please note that personal checks are not accepted.

The exceptions to immediate payment in full are as follows:

The terms of your judgment provide otherwise, or

You have made an agreement with the Court or your probation officer, or

You have entered into a satisfactory repayment agreement with this office, or

You are presently incarcerated.

If you are presently incarcerated, you may begin paying on your debt through the Inmate Financial Responsibility Program. Regardless of the foregoing exceptions to immediate payment in full, please be advised that the United States may enforce the judgment for the full amount as provided by law.

If you have paid the debt in full, then please disregard this notice and notify the United States Attorney's Office immediately by returning a copy of this letter with a copy of the receipt(s).

Sincerely,

JOHNNY SUTTON,
United States Attorney.

To add insult to injury, a letter from U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton's office was sent on March 14 to the families, as I say, of both of these officers. And I have it right here, and let me read that to you, which I have just submitted for the RECORD.

Final Litigation Unit of the United States Attorney's Office is in charge of collecting your criminal debt. The amount you owe is due now and will be delinquent after 30 days. Delinquency may result in certain penalties being added. Please be advised that the United States may enforce the judgment for the full amount as provided by law.

This is to a family of a law enforcement officer now who is languishing away in solitary confinement, and the family is being destroyed. Talk about cruelty.

The Compean family has already lost their home, and they have no health insurance, and now they receive a letter like this from the U.S. attorney.

I hope the American people are understanding the horror story that we are putting these two Border Patrol agents through. And our President knows about this. His protege, the U.S. attorney, knows about this, and I will tell you that, yes, Attorney General Gonzales knows about this.

So how come the agents were prosecuted and not the drug smuggler? Why is it that the Border Patrol agents have been treated so ruthlessly and without mercy by the U.S. attorney and by the Justice Department, and, yes, by the President of the United States?

The whole rotten episode has turned justice on its head. The book was thrown at heroes who protect us, while the drug smuggler got immunity. According to U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton, who was a longtime Bush appointee and protege, a friend of the President, Ramos and Compean are not heroes. In fact, he considers the two officers to be criminals, charging them with assault with serious bodily injury, assault with a deadly weapon, discharge of a firearm while committing a crime of violence, which carries a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 years, and a civil rights violation. Sutton claims he had no choice but to prosecute the two Border Patrol agents because, according to Sutton, they broke the law. And when they violated procedures for discharging their weapons, they discharged their weapons at a fleeing suspect. That was not permitted.

The procedures were not followed, and that is true. They didn't know absolutely for sure he didn't have a gun. They thought he did. But where do we have rules saying that a Border Patrol

agent has to be shot and wounded before he can use his weapon?

Sutton could have granted immunity to law enforcement officers and thrown the book at the drug smuggler. That is what would have made sense. After all, these two law enforcement officers had a perfect, clean record. The drug smuggler was a drug smuggler.

But, instead, Johnny Sutton, our U.S. attorney, protege of the President, chose to side with the drug smuggler, and threw the book at the Border Patrol agents. This was totally discretionary on the part of Johnny Sutton, who continues to say he had no choice but to bring charges against the Border Patrol agents. No, he could have given the immunity for a lack of procedure to the Border Patrol agents and thrown the book at the drug dealer. This was an indefensible decision, and now Sutton lies to us with the suggestion that he didn't have a choice to prosecute.

So how does this incident then mushroom into this matter of the ultimate and utter destruction of the lives of these two Border Patrol agents and their families? After the incident, the drug smuggler, also known as Aldrete-Davila, contacted Rene Sanchez, a childhood friend, for advice. Why did he call Rene Sanchez? Because Sanchez is a current Border Patrol agent in Arizona. Now, instead of turning in this drug smuggler, even though he was a friend, an old, longtime friend, he didn't turn in the drug smuggler. He went to the authorities, and this law enforcement officer, who was sworn to uphold the laws of the United States, chose to intervene on the behalf of his childhood friend who was smuggling drugs, a mule for the drug cartel. He was also called as a character witness, this same man, on the drug smuggler's behalf during the trial in which he described how the drug smuggler actually was a very fine and decent man.

Well, Mr. Sanchez contacted the Department of Homeland Security, who, in turn, decided to open an investigation into the conduct of Ramos and Compean. What? A drug smuggler with 750 pounds of narcotics is thwarted from making his delivery and then complains he was shot at, and our government decides to investigate the law enforcement officers? Something is really wrong with this picture.

Mr. Sutton had every chance to focus his enormous prosecutorial powers on the drug dealer. He chose to target the enforcement officers because maybe they weren't following procedure. He chose to turn a possible procedural violation by the Border Patrol agents into a criminal act, rather than prosecuting a career drug smuggler.

As part of their investigation, the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General sent Special Agent Christopher Sanchez, which is no relation to the other fellow, into Mexico, and this fellow offered the drug smuggler immunity, an immunity deal in exchange for his testimony against the Border Patrol agents. The

smuggler was then brought back into the United States, given free medical care for his injuries, all at taxpayer expense.

One wonders at the outcome and what would have happened if Mr. Sutton would have spent one-tenth the effort trying to find this criminal and trying to demand his extradition and punishment for smuggling narcotics into our country, rather than focusing on our law enforcement officers who are there to protect us and trying to find a way to bring them down.

The drug smuggler was portrayed by this U.S. attorney as the victim. He was portrayed that to the jury and to the public as the victim because the drug smuggler swears he wasn't armed, and, of course, the U.S. attorney took the word of the drug smuggler rather than the law enforcement agents that he wasn't armed. Sure, a drug smuggler has \$1 million worth of drugs and he is not armed.

The jury is told that Davila was just trying to raise money to buy medicine for his sick mother, and he had never smuggled drugs before. So the U.S. attorney made that claim to the jury and painted the worst possible picture of Ramos and Compean.

Then our government takes the word of this nefarious drug-dealing character over two law enforcement officers, again portraying that to the jury as what they believed to be the case.

In short, the initial decision to prosecute the two Border Patrol agents instead of the drug smuggler was indefensible. And then our U.S. attorney moved forward with a vigor to beat these two men down, perhaps just to protect a wrong decision.

Well, Mr. Sutton's only defense of this wrong decision is to cover up the horrendous decision. And how did he do that? He has to demonize the two Border Patrol agents and has to make sure they get the maximum penalty.

But this doesn't meet the smell test. Anyone who comes close to this case knows it stinks. According to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General's report, which includes Agent Compean's sworn statement that he repeatedly stated that he believed that the drug smuggler had a weapon, and that he felt threatened, the Border Patrol training allows for the use of deadly force when an agent fears imminent bodily injury or death. The two officers said that under oath. Both officers testified they saw Aldrete-Davila turn and point what they believed to be a weapon at them while he was running away.

The wound created by the bullet in this man corroborates the agents' version of events. During the trial, an Army doctor, a prosecution witness, I might add, testified that the drug smuggler's body was bladed away from the bullet that struck him. That is consistent with the motion of a left-handed person running while pointing backwards, causing the body to twist, once again corroborating Ramos' and

Compean's belief that the smuggler had a weapon in his hand.

Later, the drug dealer's family, and this is really important; later the drug dealer's family verified to a news reporter that he always carried a gun and that he had been making deliveries of drugs for a long time.

□ 2230

That, of course, never made it into the trial or to the jury.

It is important to understand that only three individuals were eyewitnesses to the crucial events of that day: the two accused border agents and a self-admitted drug smuggler. The other Border Patrol agents who responded to the scene and perhaps heard some of the shots testified under immunity and contradicted themselves several times on the witness stand. And why did that happen? What was the problem there?

Most importantly, when we are looking at this, we know that their view of events was completely obscured. They did not see what was going on, these other agents, the supervisors, because there was a 12-foot-high berm on the edge of a levee right across from an access road where all this was happening. None of the other agents could have seen what transpired on the other side of this berm. Well, they heard the shots; yet these agents, these same agents, two of them at least who were the supervisors of Ramos and Compean, were threatened that if they didn't testify against Ramos and Compean, they would be prosecuted themselves. Is this intimidation?

The fact is these two supervisors didn't make a report on the incident. They didn't ask Ramos and Compean about the incident. It wasn't Ramos and Compean who falsified a report. They were never asked by their supervisors because no one wanted to fill out 5 hours' worth of paperwork. And then in comes the U.S. attorney making this a criminal offense.

Well, it begs the question of why the two supervisors needed immunity before they could testify. Why is it that they needed immunity? If they weren't involved in the incident, why were they offered immunity? Well, they were given immunity by Johnny Sutton because he was threatening them. He was threatening, you either do this, or you are the one who is going to be prosecuted for not filing a report on this shooting incident. This calls into question what effect this all had on the truthfulness of their testimony.

The U.S. attorney's version of what happened that day relies almost exclusively on the testimony of the drug smuggler. We are talking about what happened firsthand. The other people were across and didn't see it. They heard noises. According to the Department of Homeland Security investigation, the supervisors heard or knew about the shooting. That is in the report of the Department of Homeland Security investigation.

So the supervisors heard or knew about the shooting; yet they did not ask Ramos and Compean about it because why? Because they were trying to cover something up? No. Because they didn't want to do 5 hours' worth of paperwork on their own time. And Johnny Sutton, our U.S. attorney, turned that into a felony, attacking our law enforcement officers and letting the drug dealer go, focusing on our law enforcement officers, trying to find anything he can do to get them and bring them down and anything he can do to protect the drug dealer.

Well, it was their duty, meaning the supervisors who were threatened by Sutton, to change their testimony. It was their duty, not the field agents', to write a report about this incident. That is probably what he used to hang over their head: You were the ones who were supposed to write the report. If you didn't, they must have kept this information from you.

It was never brought up even though they were right there. As a matter of fact, the agents that we are talking about, Ramos and Compean, and all agents that are on the border there, are prohibited by Border Patrol policy from filing a written report on a shooting. INS firearms policy section 12(b), 1(g) states: "Ensure that supervisory personnel or investigative officers are aware that employees involved in a shooting incident shall not be required or allowed to submit a written statement of the circumstances surrounding the incident." So Ramos and Compean were not permitted to file a written report, and the supervisors didn't file it, and so Johnny Sutton went after the supervisors and threatened them in order to get them to testify against Ramos and Compean. After all, why then would he have to grant them immunity otherwise?

"All written statements regarding the incident," a shooting incident, "shall be prepared by the local investigating officers and shall be based upon an interview of the employees."

So here you have Ramos and Compean prohibited from writing their own report. Yet Johnny Sutton continues to claim that the officers filed a false report to cover up their crime; not to cover up that they were not following the right procedures, but to cover up a crime. The supervisors knew about the shooting. They didn't ask Ramos and Compean what had happened, because once they did, it would have required 5 hours of additional paperwork. And because the guy got away, they didn't know that he had been wounded. They just assumed that the incident was closed.

So now because people who were just trying not to have to do 5 hours' worth of paperwork, officers who risk their lives for us every day are being brought down and their lives destroyed because of that, and the drug dealers go free.

By no means did anyone's action raise to the level of criminality. What might be considered unauthorized dis-

charge of a weapon, because, let us face it, Ramos and Compean, again, couldn't prove absolutely that they knew the drug dealer had a weapon, and, of course, if he did and they were wrong, they would be shot, and they would be dead, well, they can't prove it absolutely; so that has been turned into attempted murder by the U.S. attorney.

Again, the agents thought the drug smuggler was pointing something at them. Their story has never changed. They testified to this in court. The drug smuggler had just been in a physical altercation with one of the officers. Of course, the U.S. attorney believed the drug dealer, who swears that Compean just fell down. He believes the drug dealer when he said, "I didn't have a gun." You have to believe the drug dealer because he was the only one on the scene and he got away, although his family has told reporters that he always carried a gun. And it does make sense that someone who carries a million dollars' worth of drugs would be armed.

So even though the Department of Homeland Security Office of Investigation determined that all seven officers on the scene knew about or had heard about the shooting, the U.S. attorney granted those officers immunity, which, now, why did he have to do that if they were just going to tell the truth? To testify against Ramos and Compean. There must have been a threat there: If you don't testify this way, well, I am not going to grant you immunity, which means I can charge you with a crime. So, remember, it is the supervisors' job, not the agents', Ramos and Compean, to fill out the written report.

So this leads to the logical conclusion that these witnesses were intimidated into testifying. Our U.S. Attorney's Office intimidated witnesses. They were threatened and then given immunity if they went along. If this incident would have been kept in perspective, this whole shooting incident, and, yes, if the weapons were discharged without justification, and, still, when you think someone is aiming a gun at you, that is justification, but at the very worst, if all supervisors and agents were failing to report a shooting, that may or may not have been consistent with the regulations governing the discharge of weapons. Maybe that was a violation of procedure, that those supervisors, along with those two Border Patrol agents, should have worked those extra 5 hours and filed that report. And do you know what would have happened? They would have been disciplined, and that would have been the end of it. The penalty for not reporting a shooting is a 5-day suspension.

This was an issue of procedural violation maybe, not criminality, and there is a serious question about the viability of those mandated procedures that we are talking about that you have got to really keep your gun holstered even

when you are going up against drug dealers and you are going up against terrorists.

Of course, we have an insane border policy which has resulted in an open border in which terrorists and drug dealers think they can just come across the border, and this was even before Ramos and Compean, and we have had an invasion of millions of illegal immigrants across the southern border, and that border policy now is destroying the lives of the only people who are there trying to defend us.

Over 90 Members of Congress have expressed concern, if not outrage, at the many troubling aspects of this case. Our repeated attempts for Presidential intervention have gone ignored or rebuffed. Our pleas to keep the officers out on bond pending appeal fell on deaf ears. Instead, the President dug in his heels and sent Tony Snow out to chastise our efforts to save Ramos and Compean by suggesting, in the President's words, take a closer look at the facts in the case since these men were convicted by a jury.

Johnny Sutton went on public airwaves and lied to the public to discredit the agents. How many times have we heard they shot an unarmed man in the back as he was running away? He wasn't shot in the back. He was shot in the side, in the buttocks, as he was aiming something at the officers. He wasn't just a man. He was a drug smuggler. He wasn't someone who happened across the border.

It has been discovered that the Homeland Security Department lied to Congress and then covered up their lies because this was all part of the effort by this administration to demonize the two law enforcement officers, to cover up their horrendous mistake and decision in prosecuting them in the first place, but, of course, also trying to keep the lid on the fact that there is a disaster happening in American security to our southern border. And this case, of course, brings attention to the failure of this administration to protect our national security and leaving us totally vulnerable at our southern border.

So even today the Department of Homeland Security released an official statement by IG Skinner, and this statement, which I will also add for the RECORD, is filled with misinformation and inaccuracies about the facts of this case.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD L. SKINNER, INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY REGARDING THE INVESTIGATION OF FORMER BORDER PATROL AGENTS IGNACIO RAMOS AND JOSE COMPEAN

Remarks by certain Members of Congress as reported in the media have stated that members of my staff lied to Congress. At a hearing before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on February 8, 2007, I stated, in part, the following:

The decision to prosecute former Border Patrol Agents Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean was made by the Department of Justice, not by my Office. My Office conducted the investigation in coordination with the United States Attorneys' Office.

I stand by the work of my Office. Our investigators did an outstanding job and I fully support their work.

At no time did any member of my staff lie to Congress about the investigation of Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean or any other matter. My staff has acted honestly and in good faith.

In a closed Members' briefing on September 26, 2006, my staff reported that Mr. Compean had said that he and Mr. Ramos had stated that they "wanted to shoot a Mexican." My staff reported this statement to me, and then reported it to Representative Michael McCaul and other Members and their staff during the closed briefing. Representative McCaul was then serving as Chair of the Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Homeland Security Committee. At the time my staff made that statement, they believed it to be true, although we later learned it was inaccurate. In fact, Mr. Compean had stated in a sworn statement that "my intent was to kill the alien. . . and I think Nacho [Ramos] was also trying to kill the alien." The alien Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos attempted to kill, Mr. Olsvaldo Aldrete-Davila, had come from Mexico and escaped back into Mexico.

The statement that Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean supposedly "wanted to shoot a Mexican" never was reported in any document by my office or by the Department of Justice, and was not introduced at the trial of Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean, which had been completed on March 8, 2006, six months prior to the briefing. That statement also was not reported by my office to anyone other than then Chairman McCaul and the other Members and their staff in attendance at the closed briefing.

The briefing my office provided to then Chairman McCaul and the other Members was initiated at his request in his capacity as Chair of the Subcommittee on Investigations.

Mr. McCaul and the other Members understood that the information my office was providing was not public, and was not to be made public—it was For Official Use Only for the Committee's use in discharging its official business.

At the time my staff tried to accommodate then Chairman McCaul by providing an oral briefing, we did not have the benefit of a trial transcript or even a written report of investigation. Consequently, my staff made some misstatements during the briefing, but nothing that affected the investigation, the trial, the convictions or the sentences of Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean.

The only reason the statement that Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean allegedly said they "wanted to shoot a Mexican" has become public is because the terms under which my office briefed the Members have not been honored. Others have publicized that inaccurate information and reported it to the media. That information was not used at trial nor in the sentencing of Mr. Compean or Mr. Ramos.

The evidence that was introduced at trial proved that Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos attempted to shoot Mr. Aldrete-Davila in the back while he was unarmed and running away from them.

Evidence introduced at trial proved that when Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos attempted to shoot Mr. Aldrete-Davila in the back, they did not know that he had been attempting to smuggle marijuana into this country.

Evidence introduced at trial proved that when Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos attempted to shoot Mr. Aldrete-Davila in the back, they did not even know that he was in this country illegally.

At no time did Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos warn their fellow Border Patrol

Agents that they believed Mr. Aldrete-Davila might be armed. Consequently, other Border Patrol agents walked around in the open where they were exposed, rather than taking cover or other precautions.

After shooting Mr. Aldrete-Davila in the buttocks, Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos made no attempt to arrest him, thus allowing him to escape back into Mexico. Rather than try to arrest Mr. Aldrete-Davila, Mr. Compean picked up the spent shell casings and threw them away and instructed another agent to do the same. Neither Mr. Compean nor Mr. Ramos reported the shooting incident to their supervisor, though required to do so.

In conclusion, I am deeply disturbed that these allegations have been made regarding the integrity of my staff I reiterate my staff acted honestly and in good faith at all times.

And let me note, despite the administration's repeated claims that Ramos and Compean were convicted by a jury of their peers, it is important to note that the jury didn't hear so many of the facts that were important for them to come to the truth in this issue.

Finally, after 11 months, the completed trial transcripts of their trial were made available. So for 11 months we haven't even been able to see the transcript of this trial. And here we have the Department of Homeland Security telling us that when they were giving a briefing to Members of Congress, one of the Members of Congress who is the chairman of an oversight subcommittee, that they had made misstatements, and then this document itself is filled with misstatements. One wonders about the sincerity and the professionalism of the people in this administration in this very volatile issue dealing with border control. Something is amiss. Something is causing the system to go askew.

Federal District Judge Kathleen Cordone, another Bush appointee, I might add, would not permit critically important aspects of this case to be introduced during the trial. She did this at the request of the prosecution. For example, she would not allow any reference to describing the dangerous conditions of the border. Essentially the jury was supposed to imagine that the shooting took place in a completely sterile environment where the likelihood of Border Patrol agents confronting armed drug smugglers was not a plausible scenario.

Well, that is absurd. And a recent headline in the Washington Times is a perfect example. It states: "Officers Outgunned on the Border." The reporter describes in great detail the unprecedented surge in violence along our borders fueled by heavily armed illegal gangs who patrol those areas in order to protect their criminal enterprises; yet this judge didn't think it was important for the jury to find out that these Border Patrol agents were working in extreme danger every day. And thus when they thought they saw him turning around and aiming something at them, would that be justified?

It might not be justified if you are in downtown USA in some very peaceful town someplace around the country, or

at some school or church or maybe even in a courtroom, but when you are on the border, and you are off on your own, and you are confronting this type of challenge, yes, if someone is pointing something at you, and you realize he has just escaped, that he has been in an altercation with one of the officers, and then later, of course, we find out that he was a drug dealer, yes, there was every reason for them to be concerned that he might have a weapon and shoot them.

□ 2245

In fact, his family, again has told a reporter, he was armed many times when he went out, and he was someone who had done this many times before, drug smuggling, that is. So perhaps the most troubling omission from the trial, again, was about the drug smuggler himself.

Already under immunity for smuggling \$1 million worth of drugs into the country on that day of the shooting, Davila was involved with a second drug smuggling incident in the months later after the first incidents. In October of 2005, he again was part of another drug smuggling incident. According to sensitive DEA documents obtained by my office, the government's star witness against Ramos and Compean was ID'd as the driver of a van filled with another 750 pounds of marijuana seized during a joint DEA-Border Patrol operation on October 23, 2005. This was only 6 months after he had been intercepted by Ramos and Compean.

So instead of doing the right thing and throwing the case out because their star witness has proven to be an awful, dreadful human being, a professional drug dealer, instead of throwing the case out, no, the U.S. Attorney chose to ignore this information; not only ignore it, but to pressure everyone in the trial to make sure that this information that their primary witness, the guy who they are portraying as a man who had never done this before, and was simply raising money for medicine for his mother, that the information he was involved in yet another drug operation was never disclosed. The U.S. Attorney did everything he could to make sure that was not disclosed to the jury or the public.

Johnny Sutton has lied to the American people about this. Every time he was asked questions about it, he would give an answer that sounded like he was saying no, there was no second incident. But if you examine the words, that is not what he was saying. He was, as unscrupulous lawyers often do, saying one thing, but making people think that he was saying something else. He was lying without actually having to be technically lying.

So, what happened? We have their prime witness now involved in another drug deal operation, and the U.S. Attorney pressures the judge to not permit anything about the second incident to become known to the jury. They

said "Mr. Davila is not on trial." The prosecutor then insisted that the defense could not even question Davila about a second incident. Unfortunately, the judge went along with the prosecution in this case and then ruled that just because the star witness had been arrested again for drug dealing, that that was not relevant to this case. A gag order was placed on anyone involved in the case so no information open the second drug smuggling incident could ever reach the jury.

So the jury wasn't allowed to hear that the drug dealer's commission of a second offense while he was waiting for that trial had taken place. We are talking about the credibility of the primary witness against Ramos and Campeon.

His credibility is not relevant? The jury shouldn't know that this is not just a man who is raising money for the medicine for his mother, that that is not who he is. Who he really is is a professional drug cartel mule who did this often and was arrested again after he had been given immunity by our government, and a pass, I might add, to go in and out of our country?

The jury also never heard that Christopher Sanchez, the Department of Homeland Security investigator who took Davila, took him and the removed bullet fragment, which had been removed from him, this Department of Homeland Security investigator took him to his personal residence for a night after he was released from an American hospital which got this bullet fragment out and the bullet fragment was in his possession. So we have a negligent action that broke the chain of custody for this vital piece of evidence.

What we are talking about here is something that any lawyer can tell you is the type of sloppiness that taints evidence and disqualifies it from being used by the prosecution. That wasn't permitted to be told to the jury.

What is going on? Our Border Patrol agents make one possible procedural mistake in the field in an instantaneous reaction to a man who might be shooting at them, and the book is thrown at them. "You make any mistake and we are going to squash you like a bug." But when they make a mistake about breaking the chain of evidence and actually taking a witness putting them in a prosecutor's home, totally violating procedures and tainting the prosecutorial case, well, those mistakes in procedure are just ignored. They are just ignored.

Why is it that the two heroes who are protecting us with their bodies every day of their life have the book thrown at them, and if they can possibly turn a mistake into a felony, they are destroyed; but the U.S. Attorney's Office, if they make a mistake, or the Department of Homeland Security, which now admits that they made misstatements to a group of Congressmen investigating this issue, and then I might add for 4 months covered up the fact

they had made those misstatements, why is it all forgotten and forgiven on one side, but yet our defenders have to have the book thrown at them? Why is the government bending over backwards to accommodate and protect a professional drug mule?

Our government went to Mexico, sought out the drug smuggler, granted him immunity, issued a border crossing card and provided him free healthcare, all at America's expense, and now the fellow thinks he is going to sue the U.S. Government for \$5 million.

Perhaps most perplexing is the fact that three of the 12 jurors in the trial of Ramos and Campeon later submitted sworn affidavits alleging that they had been misled by the jury foreman into believing that if the majority of jurors voted for a conviction, they had to go along and vote guilty, even though they thought the defendants were innocent.

That is right. These are unsophisticated jurors, not very well educated people, but regular human beings; intelligent, but not educated in the ways of the law. They were told by the foreman of the jury that hung juries would not be allowed. The three jurors said, and they have signed written affidavits, that they felt pressured to vote guilty. One of them said, "Had we had the option of a hung jury, I truly believe the outcome may have been different."

Another juror said, "I think I might not have changed my vote to guilty had I known that a hung jury was an option. I did not think the defendants were guilty of the assaults or the civil rights violations."

The judge, again at the urging of the prosecutor, denied a request that the two agents that we are talking about, Ramos and Campeon, be permitted to remain free on bond until the appeal could be heard. Common criminals are permitted to stay out on bond until their appeal is heard, but not these two Border Patrol agents.

I stand before you, Mr. Speaker. Here we are, and right now as we are speaking Border Patrol agents Ignacio Ramos and Campeon are languishing in solitary confinement in Federal prisons as a direct result of the mean-spirited, ruthless prosecution that was brought upon them by our Justice Department and with the backing of the President of the United States.

Ramos and Campeon were ripped away from their families on January 17, 2007, and forced to begin serving their unjust 11 and 12 year prison sentences all because our own Federal Government chose to take the word of a drug smuggler and give him immunity and take his word over that of two law enforcement officers and throw the book at them, even though those two law enforcement officers had put their lives on the line to protect the borders of the United States, protect our families and our communities for 5 and 10 years, risking their lives for us.

I, along with a dozen other Members, signed on to a letter requesting that

the Justice Department release the officers on bond pending their appeal. As I say, it is a courtesy often afforded common criminals.

And, yes, Ramos was severely beaten in prison, and thus we knew that their lives were in danger for them to be in this prison and there was a reason to let them be out on appeal. Yet the Justice Department chose to ignore the pleas of Members of Congress and the pleas for mercy of the families, and the agents were denied bond.

I might add that after a lengthy delay, I finally received a letter from the Justice Department claiming to have no choice but to deny bond. By the way, this was the Justice Department's letter to me. I received it just today telling me why they couldn't give these two, Ramos and Campeon, bond and let them out on bond while they are doing through their appeal.

They really have to be very specific and they have to follow all the rules. They have to be exactly right in what they are doing. Except, of course, they address the letter to "Congresswoman Rohrabacher." Congresswoman Rohrabacher. Well, if they can't get that right, why are they playing with the lives of Ramos and Campeon? If they can't get that right, why is it that if Ramos and Campeon make a little mistake in their procedure, that they get the book thrown at them?

Also let me note this "Congresswoman Rohrabacher" letter to me from the Justice Department is just another example of the contempt that this administration has demonstrated time and again for congressional oversight and congressional concerns.

This Attorney General, this President, has time and again, instead of treating the legislative branch as something that deserves the respect that we do deserve, as the presidency deserves, time and again we have been shown contempt. We have had people in communicating to us, we put questions in to the Attorney General and get calls back from people four or five layers down. Here we are getting an answer back from someone who doesn't even know that I am not a "Congresswoman Rohrabacher." Yes, that is contempt, and they will pay the price for that contempt.

Our pleas as Members of Congress were not unfounded. Members warned the administration that Ramos and Campeon faced imminent danger once they entered the respective Federal correctional facilities. Not only were they not properly protected, Agent Ramos was placed in a facility known to be infiltrated by illegal Mexican gang members, and within 8 days of his arrival, Agent Ramos was savagely beaten by five of those illegal Mexican gang members.

Instead of sending him to a minimum security prison or letting him be out on bond, the administration decided to make an example of him. They wouldn't even send him to a minimum security prison where he would be safe.

Instead, the Justice Department chose to keep him at this dangerous facility where he had already been beaten. And Agent Ramos, even as we speak, has been in solitary confinement for 45 days and counting. Solitary confinement. Locked in a cell 23 hours a day, telephone privileges limited to one call of 15 minutes every 30 days, and no interaction with other inmates. Mr. Campeon is suffering the same fate.

The Bureau of Prisons uses the euphemism to describe their incarceration as "special housing for their own protection." Make no mistake about it, they are in solitary confinement, a unit designed as a punitive measure, not a protective measure. Ramos and Campeon, two brave Border Patrol agents, are suffering a fate not even bestowed upon murderers and drug dealers. This amounts to cruel and unusual punishment, intentional cruel and unusual punishment.

These two agents could have been sent to a minimum security prison where they would be safe. We actually asked the President, through back channels, personally, just go to the judge and support the effort to let them out on bond until the appeal is heard. The next day, it was announced that no, the administration officially opposes any letting them out on bond.

Well, basically, that was sending a message to everyone who patrols our borders. He sent the message to every Border Patrol agent when he said not only are you going to be prosecuted, but you will be destroyed, you will be obliterated, you will be smashed like a bug if you get in the way of what we want to happen down at the border.

President Bush has essentially dismantled our ability to control America's southern border. Any agent who gets in the way will be squashed, as I have said. So much for the President's compassion. So much for his talk about Christian charity. Ramos and Campeon are languishing in solitary confinement. They are being brutalized. There is cruel and unusual punishment being dealt out to them because they dared challenge the President.

□ 2300

I don't want to hear anything more about compassion from a man who lets that happen to our brave defenders, and then focuses us on a far-away war while letting terrorists and drug dealers penetrate our southern border.

Since January 17, when the propaganda machine and smear campaign against Compean and Ramos was fully unleashed by the President, by Tony Snow, and his protege, the U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton, more questions than answers have arisen. Both Tony Snow and Johnny Sutton smugly lectured the American people and Members of Congress to "take a closer look at this case." And as the President said in his own words, "Take a sober look at this case."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have closely examined this case, and maybe it would

behoove the President to take some advice and to look at this case honestly.

U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton, who is probably briefing the President, has his own personal life tied up in this. He is not an unbiased source of information about this case, just as Attorney General Gonzales is not. They have already advised the President in a horrendous way and started him down the road to the situation where he is at today.

John Sutton prosecuted the good guys and gave immunity to the bad guys. He could have done it the other way around, but he didn't. He chose to prosecute the good guys and give immunity to the bad guys. Sutton has continually engaged in a propaganda campaign aimed at creating a prejudicial public view against Agents Ramos and Compean. He has repeatedly stated that "these corrupt agents shot an unarmed man in the back." This is not true.

The prosecution's own witness, an Army surgeon, testified that the bullet hit Adrete-Davila in the buttocks, not in the back. And, of course, he was turned in a way that the bullet entered indicating he was aiming something backwards. And, of course, this was not just a man in the back. It was not a nun or some tourist who happened to stray across the border. It was a professional drug smuggler who works for a drug cartel, a mule, a deliveryman for drugs, bringing dangerous substances into our neighborhoods in order to threaten our schools and our children.

Remember, since the drug smuggler absconded into Mexico, there was no way to know whether he was armed or not, yet Sutton chose to believe the drug smuggler who said he was not armed, even those the smuggler's own family members say he has been smuggling drugs since he was 14 and was "always armed."

So there is no question that he was a member of a drug cartel, but Johnny Sutton takes the drug smuggler's word over the law enforcement agents', and he portrays the drug smuggler to the jury in a dishonest way and keeps from them information that would expose the drug dealer as a professional drug dealer and not as he was portrayed before the jury.

Johnny Sutton turned the drug dealer in front of the jury into a victim. He was just trying to raise money for medicine for his dear mother and had never done drugs before. Sutton turned reality on its head. He sided with the drug smuggler over two men who risk their lives every day to protect us.

So now they must be destroyed to protect the mistake that was made not only in prosecuting them, but the mistakes that are made in policy down at the border that are putting our country at risk. These two Border Patrol agents are being destroyed to protect Sutton's failure. They are being destroyed to protect Gonzales' job, and they are being destroyed to protect the President's legacy, because all of those are at stake if the people learn the

truth about what is happening on our border, and what the Ramos-Compean prosecution is all about.

Sutton vilifies helpless Border Patrol agents like these guys who get in the way every chance he gets. Just ask David Sipe, Gary Brugman and Gilmer Hernandez, all law enforcement officers who have been prosecuted by Johnny Sutton.

What we are talking about with Ramos and Compean is not only a sin against these men, not only a message to all our Border Patrol agents, but part of a pattern that is going on in which this administration is trying to cower our protectors, our law enforcement officers, from enforcing the law at our border, leaving us totally exposed.

The lies are evident. For example, Johnny Sutton continually refers to Ramos and Compean as corrupt agents. Well, again, why is our U.S. attorney out speaking on radio calling them corrupt agents? There weren't any charges of corruption. In fact, I have looked through this, there has never been a charge of corruption against either of these men. Yet the U.S. attorney is out in the mass media saying they were corrupt Border Patrol agents. They have never been charged with corruption because they have a totally clean work record.

Yes, Ramos had some family problems years ago, not part of his job, and Mr. Sutton, of course, has chosen to bring that personal matter up in order to vilify Mr. Ramos. But in terms of that, everybody understands you can have family problems. This had nothing to do with his job. In fact, Ramos had been nominated for Border Patrol Agent of the Year, and there is no corruption, yet Johnny Sutton lies and says these corrupt Border Patrol agents.

Johnny Sutton, when asked whether there was a second incident, lies and says something that makes it sound like there wasn't a second incident. But in reality his words are just technically not a lie, but what he is presenting is an untruth. That is what unscrupulous lawyers do.

What is the real significance of this case? The U.S. Attorney's despicable prosecution of these Border Patrol agents has put Border Patrol agents on notice: Any use of force to protect America, to secure our borders, and you will go to prison, and your life will be destroyed.

The consequences for Ramos and Compean in this case extend far beyond the destruction of these two men and their families. Yes, it is horrible that these families are being driven into destitution, and now they add insult to injury, sending them a bill. The Compeans have lost their home. There are three kids in that family, and they do not have health insurance, and their lives are being shattered, and Johnny Sutton sends them a bill to rub their nose in the fact that their father is in prison in solitary confinement.

But what are the consequences of this to all of us? These families are being destroyed, but there are more American lives at risk. Our southern border is open not just to an invading army of illegal immigrants, but, yes, to drug dealers like the ones like Ramos and Compean confronted, and, yes, to terrorists.

What if it was found that that van that Davila was in turned out not to possess a million dollars' worth of drugs, but instead it was a dirty bomb in that van; and if that drug dealer wasn't a Mexican, but instead turned out to be an Arab terrorist on the way to a target in the United States? Well, these two men, instead of being in solitary confinement, they would be invited to the White House and be congratulated and be made heroes.

Now there is a bigger agenda here. There is a hidden agenda here at play with the Ramos and Compean prosecution. The American people have a right to know who gave the order to go ahead to prosecute Ramos and Compean in the first place. I am sure Gonzales was in on it, and we need to know that. We also need to know as this case progressed where the President and Mr. Gonzales played a role in making decisions as to where they would be imprisoned, and if they would get out on bail during the time of appeal.

How did an incident that could have easily been resolved through an administrative reprimand within the Border Patrol itself spiral into charging them with attempted murder and a civil rights violation? According to a memo dealing with a meeting between four members of the Texas delegation and representatives of the Department of Homeland Security investigating team, the Mexican Consulate contacted the U.S. Attorney's Office on March 4, 2005, the same day this investigation began.

It seems to fit a disturbing pattern with all of these other prosecutions that the administration has moved forward with.

In the Gilmer Hernandez case, the Mexican Consulate sent 17 letters to our government demanding prosecution. In the Gary Brugman case, the Mexican consul sat in the courtroom during the trial, and Johnny Sutton went so far as to thank him for his assistance in locating the illegals Sutton used to testify against Brugman.

This stinks. We need to get to the bottom of this and find out if a foreign government is having an undue influence on prosecutorial decisions of our own law enforcement agencies and members. This subject of whether there is some type of foreign involvement, meaning the Mexican Government, in prosecutorial decisions here of our own law enforcement officials, that is now going to be looked into by the International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight Subcommittee of which I am the ranking member. Chairman DELAHUNT has stated that we will be holding hearings into this subject.

There will be hearings of our oversight subcommittee to explore the pattern of questionable foreign influence on our government's decisions to prosecute law enforcement officers in the United States, especially those law enforcement officers who are trying to stop drug dealers who are coming in from Mexico, and stop the invasion of illegal immigrants who are pouring into our country from Mexico.

□ 2310

The Mexican government is having an undue influence on the decision of our government prosecutors in order to make concessions to the Mexican government. If our government is actually prosecuting people who do not deserve to be prosecuted, the American people have a right to know what political decisions are being made in coming forward with these indefensible prosecutions.

Did Ramos and Campean make mistakes? Maybe. Should they have been punished and reprimanded for them? Maybe. Should they have been charged with a crime? Absolutely not. By doing so, the Justice Department has demoralized our Nation's defenders on our southern border.

These are the facts. These are the facts that have engaged the public, causing Americans to wonder what in God's name is going on with our government, with our President. What is their President thinking? How could our President be as mean-spirited and arrogant as to not hear the pleas of so many citizens and to hear the pleas for mercy from the families of Ramos and Campean.

Yes, there is a hidden agenda here. Powerful economic interests want cheap labor. They want an open border. They want illegals who work cheap and who will depress the wages of working Americans, but the out-of-control flow of illegal immigrants is a nightmare at this moment for the American people.

This administration and past administrations and policy-makers and big corporate interests in Washington are so far out of touch and do not understand the reality of what is going on with this issue, and they do not care about the suffering of the American people. These elites, they do not care that illegal immigrants are pulling down the quality of our health care, shutting down emergency rooms. They do not care that they are undermining the quality of education by overcrowding our classrooms. They do not care that they are driving down the wages of middle class working people. They do not care if our criminal justice system is being stretched to the breaking point, that American citizens are now being victimized and murder and raped and robbed by criminal illegal aliens every day.

The only heroes in this entire system on which ordinary Americans depend are those in the thin green line of the border patrol. The elites have turned against our heroes, our defenders. They

smashed two of them to warn the others what will happen to any patriot who actually is trying to protect our southern border and stop the criminal illegal aliens from entering our country.

This case shows why a guest worker program or amnesty program is not even remotely feasible until we can control our southern border. This is a country that cannot or refuses not to stop these illegal aliens that are pouring into our country. This country's policy has not stopped this invasion of our country, and if we do not do this and we do not support those who are protecting us in our southern border, there will be a price to pay.

On 9/11 we suffered a huge loss when people flew airplanes into buildings, but when it is fully understood, and I am sure the message has gone out not just to our border patrol agents but to the drug dealers and the terrorists throughout the world about what the situation is on our southern border, we could end up with a catastrophe in the making. We need to protect our southern border. We need to protect it because that is the protection that we can give to our communities, to our families.

Those border patrol agents, that thin green line of individuals who risk their lives for us, they are our first and last line of defense between chaos and mayhem and murder and the lives of our families.

I would ask that all of us make sure that we let everyone know, our elected officials and the executive branch, the President as well as Members of Congress, know how strongly we feel that Ramos and Campean should be pardoned and that we should protect our southern border and make sure the United States remains safe and secure.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for the week of March 19.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

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 Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, March 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and March 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, March 20.

Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today and March 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and March 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 20.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, March 20.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously; to the Committee on the judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 85th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a leading association for the 1,300,000 United States citizens of Greek ancestry and Philhellenes in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on March 16, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1129. To provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an arterial road in St. Louis County, Missouri.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 20, 2007, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

884. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq pursuant to Section 9010 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006, Pub. L. 109-289; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

885. A letter from the Chief, Federal Duck Stamp Office, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Contest Regulations (RIN: 1018-AU94) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

886. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfers [Docket No. 051104293 5344-02; I.D. 121806B] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

887. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery Quota Transfers [Docket No. 051104293 5344-02; I.D. 121806B] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

888. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Arrowtooth Flounder and Flathead Sole in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 122006D] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

889. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 02010F] received February 28, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

890. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery; Quota Harvested for Part-time Category [Docket No. 010319075-1217-02; I.D. 121806C] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

891. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's First Quarterly Report on the Status of Significant Unresolved Issues with the Department of Energy's Design and Construction Projects, pursuant to Public Law 109-702, section 3201; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

892. A letter from the Chairman, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting the FY 2006 Annual Report of the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, pursuant to Public Law 102-281, section 429(b) (106 Stat. 145); jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Science and Technology.

893. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a report on the proposed fiscal year 2008 budget; jointly to the Com-

mittees on Agriculture, Oversight and Government Reform, and Appropriations.

894. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, "Federal Railroad Safety Accountability and Improvement Act"; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

895. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, "The Next Generation Air Transportation System Financing Reform Act of 2007"; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Science and Technology, and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Filed on March 19, 2007]

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1433. A bill to provide for the treatment of the District of Columbia as a Congressional district for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-52 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 254. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1227) to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina (Rept. 110-53). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income taxation all compensation received for active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1560. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to fund breakthroughs in Alzheimer's disease research while providing more help to caregivers and increasing public education about prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve drug safety and oversight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand certain rules with respect to housing in the GO Zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 1563. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a minimum payment rate by Medicare

Advantage organizations for services furnished by a critical access hospital and a rural health clinic under the Medicare Program; 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. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1564. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide additional protection to estuaries of national significance; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 1565. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit the conversion of leadership PAC funds to personal use; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WATT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1566. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Stevie Wonder, in recognition of his ground-breaking musical achievements, activism, and contributions to the music industry; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1567. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide increased assistance for the prevention, treatment, and control of tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 1568. A bill to establish the Henry Ford Scholarship program to provide scholarships to high-achieving students to pursue undergraduate degrees in mathematics, science, engineering, and health-related fields; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 1569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend the excise tax on highway motor fuels when average United States retail gasoline prices exceed \$2.75 per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 1570. A bill to provide compensation for certain World War II veterans who survived the Bataan Death March and were held as prisoners of war by the Japanese; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 1571. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate discriminatory copayment rates for outpatient psychiatric services under the Medicare Pro-

gram; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1572. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the discriminatory treatment of the District of Columbia under the provisions of law commonly referred to as the "Hatch Act"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 1573. A bill to modify the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument, to establish the Minidoka National Historic Site, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding Division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to preserve State authority to ensure the security of chemical facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 1575. A bill to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationship of the Burt Lake Band as a distinct federally recognized Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BISHOP of New Jersey, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H.R. 1576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HODES

H. Res. 253. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BOYD of Florida, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 255. A resolution congratulating the Florida A&M University "Marching 100" Band for all of its accomplishments, including its performance in the Super Bowl XLI halftime show; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. SHULER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. McNERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 39: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 82: Mr. HELLER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 140: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 146: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 172: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 196: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 197: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 201: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 255: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 271: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 303: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 327: Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WU, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BUYER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. McNERNEY, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 423: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 493: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 526: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 545: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 551: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 553: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 583: Mr. FARR, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 592: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SIREN, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 606: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 612: Mr. HARE and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 634: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. McCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 643: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 658: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 661: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 695: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 734: Mr. KIND and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 748: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 760: Mr. WOLF and Mr. McNERNEY.

H.R. 790: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 797: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HARE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. McNERNEY, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 840: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 854: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 947: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 969: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 970: Mr. GORDON and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 971: Mr. HAYES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. CASTOR, and Ms. HERSETH.

H.R. 1034: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1043: Mr. HINCHEY and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 1073: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1076: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1091: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 1108: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1119: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1125: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 1134: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1144: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1147: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1148: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1153: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1222: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 1223: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FARR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 1225: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1228: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1232: Mr. SOUDER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1261: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1268: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1284: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. BUYER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1303: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1304: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1306: Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 1307: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1314: Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 1322: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1330: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1363: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1384: Mr. FARR, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1395: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1400: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1413: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1430: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1433: Ms. WATERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1439: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1441: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1448: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1457: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1465: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1497: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1498: Mr. PETRI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HOLT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 1505: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1532: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1538: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. REYES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. UDALL

of Colorado, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1542: Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BACA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1551: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. FORBES, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Con. Res. 75: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 92: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 68: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 118: Mr. BAKER and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H. Res. 158: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 226: Ms. CARSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 227: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 233: Mr. HOLT and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Res. 240: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, or a designee, to H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.