United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2007 No. 50

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Lord God, You are forever refuge and strength for the Members of the House of Representatives and for all the military forces of the United States of America.

United in common patriotism and by the spirit of prayer today, we mentally remove ourselves from this honored and secure Chamber and desire to stand with our military, both in Iraq and Afghanistan, and pray together with our troops.

Together we seek an end to war and all forms of terrorism. Together we long for peace. Together we desire to see respect for human life and civil rights in all the streets of Baghdad and the valleys of Afghanistan. Together we are resolved to work to form stronger national unions in these countries with domestic tranquillity and common defense. Together we hope they will establish equal justice under the law. Together we pray for the secure blessing of liberty for ourselves and the posterity of Iraq and Afghanistan.

Lord God, You have placed these movements in our hearts. Show America how to accomplish this task today, tomorrow and every day. For we place all our trust in You now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SIRES 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain ten 1-minutes on each side.

REPUBLICANS SEEM CONTENT TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT ANOTHER BLANK CHECK ON IRAQ

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, this week the war in Iraq enters its fifth year. Today I doubt anyone in this Chamber will stand up and say that it has gone as expected.

Our troops have served this Nation admirably, but the Bush war cabinet failed to properly plan for a war in Iraq. As a result, even the Pentagon now admits what many of us have been saying for months: A civil war is being fought in Iraq.

This week, we have an opportunity to send the President a message that this war is not going to go on indefinitely. Even in the face of increased violence in Iraq and the lack of real progress towards a political solution, congressional Republicans continue to pledge to stay the course.

Madam Speaker, the days of rubber-stamping the President's requests are over. The American people want Iraq to take responsibility for its own nation. The only way that is going to happen is if the Iraqi Government knows we are not going to be there indefinitely.

FY 2007 SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the FY 2007 supplemental measure as currently written. It would place dangerous constraints on our mission and our war on terrorism in Iraq by empowering our Congress to overrule our Nation's top generals, who best understand the challenges there. Our Iraq policy should be based on the recommendation of General Petraeus, not the commands of armchair generals in Congress. Our Nation's mission in Iraq is too important to fall victim to the dangerous congressional micromanagement.

Iraq is a central front in a war against the radical jihadists. The outcome of this mission will greatly impact our national security for decades to come. For this reason, this body should pass a supplemental bill that fully funds our troops, without tying the hands of our military commanders.

Vote ''no'' on this supplemental.

VOTE ''YES'' ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 1234

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

Printed on recycled paper.

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Let's speak of the consequences of a ''yes'' vote on the Iraq supplemental.

A ''yes'' vote would keep the war going through the end of President Bush's term. It would provide money to fuel an attack on Iran. It would force the privatization of Iraqi oil. It would escalate the insurgency. A ''yes'' vote would increase the number of troop casualties in the middle of a civil war. It would increase the number of civilian casualties. It would create a demand for more troops. It would force a cutback in the agenda of many in Congress because money that could be used for schools, health care, seniors and the environment would continue to be spent for war. It would force the destabilization of the Middle East and would erode the public's confidence in Congress.

It is time to end the war; to bring the troops home; to use the money that is in the pipeline to bring the troops home; to set in place a parallel process to stabilize Iraq. That is what House Resolution 1234 is about. I urge its consideration and support of Members of Congress.

BUYING VOTES TO MICROMANAGE WAR IS WRONG

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today we will debate the emergency supplemental to fund our efforts in Iraq and in Afghanistan. Will it be an open debate? No. We will be operating under a closed rule with no amendments. Will it be a focused debate? No. Unless you believe that pork barrel spending on spinach farmers and peanut storage are critical to the global war on terror.

A USA Today editorial said this: ''It is hard to say which is worse, leaders offering peanuts for a vote of this magnitude, or Members allowing their votes to be bought for peanuts. These provisions demean a bill that if enacted would affect the lives of troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, the balance of power in the Middle East and America's long-term security.''

Reports today also say that if pork-barrel spending isn't enough, that Democrat leaders are issuing veiled threats, such as the loss of committee assignments, for those Members who oppose them. The Democrat leaders offered the voters change in November, but all the Nation is getting is politics worse than usual.

The supplemental should be defeated, and the Democrat majority should come back with a bill that honors our troops and does not demean their sacrifice.

IN FAVOR OF THE WAR SUPPLEMENTAL

(Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of a new direction in Iraq.

For 4 years, Republican Congresses followed lock-step as this President led our country into an open-ended commitment refereeing a religious civil war on the streets of Baghdad and Iraq.

After the fall of Saddam Hussein, ensuring no weapons of mass destruction, and several elections, the Republican Congress still follows lock-step as my fellow soldiers continue to give the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq, without a clear mission, without benchmarks to determine success, and without a clear timeline for coming home. That ends in the 110th Congress. This is a defining moment.

Mr. Speaker, many of us were elected to Congress on the promise of new leadership. That is what the Iraq Accountability Act does. It leads the way out of Iraq, leads the way to rebuild our overextended Army, and leads the way to win the war on terror.

For too long the American people have been craving leadership, craving accountability and craving new direction in Iraq. Let's give them that with this piece of legislation.

LET'S GIVE OUR TROOPS A CLEAN EMERGENCY SPENDING BILL

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I support the war in Iraq and the President's call for reinforcements. I made every effort to support our troops in the field, but I cannot support the Iraq supplemental because it is fiscally irresponsible and constitutionally flawed.

Emergency war spending bills should be about emergency war spending. In addition to much-needed support for our troops, this legislation contains billions of dollars in domestic spending that have nothing whatsoever to do with our national defense. And this bill is constitutionally flawed.

Under the Constitution, it is very clear; Congress may declare war; Congress may choose to fund or choose not to fund war; but Congress may not conduct war.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is fiscally irresponsible and constitutionally flawed. The American people expect this Congress to send our soldiers the resources they need to win in Afghanistan and Iraq with no strings and no pork. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, consider carefully what you will do today. The American people want our troops to come home, but they want them to win and come home. Let's give them a clean emergency spending bill, and give them a chance to do just that.

FEBRUARY JOB NUMBERS

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the most recent employment report showing modest job gains in February provided further signs of a slowing economy. Private sector employment rose by just 58,000 jobs, the smallest monthly gain in nearly 2½ years.

The unemployment rate edged down last month only because the labor force shrank, and many people are discouraged by their job prospects. This is hardly the picture of a robust labor market, which is not good news for workers.

President Bush is now tied with his father for the dubious honor of having the worst job-creation record of any President since President Hoover. American families are understandably worried about the future because the economy is weakening even before many have shared in the gains from the economic growth so far.

□ 1015

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS PORK

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, this week politicians in Congress are trying to use our military troops as a bargaining chip for their own pork barrel and domestic projects. Some of these projects are designed to buy votes of wavering Members. The bill includes such things as $25 million for spinach subsidies, $74 million for peanut storage, $120 million for the shrimp industry, money for extra office space for the House of Representatives.

This bill ought to focus on our troops. Congress is telling the President you cannot fund body armor for our troops in combat until you give us more money for our pet projects and pork barrel. Those tactics are fiscally irresponsible and wrong. Let's pass a clean emergency spending bill.

ALL AMERICANS DESERVE REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to support legislation that will bring Washington, D.C. into this century. It is time to give the citizens of Washington, D.C. the right to vote in the United States Congress.

They have the right to pay taxes, but they don't have the right to vote in the United States Congress. They have the right to serve in the military, but they don't have the right to vote in the United States Congress.

While the Constitution of the United States does not directly address this question, it does speak of government of the people, by the people, for the people. It is time for the people of Washington, D.C. to participate in this form of government.

No other democracy in the free world has in its capital people who cannot vote. It is time to give the citizens of Washington, D.C. the right to vote in the United States Congress.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS PORK, LITERALLY

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, ''such sums as may be necessary are hereby appropriated for livestock producers.''

Mr. Speaker, the so-called U.S. Troops Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act contains this open-ended appropriation for pork, literally. The Troops Readiness bill contains another open-ended payment of taxpayer dollars for crop payments.

While the bill restricts funding for our troops, it would provide $25 million in a bailout for spinach farmers, another $74 in taxpayer dollars for peanut storage, and $283 million for milk producers. All of this spending is designated under the bill as emergency wartime supplemental appropriations, language that means that the bill waives the budget so we can pay pork producers. It is ironic that this bill treats pork producers better than our troops.

It is no wonder that the majority will not be allowed amendments to this bill, because the American people would not approve the payment of pork spending under the name of our troops overseas.

NO MILITARY SOLUTION TO IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will have a chance to move the Iraq war in a new direction: one that holds the Iraqi Government accountable for meeting benchmarks that they have already promised they could make.

In contrast, the President's only answer is an open-ended commitment to what even his own Pentagon now admits is a civil war. Military leaders across the board have already told the President that there is no military solution to the war, and yet he continues with the status quo.

Lieutenant General Peter Chiarelli said in December: ''The proper political pieces must be in place in order for any of the military, economic or social initiatives to take hold and flourish.''

Lieutenant General Raymond Odierno said: ''It is clear you cannot solve this problem militarily.''

And just last month, Major General Paul Eaton said: ''Time and again, they have shown a tendency to focus almost exclusively on military solutions to problems without leveraging the full economic, political and diplomatic solutions to problems.''

These military leaders are correct. Iraqis must step forward and make critical political reforms if they really want to begin to stem the violence. But unlike the President, Democrats will finally demand some accountability from the Iraqi Government this week.

EMERGENCY WAR SPENDING

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strong opposition to the Democrat-sponsored emergency supplemental. I fully support funding our troops, but I will not be coerced into voting for a politically motivated deadline that helps our enemy.

As an appropriator, I am deeply disappointed that the important mission of funding our troops in harm's way has been overshadowed by over $21 billion in nonemergency spending. There is an appropriate time and place to discuss the war and funding important projects, but it shouldn't be done on the backs of young Americans fighting overseas.

Setting deadlines and threatening to restrict funds emboldens our common enemy and will have disastrous effects on the morale of American and Iraqi troops fighting to bring security to our war-torn region. Bringing troops home before the situation has been stabilized won't end our global struggle against terrorism. It would do the opposite.

I urge Members to oppose the supplemental. Our troops deserve to be fully funded, and they clearly deserve the support required to succeed. General Petraeus deserves time to work his plan. He is the general on the ground, not the Congress.

MAN'S BEST FRIEND

(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, Presidents Washington and Lincoln understood, as does Michael Auberry, the true value of man's best friend.

America would have never known the greatness of General George Washington if his dog, Mopsey, had not saved the young lad when he wandered far from home.

Fido, Lincoln's dog, allegedly jumped in front of a knife-wielding drunk, saving President Lincoln from injury. Gandalf is the latest of these heroes.

Gandalf, a 2-year-old Shiloh shepherd heard the cries for help and answered like a true soldier. He led searchers to Michael Auberry, a 12-year-old Boy Scout who had been lost for 4 days in the woods. Thanks to Gandalf, Michael was safely returned to his family.

Gandalf, a search-and-rescue dog, is a trailing dog trained to pursue specific individuals by following their scent. When time is short and the situation is extreme, it is man's best friend who answers the call. Rescue dogs, bomb sniffing dogs, and drug dogs are always loyal to guide, reassure, rescue, and save us.

As Harry Truman once said: ''Dogs are as necessary to the welfare of our country as Wall Street and the railroads.'' Dogs, man's best friend.

And that's just the way it is.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1433, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 2007

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 260 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 260

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1433) 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour and twenty minutes of debate, with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 1433 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO). The gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

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

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 260 provides for consideration of H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour and 20 minutes of general debate, with 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the amendment printed in the report shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation was built upon the principle that it was patently unjust to require people to pay taxes to a government within which they had no direct involvement, what came to be familiarly called ''taxation without representation.'' The fact that approximately 600,000 U.S. citizens live under taxation without representation within the United States today is repugnant to our very notion of democracy and to those who fought and died in creating this great Nation. How can the United States deny democracy in its capital while it promotes democracy abroad?

These citizens pay billions of dollars in Federal taxes and have sacrificed their lives in Iraq and every other war since the American Revolution. This is taxation without representation at its worst, and it is completely undemocratic. No other democracy in the world denies to its citizens in its capital city the right to vote. We here in America, the symbol of democracy to so much of the world, must not deny that right to our citizens.

This bipartisan legislation would correct this injustice by granting the citizens of our Nation's capital with a voting representative in the House of Representatives.

Some of my colleagues have suggested that this legislation is unconstitutional, that we in Congress will be acting outside our power in enacting this bill. To this, I must respectfully and strongly disagree. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution clearly enumerates the powers of Congress. Among the powers listed in Article I, section 8 states that Congress shall have the power ''to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over'' the District of Columbia. Article I, section 8 also gives Congress the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper'' to execute its enumerated powers.

Further, in 1790, Congress passed the Residence Act, giving residents of the new District of Columbia the right to vote. Since the capital was still being established, citizens were allowed to continue voting in their States, Maryland and Virginia. Congress then took this right away by statute in 1800 when the Federal Government assumed control of the District of Columbia. In the political battles that followed, District residents were denied a vote in Congress. Certainly, if Congress can remove the right by statute, so too can it reinstate that right by statute.

In the landmark Supreme Court case McCulloch v. Maryland, Chief Justice John Marshall said: ''Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.''

Extending full representation in the House to residents of the District of Columbia is a legitimate end. It is within the scope of Congress' power to exercise exclusive legislation in matters concerning the District of Columbia and consistent with not only the letter of the Constitution but also the spirit in which the Constitution was written by our Founding Fathers, that is, ''taxation without representation is tyranny.''

I, for one, want to correct this grave injustice and provide the citizens of Washington, D.C. with the same rights afforded to every other citizen in this great Nation. Our actions today will do just that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the blatantly unconstitutional measure that the Democrat majority is bringing to the House floor today.

There is not much to celebrate in this deeply flawed legislation that constitutional scholar and law professor Jonathan Turley has called ''the most premeditated, unconstitutional act by Congress in decades.''

□ 1030

But I am an optimist, and I have found a very small silver lining in what I think is a cynical political exercise that is designated for President Bush's veto pen, that is, if it ever makes it that far.

Today, the American taxpayer can be grateful that at least this week that the Democrat majority has trained its sights on simply trampling on the Constitution rather than propping up the fledgling ranks of big union bosses for the fourth week in a row. While this may not seem like much, it seems to be the best that the Democrat majority is willing to do at this time.

My opposition to this measure stems from its incompatibility with a pretty basic foundation of American Government, the Constitution. Section 2 of Article I clearly states that ''the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the People of the several States.'' The way I see it, any fourth-grader in the country can tell you that D.C. is simply not a State.

Supporters of this legislation will claim that the ''District Clause,'' which gives Congress the power to legislate over our Nation's government seat, also gives Congress the power to grant D.C. a Member of Congress. But this same clause makes it clear that by its very nature, D.C. is not a State, which brings us back to the original problem of this bill being completely unconstitutional.

But do not take my word for it. If the Democrat leadership will not listen to reason, one would hope that at least they would listen to one of our Founding Fathers, Alexander Hamilton, who offered an amendment to the Constitution that would have provided D.C. with a vote in the House. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated on July 22, 1788.

But if neither my word nor the Constitution nor the actions of our Founding Fathers is good enough, I wonder if the Democrat majority would be willing to listen to an equal branch of our government for their opinion on this matter.

In 2000, the Federal district court in Washington, D.C., concluded that ''the Constitution does not contemplate that the District may serve as a State for the purposes of apportionment of Congressional representatives.'' It seems pretty clear to me, but perhaps not every Member of this body.

So, for a moment, let us ignore my word, the Constitution, the actions of our Founding Fathers, and the decisions of the Federal judiciary.

What would it mean if Congress simply gave D.C. a seat in the House? Rather than going through the necessary process of passing a constitutional amendment, which, by the way, was attempted in 1978 and failed, it would create a precedent that said Congress would give the District three votes next year, or they could give them 10. It would mean that if Congress did not like the way the new Member from D.C. was voting, it could simply take the seat away, because if Congress has the power to create a seat, it certainly has the power to take that seat away, which it cannot do under the Constitution, the same Constitution that gives States those rights.

It would mean that Congress could deny D.C. voters the protection from, let us say, racial discrimination, given by the 15th amendment to the Constitution, or deny them protection from discrimination based on sex given to them in the 19th amendment. Is this the kind of precedent that we should be setting?

But rather than discuss the facts or logic of this approach, I suspect that the supporters of this legislation will come to the floor and simply talk about fairness. But I fail to see how it is fair that this would give every voter in Utah an unprecedented two votes,

one for their Member of Congress and one for a new at-large Member, while keeping the one man, one vote principle in every other State.

Perhaps a Member on the Democrat side would be kind enough to come down to the floor and explain this logic to me, but I am sure I will not hold my breath.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we take an oath to uphold and support the Constitution, not to trample on it. Personally, I think this is a fairly low bar that has been established. So last night in the Rules Committee, Congressman MCHENRY and I offered a commonsense amendment to have this new Member from D.C. act to preserve the individual right to keep and bear arms of the residents of the District of Columbia as also provided in the second amendment to the Constitution and upheld on March 9, 2007, by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

No matter what the supporters of this bill may claim to the contrary, the Constitution is not a cafeteria. You simply cannot pick and choose which part you are going to respect and which part you are going to ignore.

That is why our Framers, in their infinite wisdom, created an orderly, lawful process for amending the Constitution, if you so choose. So despite the fact that this underlying bill is designated for history's trash can, I am attempting to improve it slightly by forcing this entire body to recognize that the rights given in the whole Constitution, not just certain parts, should be recognized by anyone who claims to uphold and defend our government's founding document.

Unfortunately, this amendment was defeated on a party-line vote in the Rules Committee, which is fast becoming the graveyard of good ideas in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying assault on the Constitution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully disagree with my friend and colleague from Texas. I think he is trying to characterize this bill as an attempt to create statehood for the District of Columbia, which is not what this bill does. This bill attempts to do what the Constitution says that Congress can do, and that is, exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the District. That is what we are doing here, and there is precedent to that.

In 1949 in the Tidewater case, the Supreme Court upheld a decision which allowed Congress to give diversity jurisdiction to the District of Columbia, and now, generally, diversity jurisdiction only can occur between States, and despite the fact that clearly the District of Columbia was not a State, they were able, through an enactment by Congress, to be given that status of diversity jurisdiction.

The District of Columbia is not a State. It is not being treated as a State, but rather as a district for the capital, for the Federal capital. So it does have a special and unique treatment, and I think the Founding Fathers realized that it would be different, that it would not be like a State, and, in fact, it was part of the history why they came and created a capital.

When they were in Philadelphia, they were not happy with the fact that they had to constantly appeal to the Pennsylvania Legislature for the right to do different things, so they intended to create a capital that they would be able to have jurisdiction over.

That was the historical reason why the District of Columbia was created. So the fact that Congress then gave itself, or the Constitution gave Congress the right to make laws and make rules for the District of Columbia is the reason why today we are introducing this bill.

So I believe that we are not attempting to give D.C. statehood, but, rather, to give it a right to vote in this body, which is exclusively within the jurisdiction of Congress and within the right of Congress to do.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that this bill was unconstitutional for the reasons stated by my friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), but I am afraid that the way this bill treats the at-large seat in Utah makes it even more unconstitutional.

Not since the Supreme Court issued its string of one person, one vote decisions in the 1960s has Congress seen fit to amend the law to allow both at-large and district elections for Members of the House of Representatives. This bill does that and, in effect, gives the citizens of Utah the right to vote for two Representatives, one in the district and one at-large, which is something that is denied to every other citizen of the United States.

Even if this is not a violation of equal protection under the law, I think that it is extremely bad policy because it is in derogation from what those of us who have fought to enact and reenact the Voting Rights Act have attempted to do, and the Supreme Court has said on numerous occasions that at-large elections are in derogation of giving minorities effective representation not just in Congress, but for local legislative bodies like city councils and county commissions.

I fear that if this act is held constitutional with an at-large seat in Utah, that precedent will be used in jurisdictions covered by the Voting Rights Act to once again go back to at-large elections and to diminish the votes that minorities have enjoyed ever since the 1982 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act.

Finally, having an at-large seat in Utah is going to make it probably more difficult to uphold this law, and the reason I say that is that if this law is held unconstitutional with four Members from Utah being elected by district, effectively a quarter of the people of Utah will be disenfranchised since the bill has a nonseverability clause, and thus, if D.C. brings the bill down, one-quarter of the people of Utah will have no representative in Congress. That would be a powerful argument to uphold the constitutionality of this bill, and one that cannot be avoided.

Unfortunately, the majority on the Rules Committee decided to play partisan politics. They are jeopardizing the litigation of this legislation. I would hope that they would think twice, and they would vote this rule down.

I was prepared to support this legislation both in this Congress and the last Congress if Utah had four Representatives elected by districts. What you have done here, you have lost me. There is still time to correct this, and I would hope that the rule would be rejected.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), a former member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I come here with a sense of disappointment, but, admittedly, not surprise. Last night in the Rules Committee, I had the opportunity of listening to a brilliant amendment that I thought was brilliantly presented. I did it, so it was brilliant. Unfortunately, that amendment, which was a new issue to this debate that has not been discussed in other venues or has not been discussed in another committee, is a technical amendment that was designed neither to inhibit nor to promote the passage of the underlying bill.

If Utah becomes part of this bill and it is passed, we would be required in some way, shape and form to have a special election, which would cost the State of Utah about $7 million and require the legislature to come into special session to create new rules for a

special election, as well as to appropriate money that does not now exist for that.

We all know there will be lawsuits on this bill, and it will take time for those lawsuits to work the court. My amendment, a technical amendment, was simply to say let us start the process of the election in the 2008 election cycle, which would simply say there would be no extra cost to an entity for performance. There would be regular process, and that would give plenty of time for the lawsuits to have their way work through the courts. It seems ridiculous for the State of Utah to have to spend $7 million on a special election that may then be invalidated by a court action later on.

I have to admit that in some respects I feel frustrated the way the State of Utah has been treated in this entire process, forced to have a special session to draw a map, a map in which the criteria was for incumbent protection, never before done, and now forced to spend money on a special election, when an alternate is completely there.

□ 1045

Not to allow that to even be discussed on the floor does not help the body politic that is here.

I also notice that my friend from Georgia has come down here. Mr. WESTMORELAND had an amendment that was discussed in the committee and passed in the committee. Yet this Rules Committee has stripped his amendment and offered a closed rule, so they deny him the opportunity to even discuss the amendment that has already been passed.

Time after time in the last few years I sat where the gentleman from Texas sat and was denigrated by people who said we denied amendments that had failed in committee and were therefore stopping the democratic process. Here we have an example of someone who passed an amendment in committee that has now been stripped out and is no longer being allowed to discuss it on a bill that is purported to be expanding the concept of democracy in the first place.

I realize that when we talk about process, that is extremely boring to the American people. It's boring to us. Actually, most of what we say on this floor is boring to almost all of us.

But the real inconvenient truth is that poor process equates to poor policy. We will see another rule that comes out here today as well that would clearly illustrate how poor process, in an unprecedented fashion, would clearly result in poor policy.

When I was a young legislator, I one time was somewhat of a rebel, I redeemed myself and eventually became speaker, but in my second session I had a position that was at odds with my own leadership and was numerically outnumbered. But they allowed the process in Utah to work so I stayed at the table, and eventually we designed and came up with a product that was actually before for all of us. That is what we should be doing here today.

Somehow I heard, over the past 10 years, how the Rules Committee, when a different party was in charge, is where democracy goes to die. Unfortunately, this day the Rules Committee is once again where democracy goes to die. Mr. WESTMORELAND, who will be speaking in a few minutes, is living proof of how that happens.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire upon the time that remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. If I could inquire from the gentleman from New York if he has any additional speakers, with the understanding that he has the right to close.

Mr. ARCURI. Yes, sir, we have two additional speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. You do anticipate two additional speakers?

Mr. ARCURI. Yes, sir.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman to run down his time.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out, in listening to the debate, that when one looks at some of the decisions from the Supreme Court with respect to the steps that Congress, the powers of Congress, you can't help but think of Marbury v. Madison, which is one of the first great cases considered by Justice Marshall in the early Supreme Court.

In that case, the Supreme Court basically outlined what was the framework for the separation of power between the different branches of government. Basically, it set forth to Congress that it could not dictate to the Supreme Court or to the justice branch of government what the jurisdictions of or what their jurisdiction was.

Basically, what that decision came to recognize is the fact that within the particular branches of government, each branch has exclusive power and that only the Constitution can set jurisdiction.

Clearly, that is what we are doing here today. The Constitution makes it very clear that Congress has exclusive legislative right over the District. That is exactly what we are attempting to do today. We are attempting to give the District of Columbia the right to vote, as we are entitled to do, as the Constitution clearly enumerates that Congress has the right to do.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York was making a great argument for the bill itself, but we are talking about the rule. We are talking about the ability of every Member of this body to be able to amend the bill. We go through a committee process here, well, I shouldn't say all the time, because in the 110th Congress, it has been very rare that we have gone through a regular order. But in this particular case we did go through a regular order as far as the bill going to Government Reform.

I had an amendment. The amendment was pretty simple. It said, notwithstanding the fact that the District of Columbia would get a vote on the floor of this body, but that the intention, and the end result, was for them not to have representation in the United States Senate.

Now, that was fairly simple. In fact, I believe it passed Government Reform unanimously. My 700,000 people that I represent in Georgia had an opportunity to amend this bill.

But because of the closed rule that we have today, an amendment that was passed, agreed to by both sides, put in the bill in Government Reform, has come to the floor without it.

You know, this was hyped up to be the most ethical Congress. I haven't seen any proof of that. It has been hyped up to be the most open Congress where all Members would have an opportunity to participate. We certainly haven't seen that.

This is government almost by gradualism. We are gradually getting to where the leadership of the majority party wants to go. I believe that is to give D.C. the ability to have Members of Congress.

Now, this little book right here, the gentleman from New York was quoting parts of the Constitution, but he didn't quote all of it. Because in here I think it lays out very plainly who is to vote on the floor of this House and who is to have representation in this House, and who is to have representation in the United States Senate.

I think this is the first step. I think my amendment made it clear that the intention of this bill was not to gradually give them the ability to have seats in the Senate. But because it made it so clear and described so clearly the legislative intent of this body, they won't allow it to be in the bill, because their intention is to go further.

I would hope that one day we would. I hear people's lips, I hear things coming out of people's mouths. I see lips moving, talking about bipartisanism: we are going to be bipartisan; we are going to let everybody participate.

I haven't seen that in action. Let me say this, I don't think anybody has ever written a perfect bill, a bill that couldn't be adapted or expanded or explained a little bit better, a bill that couldn't be made better, a bill that couldn't be perfected.

In fact, if you read the rules of this House, it talks about amendments and

perfection and perfecting the amendment, perfecting the bill. That is all we want an opportunity to do. I think everybody in this body, all 435 of us, I think the people that we represent, all they want us to have is an opportunity to try to help perfect the bill or make it better.

So far, we have been shut out of that process. I think it is a shame. As my friend, Mr. BISHOP, said, a lot of people don't pay any attention to the process up here. But when the process is broken, the product is flawed.

I think the closed rule on this important bill is an example that this is a very broken process.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his remarks. He talks about bipartisanship. Frankly, I can't think of an issue that is more bipartisan than giving each and every American the right to vote. That is exactly what we are attempting to do here today.

You know, I can't help but think as a new Member of Congress that when we came down back in January to be sworn in, and my daughter and my family were here, one of the first things that my daughter said to me was noticing on a license plate ''taxation without representation.'' She asked me what that meant and why they were talking about that because she remembered studying about it in school.

It is critical. It is so important to us as a Nation to practice what we preach. We are in other places in the world. We are fighting wars for freedom, and we talk about how important it is to give people the right to vote and to be free, and that is exactly what we are doing here today.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, if I could please inquire upon the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes, and the gentleman from New York has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, if I could, I would like to try to get us back to a balance if we could. I would encourage the gentleman to run his time down.

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

Mr. ARCURI. We anticipate having our Speaker, and we continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman, the ranking member of the Rules Committee from San Dimas, California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. I want to express appreciation to my very good friend from Dallas and my new friend from New York for their management of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that to me it is very clear. Mr. SESSIONS' very able assistant just gave me a copy of the Constitution. Article 1, section 2 says: ''The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.''

Until we change the Constitution and make the District of Columbia a State or include it as a State or as a part of Maryland, it seems to me that this is unconstitutional.

I mean, I am not a constitutional expert, but I know that Mr. SENSENBRENNER stood here. We had a wide range of other people who have been arguing. I listened this morning to that great constitutional scholar Jonathan Turley from George Washington University on National Public Radio. He was talking about this exact line that I just read, arguing that it is unconstitutional.

I don't exactly understand why it is we are here. But there is something that hasn't been discussed at all in this debate, and that is how are we going to pay for this thing. We do know that we have got this structure that is put into place, PAYGO, as it's called.

Well, there was mandatory spending in this to establish a new Member of Congress; and under PAYGO, the rules that are adopted, the costs clearly have to be offset. The offset that is self-executed into this bill, by the rule, raises the requirement for income tax withholding by three one-thousandths of a percent. It's a pretty tiny one. But it has the potential for some real problems. Think about the self-employed computer programmer who earns $80,000 a year.

This computer programmer would have to calculate their estimated tax themselves and make quarterly payments to the government. If that computer operator misses that new three one-thousandths of 1 percent increase in withholding and underwithholds by as little as 6 cents per month, that person is subject to the Internal Revenue Service prosecuting them and seeking interest and penalties as if they were trying to evade paying their income taxes.

Basically, I concluded that if the government is going to require that they are going to take money that they say you could potentially get back from this, it is a tax increase, because if the government holds money that is mine, no matter how small it is, and I am not getting interest on that money, that, to me, is a tax increase. That is exactly what we are going to be doing when any Member votes to pass this rule that allows us to proceed in this matter.

I don't understand why it is that we are here. It is, to me, a very, very unfortunate thing. We now see how the Democrats intend to close the so-called tax gap, and it's on the backs of the average taxpayer in this country, and it is just plain wrong.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule. If, by chance, we pass this rule, which, from my perspective, self-executes a tax increase on the average hard-working taxpayer in this country, I urge a ''no'' vote on the bill itself.

One of the most ridiculous aspects of this rule is the mechanism used to pay for the mandatory spending in this bill.

The bill provides for a new Member of Congress, and as a constitutional officer, that Member's salary is a mandatory expense.

Under the PAYGO rules adopted by the House, those costs must be offset.

The offset self-executed into the bill by the rule raises the requirement for income tax withholding by three one-thousandths of a percent.

What does that mean to the average taxpayer? Well, for a married couple who both happen to be firefighters earning $80,000 a year, their interest-free loan to the government just went up by about $1.60. That's right, $1.60. But they do have to send approximately 13 cents per month more to the government to pay for a new congressional seat.

That's not the worst part, though. Take the self-employed computer programmer who earns $80,000 per year. She has to calculate her estimated tax herself and make quarterly payments to the government.

If she misses that new .003 percent increase in withholding, and under-withholds by as little as 6 cents per month she is subject to the IRS prosecuting her and seeking interest and penalties as if she were trying to evade paying her taxes.

Mr. Speaker, we now see how the Democrats intend to close the so-called ''tax gap''—on the backs of average taxpayers, all to pay another Member of Congress.

□ 1100

Mr. ARCURI. I thank the gentleman from California, my colleague from the Rules Committee. And he points out that, yes, I think a legitimate question, how are we going to pay for this? I can't help but think that when it comes to giving people freedom and the right to vote, we must find a way to pay for it. In fact, we have spent $400 billion attempting to give the people in Iraq freedom and the right to vote. And if we can spend $400 billion in Iraq, then we can spend some money here to give the 600,000 people here in the District of Columbia the right to vote.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I would simply argue, based on the point that has been made by that great expert Mr. Turley, we need to look at amending the U.S. Constitution before we go down that road. And we also have to look at how it is we are going to pay for this. Are we going to pay for it by basically imposing a tax on the average taxpaying citizen of this country by withholding dollars of theirs? I just think it is plain wrong.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCURI. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Let me just ask my friend from California, what about the constitutional expert

Ken Starr who has testified under oath that this is constitutional; or Viet Dinh, who was a chief counsel in the Justice Department under President Bush; and John Ashcroft, who wrote the PATRIOT Act and has written an opinion that this is constitutional? Aren't their views worth consideration as well?

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield so I can respond to my friend?

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

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. And I will tell you that when the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee last night began his testimony before the Rules Committee, he quoted both Kenneth Starr, and frankly I will say that it was with a great deal of pain and it was precedent-setting that our distinguished Judiciary Committee chairman Mr. CONYERS and he said this, quoted for the first time, and I suspect maybe the last, Kenneth Starr, and he went on to refer to the fact that Viet Dinh had clearly concluded this.

There are conflicting views as to the constitutionality of this. I recognize that. And, in fact, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, when he was addressing the Rules Committee last night, said that he believed that this was a 50/50 call.

I think that there are a lot of different opinions on it. Jonathan Turley is one that has spent a great deal of time looking at this, and I just happen to think that he is right. And the way I read the Constitution, that is the way I see it.

Mr. ARCURI. I would just like to point out that the gentleman from California says that he is not clearly not an expert on the Constitution, but I think he has a much better understanding of the Constitution than he admits.

You sound like you are strictly attempting to interpret the Constitution, a strict constructionalist. And that being the case, I think it is clear, a close reading of the Constitution gives Congress under Article I, section 8 exclusive legislation over all aspects of the District. So I think that it is clear in a strict reading of the Constitution that Congress has this ability.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield to me for a moment. I thank my friend for yielding, and I really do appreciate him, and he is my new friend on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that it is Article I, section 2, to which I point where it refers to the fact that this body, according to the Constitution, is to become comprised of Members elected from the several States. And that is why I argue that if, in fact, we are going to do this, we should look at a way in which the District of Columbia becomes a State so that it can, in fact, comply with the Constitution.

Mr. ARCURI. I just would point out what I stated earlier. In the Tidewater case, the Supreme Court upheld the ability of Congress to designate the District of Columbia, for purposes of diversity jurisdiction, as a special creature, as not a State, but standing in certain respects in the same way that a State does. I think it is clearly within the power of Congress to do this, and I yield.

Mr. DREIER. Again, this description of the District of Columbia as a special entity is absolutely right. That is what the Framers of our Constitution wanted to do in establishing the District of Columbia to ensure that it is not a State. That is the uniqueness of the District of Columbia. And I am arguing that if, in fact, we need to make this change so that it complies with Article I, section 2, it seems to me there needs to be a modification to the Constitution.

Mr. ARCURI. Reclaiming my time. And I think I just have to answer that by saying if you look at historically why Congress actually created the District, it was so that it would have jurisdiction over the area which it sat, not for the reason that you indicate.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule, and as well as I am in opposition of the underlying bill that we are considering today, and I do so because I am a strict constructionist. I am a believer and I am a defender of the Constitution. In fact, when I came to Congress, like all of us did, I took an oath to uphold the Constitution, and I intend to do so. And I believe that what the House is considering passing today in this legislation is simply unconstitutional.

Let me just say, I am not against the citizens of the District of Columbia having the right to vote for a Member of the House of Representatives. In fact, before I came to Congress, I had the privilege and pleasure to serve as the Michigan secretary of state for 8 years, and that is the chief elections officer in my State, and a principal advocacy of mine then as it is now was registering as many citizens who were eligible to vote, and then trying to get as many who were registered to actually participate in the elections process.

However, under the Constitution of the United States, it explicitly declares that representation in Congress can only be granted to States. Article I, section 2 states clearly that: Representatives shall be apportioned among several States.

Interestingly enough, even the District of Columbia recently argued that it was not a State and shouldn't be treated like one. And I am referring to the recent District Court of Appeals case about the long-time D.C. gun ban when the District argued that the second amendment did not apply to them because they are not a State. And I am not sure if the District actually believes that other parts of the Constitution don't apply to them for the same reasons. For instance, they might think that the first amendment doesn't apply to them. I am not sure.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution applies to every American wherever you live, the first amendment, the second amendment, and the section that precludes the District from having a vote in this Chamber.

And if we are going to sacrifice the Constitution on the altar of politics, why are we stopping with just giving D.C. a vote in the House? Why not give them two Senators like every other State has? How about a Governor? A statehouse? A State senate as well as all the other constitutional officers that other States have, like the attorney general or secretary of state or whatever?

Also, by trying to buy a few votes by saying that we will expand the membership of this Chamber by giving D.C. one Member and Utah one Member so that we will hopefully have one Democratic vote or one Republican vote; since we are being completely political and arbitrary, how about just one vote for the District, and then give whatever Member has the most Republican district in the Nation, give them two votes?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for a bill that clearly violates the Constitution. It will never be upheld by the courts. The District should either go back to being a part of the State of Maryland, as they were at our Nation's founding, or we should amend the Constitution. Asking Members to vote to violate our Nation's Constitution, I believe, is absolutely the wrong approach. I would urge a ''no'' vote on this rule and a ''no'' vote on the underlying bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 16 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Let me just say, a strict reading of the Constitution, if you look just at its face, if you read that, D.C. residents wouldn't have a right to a jury trial because that is only to residents of States. D.C. residents would have no right to sue non-D.C. residents in Federal courts under diversity jurisdiction, which is reserved to residents of States. The full faith and credit clause wouldn't apply to D.C. under the Constitution, because that only applies to States. But Congress, under the District clause, has allowed the District to be treated as a State for those purposes.

The previous speaker says, well, if they can do this, why can't they be treated as a State for other purposes? The city argued under the gun ban that they weren't a State because Congress hadn't specifically said they were a

State, but the District clause is all-inclusive and gives Congress the power to determine what the rights are. We have that right. It is not an inherent right to vote in the House of Representatives, but we have that right under the District clause.

The difference between the House and the Senate in the constitutional reading is the Senate represents States. Individuals represent States, and each State gets two Senators. And the District of Columbia is clearly not a State. But the House of Representatives is of the people among the several States, a different wording. In fact, at the time the Constitution was created, the people in the District were among the several States, and, in fact, the residents of what are now the District voted for Congress the first 12 years of the Republic.

But this is not a right that goes to the District of Columbia. This is a right that goes to the people of the District of Columbia, and Congress has the right to determine whether they have it or not. This was taken up in 1800 when the anti-Federalists won the Presidency by one electoral vote, if you remember, and in a lame duck session this was debated, and, as usually happens, they punted it to the succeeding Congresses.

I think the constitutionality of this thing is very, very clear that, under the District clause, we have the ability in Congress to determine if they get a vote in the House or not. And I just want to set the record straight on that. All of these other rights, jury trial, right to sue, full faith and credit, even the Federal Government would not be allowed to impose Federal taxes in the District under a strict reading of the Constitution. But under law and under the District clause, we have expanded it to the District. I just think the record should reflect that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New York if, due to the imbalance of time, if he would like to perhaps have some more of his speakers. If so, I would reserve the balance of my time if he chose to go that direction.

Mr. ARCURI. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker. And I really had not intended to come forward since I will be managing in a few minutes but I must say that I have been virtually driven to the floor by the abstractions of the discussion. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Would the gentleman from Virginia engage in a colloquy with me?

I will have more to say about the specific legal and constitutional issues, but I do want to say something to those who are such literalists that they would deny us of the right to vote citing the Framers and the Constitution. Is it not true that the State of Virginia and perhaps as many as half the Colonies were not States, but Commonwealths? And is ''Commonwealth'' mentioned anywhere in the Constitution?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. That is correct in the case of Virginia, if the gentlelady would allow me.

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. The District of Columbia portion that came from Virginia went back to Virginia in 1846. And I think it is important for Members to understand the reason for the Virginia section of the District petitioned to go back to Virginia was because they were afraid that Congress was going to enact a ban on slaveholding in the District.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman. And the gentleman has clarified something further concerning the right to vote in the people's House.

The reason I come is not, frankly, to engage early in the discussion we will be having on the bill itself; but because the discussion has been such an abstraction. I have come because that discussion has been as if the Framers set up a place, not a city with real people. It is as if you can discuss these rights without referring to whom these rights would belong.

Members have come to the floor with the hubris to believe that the Framers intended their constituents to have full rights under the Constitution, but not my constituents because we happen to live in the Capital of the United States created by the Framers.

I do want to let you know who you are talking about so that this discussion will not be all about constitutional and legal abstractions that can only be settled by the courts of the United States. You are talking about Kathryn Ray, who lives here and is a mom and a librarian and a PTA president. You are talking about Larry Chapman, who is a D.C. firefighter, putting his life on the line for emergency response here and throughout the city. You are talking about Liz Allen, an attorney who has had her first child and has decided to raise this son here in the District of Columbia even though her family is denied a vote.

□ 1115

You are talking about Wade Henderson, like me a native Washingtonian, president of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, who has fought every day for civil rights around the world but has never had a vote in Congress. Like me, he is an African American who grew up in this city when it was a segregated city. Like me, he understood that the composition of this city then and for centuries has had much to do with the denial of voting rights in this city. And so, like me, he has argued in these Halls that all citizens of the District of Columbia, of every background, finally have the rights that all other Americans now take for granted.

This bill is about Evelyn Curtis, a nurse at one of our hospitals, who would love to have a say on health care issues. She can talk to me, but I can't talk to you about what she believes by voting.

This bill is ultimately about 650,000 American citizens. When you are asked to vote on this bill in the middle of a war, when our citizens are among the troops on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan, remember that you will be voting not for my vote but for the votes of the people who live in the District of Columbia and especially for the votes of those Washingtonians who as I speak are serving in Iraq, Afghanistan and throughout the world in service to the United States of America.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and to have an opportunity to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. The first premise is that we all stand here on the floor of this Congress and take an oath to uphold the Constitution. Even the strongest advocates for this bill before the hearing in the Judiciary Committee testified that if we believe that a bill is unconstitutional before us, we are obligated to uphold our oath and vote ''no'' regardless of how much we might support the underlying policy. That is the stand that I take on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

I would declare this to be the first round, one step along the way in the D.C. statehood bill. But the discussion that has been here on the floor and the exchange and the colloquy with Mr. DREIER on Article I, section 2, article I, section 3 and then the reference was brought up also of article I, section 8, to address those, it works just like this: Article I, section 2 reads: ''The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.''

Now, if D.C. is not a State, we can't have Members that come from places that are not States. It's a pretty simple analysis here. Read the Constitution. It also says in the bill that this doesn't include Senators. That was an amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Statutory provisions aren't constitutional restraints. By the same rationale, and I mean exactly the same rationale that you can come to a conclusion that there could be a Member in this Congress that votes in full representation for D.C., you have to also conclude that there is a constitutional provision for two Senators as well, because I will argue that Article I, section 3, after the 17th amendment is applied to it reads this way: ''The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State elected by the people thereof.'' So the only

distinction between a District Representative, a Member in the House, and two Senators is the phrase ''by the people of the several States'' as applied to the Member and ''elected by the people thereof'' as applied to the Senators.

This is imperative and compelling. So if you accept a Member here constitutionally, you also accept two Senators here by the same constitutional rationale.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the gentleman that if something is unconstitutional, certainly I would not support it, but I believe that this bill is constitutional, and I believe again Article I, section 8 makes it constitutional for Congress to pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me first of all add my appreciation to Congressman TOM DAVIS; maybe the constitutional teachers at the University of Virginia law school are owed a debt of gratitude as well; and, of course, the gentlelady who has persisted throughout her, I think, legal and legislative career, the Honorable Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

This is a historic moment and an historic day. I think the crucial-ness of this debate should not be lost on the American people. I rise to support this rule, this structured rule, that allows an amendment by Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. CONYERS, and I would like to give comfort to those on the other side of the aisle to read their Constitution and explore even some of the Supreme Court cases that document that the District of Columbia under Supreme Court law has been held as a State in certain purposes.

Now, what is lost in this debate is that this is not a singular legislative act that excludes a balance. Out of this provision comes a seat for the State of Utah, which has requested a seat for many, many years. Just recently, we added a seat for North Carolina so that citizens of the United States could vote. So it is being defined by my opponents on the other side, this rule that it is unconstitutional because they are not giving you the whole story. This, because of population concerns, adds a seat to Utah. But, more importantly, this is a constitutional approach. They are right. Article I, section 2 indicates that the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members from every State. But then there is an enunciation of the powers of Congress that goes under section 8, clause 17, that ''the Congress has the power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatever over such district that has been established as the capital of the United States.'' The Congress has all power.

Now, let me say this. We are not all powerful. We represent the people of the United States. But would you ask the question as we are debating soon the crisis in Iraq, where the policies of this Nation have been to export democracy, create an opportunity for those citizens of Iraq to vest in their country, to vote for their leadership, does it make any sense for individuals paying taxes, who are on the front lines of Iraq, Afghanistan, World War I, World War II, the Vietnam War, the Korean conflict, and any conflict around the world, to be denied the right to vote if the Constitution gives us the authority to do so?

I commend the Constitution to my colleagues. I might say that we welcome the distinguished gentleman from Iowa's amendment to work with Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON to get Senate provisions, if he desires to do so. It seems like he was concerned that the other body was not represented. But when we debate this question as we will soon, let us have the facts. You cannot quote one part, as one would say in the church, of the Bible and exclude the other part. You can't quote one part of the Constitution and ignore the powers of this Congress that has a right to exercise authority over the District of Columbia.

I think the other question that should be asked and answered, who will it harm? Who will be hurt by recognizing the voting rights of people that are here in the United States paying taxes and shedding their blood? Who would argue against the place that thousands and millions of Americans come as their capital that they love, and they leave behind those who care for and take care of this capital, the residents of the District of Columbia, and they leave them with no right to vote.

So I believe that this rule is the right rule. I have disagreed with rules, both Republican and, frankly, Democratic rules. Later today I will disagree with the rule that will be put forward. But frankly I think this rule that is structured makes a great deal of difference and it is important that we make sure that we abide by this book and we read it consistently with its language and that is to say that Congress has the power to move forward.

I would ask my colleagues to be reminded that there are citizens in this country that cannot vote, and I hope that you will view the work of the Congress as it is constitutional and right to give those citizens the right to vote, for they too are Americans.

I ask my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I thank my friend for yielding.

We have Republicans quoting liberal professors and Democrats quoting conservative professors in support of where they are. At the end of the day I believe that if the District were a Republican enclave, our side would be getting up screaming for voting rights and the other side would be saying, no, the Constitution is strict. We are trying to take the politics out of this.

In the last Congress, both committees with jurisdiction under Republican chairmen cleared this bill for the floor and the Republican leadership denied it an opportunity to come to the floor. We could have had a full and open debate at that point. I think it would have been helpful to the process. Now the Democrats are in control and they are bringing this up, not for a full and open debate, unfortunately, but under a closed rule. We should have an open rule on this. At the time when we are spending billions of dollars and sacrificing thousands of lives to bring democracy to Baghdad, to Afghanistan and around the world, shouldn't we look right next door to our friends and neighbors here in the Nation's capital and give them the essence of democracy, the right to vote here on the floor of the House of Representatives? I think we should.

There are different views as to how we should do this. The former chairman of the Judiciary Committee says it's constitutional, but doesn't like the at-large aspect of the Utah seat but we are not able to debate that on the floor today. My friend from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) who has long been a champion of voting rights here has a different mechanism under which this could be established.

I wish we could have a full and open debate on this. I think it would be helpful to the process. And I am really torn. Because on the one hand our side doesn't want the bill to come up at all, and the other side wants this to come up under very closed rules where we can't have full and open debate. I look forward to a spirited colloquy as we move through this. I am going to support the bill in its final form, of course, as it moves through because I think this is something that is long overdue for citizens of the Nation's capital and with a long line of legal precedents which treats the District of Columbia like a State when Congress says it can be treated like a State. Things like the right to trial by jury, paying Federal taxes, other issues that apply only to States under the Constitution but which under the District clause to the Constitution when we apply it to the District, it is treated like a State.

And once again, looking at such conservative jurists as Ken Starr, Viet Dinh who wrote the PATRIOT Act for the Bush administration testified under oath as to its constitutionality. This shouldn't ultimately be locked up in this. This should be about basic voting rights for the capital of the Free World.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman for inquiring. I would like to save my 2 minutes for my close and would like to ask if the gentleman would allow me 1 additional minute for a speaker that I have.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I just want to say, I will not object. I will not object, out of the sense of fairness that I hope that every Member will bring with them to the floor when the time comes to vote on this bill. I will not object, because Mr. ROHRABACHER, who may disagree with my bill, has at least understood that the Republic will not go on as long as the residents of the Nation's capital are denied a vote in the Congress and has himself introduced his own version of a voting rights bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, this is all about fairness. And in the spirit of fairness that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) talks about, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for debate only.

□ 1130

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, my friend was very correct when she said we should all be concerned about the rights of the people who live here in the District of Columbia, the fact that they have taxation without representation and then lack the voting rights other people do. However, what is being offered today is clearly unconstitutional. If we just go through this whole procedure and it gets thrown out by the Court, what have we accomplished?

There is an alternative. Unfortunately, that substitute was not made in order. There is an alternative which would give the people in this State not only the right to vote for a Representative in the House, but for a Senator and 11 congressional electors as well. The substitute, which would be constitutional, simply grants the citizens of the District of Columbia their State citizenship rights in Maryland, which is what happened in Virginia, of course, in the past, 100 years ago. My substitute would give the people of this city the right to vote for two Senators as well as a Representative as well as electors, and yet this was not permitted to come to the House here today. It is a substitute, and we were not allowed to vote on it here or to even consider it.

I would say there are some political considerations that have limited this debate at the expense of the people of this city. I would like to place in the RECORD a further description of the substitute legislation that I have in mind. And I would suggest that what we do is get politics out of this. Let us give these people a right not only to vote for a Representative, here but for two Senators. We have it within our ability to do that.

The Rohrabacher substitute, essentially the text of H.R. 492, restores the full House, Senate, and Electoral College voting rights enjoyed by residents of the District of Columbia as citizens of Maryland from creation of the District in 1790 to the enactment of the Organic Act of 1801. By restoring the state citizenship rights of D.C. residents to vote for, run for, and serve as U.S. Representatives and Senators, the Rohrabacher substitute complies with the literal reading of Sections 2 and 3 of Article I of the Constitution requiring that Representatives and Senators come from states.

Like the base bill, the Rohrabacher substitute adds an additional Representative for the next state in line in the 2000 census (i.e., Utah), and permanently increases the membership of the House of Representatives to 437. The bill provides an additional Representative for Maryland, which for census purposes will include the population of the District of Columbia. Until redistricting is accomplished, D.C. would constitute the additional Maryland district by itself. When Maryland redistricts its congressional districts, its districts would have to be equal in population, but the District of Columbia could not be divided into more than one congressional district. Federal elections in D.C. would be conducted pursuant to Maryland election law, with the D.C. government treated as a local jurisdiction in Maryland for this purpose.

To avoid double counting in the Electoral College, the substitute exercises Congress's powers in both sections of the 23rd Amendment to provide that the D.C.'s own presidential electors not be appointed or cast votes. The bill would take effect with the 2008 election, with the new Representatives from Maryland and Utah taking office at the beginning of the 111th Congress, at which point the offices of D.C. delegate and D.C.'s shadow Representative and Senators would be abolished. Utah would be required to hold its 2008 and 2010 congressional elections in accordance with the four-district plan the state adopted in 2006.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, before I really begin, extend my thanks to the Members of Congress, including Mr. ARCURI, who has taken time and been very gracious in his professional nature today on the floor, as well as the other Members who have been here, and I want to thank them for working together with us.

Mr. Speaker, I will be urging Members to oppose the previous question so that I may offer an amendment to the rule which would make in order the constitutional amendment offered by Representative DANA ROHRABACHER, as described today, which was presented to the Rules Committee last night. At a minimum the House should be allowed to vote and debate on a practical, legal alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to reject the previous question. If the previous question is agreed to, I urge Members to reject the closed rule and the unconstitutional underlying measure.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the amendment and extraneous material just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, the nearly 600,000 citizens of Washington D.C. have waited far too long for equal representation in this Chamber. They have sacrificed their lives defending this great Nation, paid their fair share in taxes, and helped to build and run this great Nation.

We have an opportunity to correct this grave injustice and provide the citizens of our Nation's capital with the most important right of all, and that is, of course, the right to vote.

I want to commend the Delegate from Washington, D.C., for her tireless efforts that have brought us together on this historic day. It is that type of passion and commitment that further strengthens our democracy.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 260 OFFERED BY REP. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after conclusion of the time for debate on the bill it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider the amendment in section 3, if offered by Mr. Rohrabacher of California or his designee. The amendment shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''District of Columbia Voting Rights Restoration Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) There is no reason, either historically or by virtue of law, why the people of the District of Columbia, the capital of the United States of America, should not have full voting representation in the Congress of the United States.

(2) Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States, which authorized the creation of the District of Columbia, provides only that the Congress shall have ''exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'' over that District.

(3) The same clause of the Constitution provides that Congress ''shall exercise like authority over'' other Federal territories that have been purchased from the States for Federal purposes. Residents of other Federal enclaves, though also denied voting rights after becoming subject to exclusive Federal jurisdiction, have had restored their right to vote for and serve as elected Federal officials from their respective States which ceded the Federal enclaves to the United States.

(4) Congress has exercised its authority to regulate Federal elections under article I, section 4 of the Constitution to set the legal requirements that States must follow in establishing Congressional districts. Congress

has also exercised this authority to require States to allow United States citizens who are former residents, and their children who are United States citizens, who are living overseas to vote in Federal elections in the previous State of residence, notwithstanding the fact that such former residents and their children may have no intention of returning or establishing residence in that State, and notwithstanding the fact that such citizens are not subject to the laws of that State, including tax laws.

(5) The entire territory of the current District of Columbia was ceded to the United States by the State of Maryland, one of the original 13 States of the United States. The portion of the original District of Columbia ceded to the United States by the Commonwealth of Virginia was returned to the authority of that state in 1846, and the people who now reside in that area vote as citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

(6) The Supreme Court of the United States has found that the cession of legislative authority over the territory that became the District of Columbia by the States of Maryland and Virginia did not remove that territory from the United States, and that the people who live in that territory are entitled to all the rights, guarantees, and immunities of the Constitution that they formerly enjoyed as citizens of those States. O'Donoghue v. United States, 289 U.S. 516 (1933); Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901). Among those guarantees are the right to equal protection of the laws and the right to participate, equally with other Americans, in a Republican form of government.

(7) Since the people who lived in the territory that now makes up the District of Columbia once voted in Maryland as citizens of Maryland, and Congress by adoption of the Organic Act of 1801 severed the political connection between Maryland and the District of Columbia by statute, Congress has the power by statute to restore Maryland state citizenship rights, including Federal electoral rights, that it took away by enacting the Organic Act of 1801.

SEC. 3. RESTORATION OF RIGHT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE AS MARYLAND RESIDENTS IN CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives and Senate, the right of the people of the District of Columbia to be eligible to participate in elections for the House of Representatives and Senate as Maryland residents in accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland, is hereby restored.

(b) ELIGIBILITY TO HOLD CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of determining eligibility to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives or Senate, the right of the residents of the District of Columbia to be considered inhabitants of the State of Maryland is hereby restored.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office occurring during 2008 and any succeeding year.

SEC. 4. RESTORATION OF RIGHT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE AS MARYLAND RESIDENTS IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the right of the people of the District of Columbia to be eligible to participate in elections for electors of President and Vice President, and to serve as such electors as Maryland residents in accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland, is hereby restored.

(b) ELIGIBILITY TO SERVE AS ELECTORS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of determining eligibility to serve as electors of President and Vice President, the right of the residents of the District of Columbia to be considered inhabitants of the State of Maryland is hereby restored.

(c) TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT OF SEPARATE ELECTORS BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—In accordance with the authority under sections 1 and 2 of the 23rd amendment to the Constitution and the authority under article I, Section 8, to legislate for the District of Columbia, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, Congress directs that no electors of President and Vice President shall be appointed by the District of Columbia and that no votes from such electors shall be cast or counted in the electoral vote for President and Vice President.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by striking section 21.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 21.

SEC. 5. COMPOSITION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) NUMBER AND APPORTIONMENT OF MARYLAND MEMBERS.—For purposes of determining the number and apportionment of the members of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland for the One Hundred Eleventh Congress and each succeeding Congress, the population of the District of Columbia shall be added to the population of Maryland under the decennial census.

(b) INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) PERMANENT INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—Effective with respect to the One Hundred Eleventh Congress and each succeeding Congress, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 437 Members.

(2) REAPPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERS RESULTING FROM INCREASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress'', approved June 28, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(a)), is amended by striking ''the then existing number of Representatives'' and inserting ''the number of Representatives established with respect to the One Hundred Eleventh Congress''.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to the regular decennial census conducted for 2010 and each subsequent regular decennial census.

(c) REVISION OF APPORTIONMENT PRIOR TO NEXT CENSUS.—

(1) TRANSMITTAL OF REVISED APPORTIONMENT INFORMATION BY PRESIDENT AND CLERK.—

(A) STATEMENT OF APPORTIONMENT BY PRESIDENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to Congress a revised version of the most recent statement of apportionment submitted under section 22(a) of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress'', approved June 28, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(a)), to take into account this section and the amendments made by this section.

(B) REPORT BY CLERK.— Not later than 15 calendar days after receiving the revised version of the statement of apportionment under subparagraph (A), the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with section 22(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 2a(b)), shall send to the executive of the State (other than the State of Maryland) entitled to one additional Representative pursuant to this section a certificate of the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled under section 22 of such Act, and shall submit a report identifying that State to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) COMPOSITION OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS FOR AFFECTED STATE.—Until the taking effect of the first reapportionment occurring after the regular decennial census conducted for 2010, the Congressional districts of the State identified by the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be those districts established under a law enacted by the State during 2006 (without regard to any amendments made to such law after 2006) which established Congressional districts for the State but which did not take effect because the number of districts provided under the law was greater than the number of districts to which the State was finally entitled after the regular decennial census for 2000.

(d) PROHIBITING DIVISION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTO SEPARATE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), in establishing Congressional districts after the effective date of this section, the State of Maryland shall ensure that the entire area of the District of Columbia is included in the same Congressional district (except as provided in paragraph (2)).

(2) SPECIAL RULE IF POPULATION OF DISTRICT EQUALS OR EXCEEDS AVERAGE POPULATION OF MARYLAND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS.—If the population of the District of Columbia equals or exceeds the average population of a Congressional district in the State of Maryland under the decennial census used for the apportionment of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland, the State of Maryland shall ensure that at least one Congressional district in the State consists exclusively of territory within the District of Columbia.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR INITIAL DISTRICT.—Until the State of Maryland establishes Congressional districts to take into account the enactment of this section, the Congressional district of the additional Representative to which the State is entitled under this section shall consist exclusively of the area of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. COORDINATION OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION.

(a) APPLICATION OF MARYLAND ELECTION LAWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal elections in the District of Columbia shall be administered and carried out by the State of Maryland, in accordance with the applicable laws of the State of Maryland.

(2) TREATMENT OF DISTRICT AS UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—For purposes of the laws of the State of Maryland which apply to Federal elections in the District of Columbia pursuant to paragraph (1), the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a unit of local government within the State of Maryland with responsibility for the administration of Federal elections.

(b) TREATMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS PART OF MARYLAND UNDER HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002.—Section 901 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15541) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the District of Columbia'';

(2) by striking ''In this Act'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.__In this Act''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR STATE OF MARYLAND AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—For purposes of this Act, the following shall apply:

''(1) The voting age population of the State of Maryland shall be considered to include the voting age population of the District of

Columbia for purposes of sections 101(d)(4) and 252(b).

''(2) The District of Columbia shall be considered a unit of local government or jurisdiction located within the State of Maryland.

''(3) An election for Federal office taking place in the District of Columbia shall be considered to take place in the State of Maryland.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS.—

(1) UNIFORMED AND OVERSEAS CITIZENS ABSENTEE VOTING ACT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 108. SPECIAL RULE FOR STATE OF MARYLAND AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

''For purposes of this title, the following shall apply:

''(1) An absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter who is a resident of the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a resident of the State of Maryland.

''(2) An election for Federal office taking place in the District of Columbia shall be considered to take place in the State of Maryland.

''(3) The State of Maryland, and the election officials of the State of Maryland, shall be responsible for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to voters who are residents of the District of Columbia.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 107(6) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff—6) is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia,''.

(2) NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1973.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Voter Registration Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.) is amended—

(i) by redesignating section 13 as section 14; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 12. SPECIAL RULE FOR STATE OF MARYLAND AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

''For purposes of this Act, the following shall apply:

''(1) The District of Columbia shall be considered a registrar's jurisdiction within the State of Maryland.

''(2) An election for Federal office taking place in the District of Columbia shall be considered to take place in the State of Maryland.

''(3) The State of Maryland, and the election officials of the State of Maryland, shall be responsible for carrying out this Act with respect to the District of Columbia, except that—

''(A) section 5 shall apply to motor vehicle driver's license applications and the motor vehicle authority of the District of Columbia in the same manner as that section applies to a State, and the State of Maryland shall provide the District of Columbia with such forms and other materials as the District of Columbia may require to carry out that section; and

''(B) the District of Columbia shall designate voter registration agencies under section 7 in the same manner as a State, and the State of Maryland shall provide the District of Columbia with such forms and other materials as the District of Columbia may require to carry out that section.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. gg—1(4)) is amended by striking ''and the District of Columbia''.

(3) VOTING ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED ACT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ee et seq.) is amended—

(i) by redesignating section 8 as section 9; and

(ii) by inserting after section 7 the following new section:

''SPECIAL RULE FOR STATE OF MARYLAND AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

''SEC. 8. For purposes of this Act, the following shall apply:

''(1) The District of Columbia shall be considered a political subdivision of the State of Maryland.

''(2) An election for Federal office taking place in the District of Columbia shall be considered to take place in the State of Maryland.

''(3) The State of Maryland shall be responsible for carrying out this Act with respect to the District of Columbia.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ee—6(5)) is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia,''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO HOME RULE ACT.—Section 752 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1—207.52, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', except to the extent required under section 5 of the District of Columbia Voting Rights Restoration Act of 2007.''.

(e) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION LAW.—The District of Columbia Elections Code of 1955 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 18. APPLICABILITY OF MARYLAND ELECTION LAW FOR ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

''Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code or other law or regulation of the District of Columbia_

''(1) any election for Federal office in the District of Columbia shall be administered and carried out by the State of Maryland, in accordance with the applicable law of the State of Maryland; and

''(2) no provision of this Code shall apply with respect to any election for Federal office to the extent that the provision is inconsistent with the applicable law of the State of Maryland.''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office occurring during 2008 and any succeeding year.

SEC. 7. REPEAL OF OFFICE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATE.

(a) REPEAL OF OFFICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 202 and 204 of the District of Columbia Delegate Act (Public Law 91—405; sections 1—401 and 1—402, D.C. Official Code) are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such sections are restored or revived as if such sections had not been enacted.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date on which a Representative from Maryland who is elected from a Congressional district which includes the District of Columbia takes office for the One Hundred Eleventh Congress.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS CODE OF 1955.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The District of Columbia Elections Code of 1955 is amended—

(A) in section 1 (sec. 1—1001.01, D.C. Official Code), by striking ''the Delegate to the House of Representatives'';

(B) in section 2 (sec. 1—1001.02, D.C. Official Code)—

(i) by striking paragraph (6), and

(ii) in paragraph (13), by striking ''the Delegate to Congress for the District of Columbia'';

(C) in section 8 (sec. 1—1001.08, D.C. Official Code)—

(i) by striking ''Delegate'' in the heading, and

(ii) by striking ''Delegate,'' each place it appears in subsections (h)(1)(A), (i)(1), and (j)(1);

(D) in section 10 (sec. 1—1001.10, D.C. Official Code)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(3), and

(ii) in subsection (d)—

(I) by striking ''Delegate,'' each place it appears in paragraph (1), and

(II) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(E) in section 15(b) (sec. 1—1001.15(b), D.C. Official Code), by striking ''Delegate,''; and

(F) in section 17(a) (sec. 1—1001.17(a), D.C. Official Code), by striking ''except the Delegate to the Congress from the District of Columbia''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to elections occurring during 2008 and any succeeding year.

SEC. 8. REPEAL OF OFFICES OF STATEHOOD REPRESENTATIVE AND SENATOR.

(a) REPEAL OF OFFICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the District of Columbia Statehood Constitutional Convention Initiative of 1979 (sec. 1—123, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking subsections (d) through (h).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) STATEHOOD COMMISSION.—Section 6 of such Initiative (sec. 1—125, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) by striking ''27 voting members'' and inserting ''24 voting members'',

(II) by adding ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4); and

(III) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (5); and

(ii) in subsection (a—1)(1), by striking subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H).

(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 8 of such Initiative (sec. 1—127, D.C. Official Code) is hereby repealed.

(C) APPLICATION OF HONORARIA LIMITATIONS.—Section 4 of D.C. Law 8—135 (sec. 1—131, D.C. Official Code) is hereby repealed.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date on which a Representative from Maryland who is elected from a Congressional district which includes the District of Columbia takes office for the One Hundred Eleventh Congress.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ELECTIONS.—

(1) APPLICATION OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS.—Section 3 of the Statehood Convention Procedural Amendments Act of 1982 (sec. 1—135, D.C. Official Code) is hereby repealed.

(2) LIST OF ELECTED OFFICIALS.—Section 2(13) of the District of Columbia Elections Code of 1955 (sec. 1—1001.02(13), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''United States Senator and Representative,''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to elections occurring during 2008 and any succeeding year.

SEC. 9. NONSEVERABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.

If any provision of sections 3, 5(a), or 5(b) of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall be treated as invalid.

SEC. 10. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed—

(1) to permit residents of the District of Columbia to vote in elections for State or local office in the State of Maryland or to permit nonresidents of the District of Columbia to vote in elections for local office in the District of Columbia;

(2) to affect the power of Congress under article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution to exercise exclusive legislative authority over the District of Columbia; or

(3) to affect the powers of the Government of the District of Columbia under the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (except as specifically provided in this Act).

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to restore the Federal electoral rights of the residents of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.''.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 260 will be followed by 5-minute votes, if ordered, on adopting House Resolution 260; and suspending the rules and agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 66.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 198, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—198

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns

Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Radanovich
Young (FL)

□ 1156

Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. PASTOR changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 180, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 195, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

AYES—226

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Lewis (GA)
Radanovich
Rush
Taylor
Whitfield
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1205

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA FOR A CEREMONY COMMEMORATING THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 66, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 66.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—424

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
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)

Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
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
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Cramer
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Larson (CT)
Radanovich
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1213

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I call up the bill (H.R. 1433) 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the amendment printed in House Report 110–63 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1433

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007''.

SEC. 3. TREATMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

(a) REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whereas the District of Columbia is drawn from the State of Maryland, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the District of Columbia shall be considered a Congressional district for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives.

(2) NO REPRESENTATION PROVIDED IN SENATE.—The District of Columbia shall not be considered a State for purposes of representation in the Senate.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) INCLUSION OF SINGLE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEMBER IN REAPPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERS AMONG STATES.—Section 22 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress'', approved June 28, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) This section shall apply with respect to the District of Columbia in the same manner as this section applies to a State, except that the District of Columbia may not receive more than one Member under any reapportionment of Members.''.

(2) CLARIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS ON BASIS OF 23RD AMENDMENT.—Section 3 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by striking ''come into office;'' and inserting the following: ''come into office (subject to the twenty-third article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the case of the District of Columbia);''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS REGARDING APPOINTMENTS TO SERVICE ACADEMIES.—

(1) UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.—Section 4342 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (5); and

(B) in subsection (f), by striking ''the District of Columbia,''.

(2) UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.—Such title is amended—

(A) in section 6954(a), by striking paragraph (5); and

(B) in section 6958(b), by striking ''the District of Columbia,''.

(3) UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.—Section 9342 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (5); and

(B) in subsection (f), by striking ''the District of Columbia,''.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection and the amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date on which a Representative from the District of Columbia takes office for the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

SEC. 4. INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) PERMANENT INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—Effective with respect to the One Hundred Tenth Congress and each succeeding Congress, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 437 Members, including any Members representing the District of Columbia pursuant to section 3(a).

(b) REAPPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERS RESULTING FROM INCREASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress'', approved June 28, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(a)), is amended by striking ''the then existing number of Representatives'' and inserting ''the number of Representatives established with respect to the One Hundred Tenth Congress''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the regular decennial census conducted for 2010 and each subsequent regular decennial census.

(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR PERIOD PRIOR TO 2012 REAPPORTIONMENT.—

(1) TRANSMITTAL OF REVISED STATEMENT OF APPORTIONMENT BY PRESIDENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to Congress a revised version of the most recent statement of apportionment submitted under section 22(a) of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress'', approved June 28, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(a)), to take into account this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(2) REPORT BY CLERK.—Not later than 15 calendar days after receiving the revised version of the statement of apportionment under paragraph (1), the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with section 22(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 2a(b)), shall send to the executive of each State a certificate of the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled under section 22 of such Act, and shall submit

a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives identifying the State (other than the District of Columbia) which is entitled to one additional Representative pursuant to this section.

(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTION OF ADDITIONAL MEMBER.—During the One Hundred Tenth Congress, the One Hundred Eleventh Congress, and the One Hundred Twelfth Congress—

(A) notwithstanding the Act entitled ''An Act for the relief of Doctor Ricardo Vallejo Samala and to provide for congressional redistricting'', approved December 14, 1967 (2 U.S.C. 2c), the additional Representative to which the State identified by the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the report submitted under paragraph (2) is entitled shall be elected from the State at large; and

(B) the other Representatives to which such State is entitled shall be elected on the basis of the Congressional districts in effect in the State for the One Hundred Ninth Congress.

(d) ADJUSTMENT OF PERCENTAGE LIMITATION ON THE USE OF THE PRECEDING YEAR'S TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The table in clause (i) of section 6654(d)(1)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to limitation on use of preceding year's tax) is amended by striking ''110'' and inserting ''110.003''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. REPEAL OF OFFICE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATE.

(a) REPEAL OF OFFICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 202 and 204 of the District of Columbia Delegate Act (Public Law 91–405; sections 1–401 and 1–402, D.C. Official Code) are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such sections are restored or revived as if such sections had not been enacted.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date on which a Representative from the District of Columbia takes office for the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS CODE OF 1955.—The District of Columbia Elections Code of 1955 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 1 (sec. 1–1001.01, D.C. Official Code), by striking ''the Delegate to the House of Representatives,'' and inserting ''the Representative in the Congress,'' .

(2) In section 2 (sec. 1–1001.02, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) by striking paragraph (6); and

(B) in paragraph (13), by striking ''the Delegate to Congress for the District of Columbia,'' and inserting ''the Representative in the Congress,''.

(3) In section 8 (sec. 1–1001.08, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''Delegate'' and inserting ''Representative''; and

(B) by striking ''Delegate,'' each place it appears in subsections (h)(1)(A), (i)(1), and (j)(1) and inserting ''Representative in the Congress,''.

(4) In section 10 (sec. 1–1001.10, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)(A)—

(i) by striking ''or section 206(a) of the District of Columbia Delegate Act'', and

(ii) by striking ''the office of Delegate to the House of Representatives'' and inserting ''the office of Representative in the Congress'';

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''Delegate,'' each place it appears; and

(C) in subsection (d)(2)—

(i) by striking ''(A) In the event'' and all that follows through ''term of office,'' and inserting ''In the event that a vacancy occurs in the office of Representative in the Congress before May 1 of the last year of the Representative's term of office,'' and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B).

(5) In section 11(a)(2) (sec. 1–1001.11(a)(2), D.C. Official Code), by striking ''Delegate to the House of Representatives,'' and inserting ''Representative in the Congress,''.

(6) In section 15(b) (sec. 1–1001.15(b), D.C. Official Code), by striking ''Delegate,'' and inserting ''Representative in the Congress,''.

(7) In section 17(a) (sec. 1–1001.17(a), D.C. Official Code), by striking ''the Delegate to the Congress from the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Representative in the Congress''.

SEC. 7. NONSEVERABILITY OF PROVISIONS.

If any provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, is declared or held invalid or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of this Act and any amendment made by this Act shall be treated and deemed invalid and shall have no force or effect of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate shall not exceed 1 hour and 20 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

This is an historic moment indeed. I am honored to lead the floor management of a bill that we have been waiting so long to debate and hopefully move forward from the House of Representatives.

This is an important moment in American history. We must now act to discontinue the disenfranchisement of citizens in the Nation's Capital. We must act to complete the important unfinished business of our democracy.

All of you here are all too familiar with the struggle for D.C. voting rights. I remember Chairman Emanuel Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, when the House gave the District a vote in 1967. I remember Delegate Walter Fauntroy's and Senator Ed Brooke's pursuit of the District's representation in 1978. I have now had the privilege of working with the distinguished gentlewoman, the Delegate from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, a tireless, relentless, brilliant advocate of the effort that brings us here today.

Right now we are attempting to resolve what could not be resolved before, through the bipartisan efforts of so many. Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CANNON of Utah, Mr. MATHESON and Mr. BISHOP have gotten us this far today, but I would be remiss if I did not name the former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, JIM SENSENBRENNER, who helped bring us so close to passage of this legislation in the last Congress. I thank all of you for the important work that has led us to this great and wonderful day.

Now, the bill before us today has a novel proposal, but it is one that we have seen before. We are now here today to finish the important work on this measure that we almost completed when we adjourned the last Congress. We are here today to finish the job.

As the only democracy in the world where citizens living in the capital city are denied their representation in the National Legislature, we come here to repair this obvious defect. Nearly 600,000 people who call the District of Columbia home, who pay taxes, who fight and die in the military, do not have a vote in the Congress. They do not have a vote in the Congress. That is what brings us here today. I am talking about people like one of its citizens, Andy Shallal, a local business owner and an Iraqi American.

Thousands of American soldiers, including District residents, have given their lives in fighting for democracy in Iraq. Because of their sacrifice, Andy can vote for the national legislature in Iraq but is denied a vote for his own Member of Congress in Washington, District of Columbia.

So District residents like Andy and all those who share the responsibilities of U.S. citizenship deserve voting representation in this Congress, and I believe that most in this body agree with me. I believe that H.R. 1433 is a sound policy response to this inequity. While some have raised questions and we have debated, we have had constitutional scholars from across the country join us in analyzing the way that we have put this measure together. I am totally and confidently satisfied that we have a bill that passes constitutional muster. We have a bill that can finally end the disenfranchisement of District residents.

The legislation relies obviously on Article I, section 8, clause 17, which provides Congress with the authority to give the District a vote. The Supreme Court has held that Congress's exclusive authority over the District is ''national in the highest sense.'' The D.C. Circuit Court has held that the Congress has ''extraordinary and plenary power'' over the District. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals has found the District Clause to be ''sweeping and inclusive in character.''

Distinguished conservatives, we emphasize that this is not a partisan measure. Thoughtful scholars like Viet Dinh, judges and scholars like Ken Starr, whom I have never cited or quoted before now, and our former colleague Jack Kemp, just to name a few, agree that the Congress has the power through simple legislation to give the District of Columbia a vote.

We have used the District Clause to treat the District like a State repeatedly: for diversity jurisdiction, for 11th amendment immunity, for alcohol regulation, for interstate transportation, for apprentice labor, for the collection

of State income taxes, the list goes on and on. Surely, we cannot say that we cannot give them, the District residents, a vote in the same way that we have handled so many other matters.

I am confident that we can pair the District of Columbia with Utah and give Utah an at-large seat. Article I, section 4 gives Congress ultimate authority over Federal elections. The one person, one vote principle will be left intact. No vote will be compromised or diluted. None of their vote will be lost, nor will it be expanded. Utah voters will be given an equal opportunity to elect an at-large Representative on a temporary basis and a District Representative.

This fight has been long, 200 years too long. We can debate this issue to no end, but at the end of the day, if District residents remain disenfranchised, we ought to be ashamed. We have a sound, bipartisan proposal before us, and I am happy to entertain the discussion on both sides of the aisle that will proceed at this time.

I want to thank those of our Republican colleagues in the House who have already seen fit to make it clear that they, too, will be joining with us to make this a bipartisan solution to an old problem. I am proud to think and hope that D.C. disenfranchisement will come to an end.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this legislation because it is clearly unconstitutional. While the bill may be well-intentioned, as Members of Congress, we swear an oath to support our Constitution. We cannot gloss over its deficiencies.

At the Judiciary Committee hearing on this bill, Professor Jonathan Turley, someone the majority consults frequently for his views, said, ''Permit me to be blunt, I consider this act to be the most premeditated unconstitutional act by Congress in decades.''

Supporters of this bill claim Congress owes the authority to enact this bill under a broad reading of the so-called District Clause in Article I, section 8. However, Article I, section 2 says, ''The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States.'' Since D.C. is not a State, it cannot have a voting Member in the House.

This was an issue that was clearly raised, debated and rejected by the Founding Fathers. Alexander Hamilton offered an amendment to the Constitution during the New York ratification convention that would have allowed Congress to provide the District with congressional representation, but his amendment was rejected by the convention on July 22, 1788.

More recently in 2000, a Federal district court here in D.C. spoke on the issue, stating, ''We conclude from our analysis of the text that the Constitution does not contemplate that the District may serve as a State for purposes of the apportionment of congressional representatives.''

The House Judiciary Committee has already spoken on this point as well in the 95th Congress. Under the leadership of Democratic Chairman Peter Rodino, the Judiciary Committee reported out a constitutional amendment to do what this bill purports to be able to do by statute. The report accompanying that constitutional amendment stated the following, ''If the citizens of the District are to have voting representation in the Congress, a constitutional amendment is essential; statutory action alone will not suffice.''

Congress passed that constitutional amendment in 1978, but it failed to get the approval of three-quarters of the States over a 7-year period. In fact, only 16 of the 38 States required for its ratification supported the amendment.

So what is being attempted by the legislation before us today is something long recognized as requiring a constitutional amendment that the vast majority of States have already failed to approve. Proponents of this legislation cite a 1949 Supreme Court case called Tidewater, but the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service issued a report analyzing that case. It concluded that ''at least six of the Justices who participated in what appears to be the most relevant Supreme Court case, National Mutual Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia v. Tidewater Transfer Co., authored opinions rejecting the proposition that Congress's power under the District Clause was sufficient to effectuate structural changes to the political structures of the Federal Government.

''Further, the remaining three judges, who found that Congress could grant diversity jurisdiction to District of Columbia citizens despite the lack of such jurisdiction in Article III, specifically limited their opinion to instances where there was no extension of anymore fundamental right,'' such as the right to vote for a Member of Congress.

□ 1230

The unconstitutional approach of this bill is completely unnecessary. Most of the District of Columbia, other than a few Federal buildings, could simply be returned to the State of Maryland. That process of retrocession is clearly allowed by the Constitution. It would grant representation to those in Washington D.C., by a simple majority vote, and they would then have representation in both the House and Senate, an improvement over this bill that limits representation only to the House.

Any discrepancies regarding the number of electorates granted to D.C. by the 23rd amendment could easily be corrected through a constitutional amendment once D.C. Members were represented in Congress through retrocession. Madam Speaker, even conceding for purposes of argument the proponents' interpretation of the vast breadth of the District clause, this bill unfairly subjects many citizens to unequal treatment.

H.R. 1433 grants Utah an additional Representative that will run at-large or statewide. The at-large provision creates a situation this country has not seen since the development of the Supreme Court's line of cases affirming the principle of ''one man, one vote.''

Under this provision, voters in Utah would be able to vote for two Representatives, their district representative and the at-large representative, whereas voters in every other State would only be able to vote for their one district representative. The result would be that Utah voters would have disproportionately more voting power compared to the voters of every other State.

There is no question D.C. residents have fought bravely in wars and served their country in a variety of ways. That is interesting, even heartrending, but irrelevant to whether or not this legislation is constitutional.

I also ask this House to consider the serious, practical consequences of passing this legislation. The inevitable legal challenge to this bill could produce legislative chaos by placing into doubt any future legislation passed in Congress by a one-vote margin.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill because it is clearly unconstitutional, and, if enacted, could lead to years of protracted legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds, and I include for the RECORD the 25 legal scholars of constitutional authority who have already weighed in on this bill, plus the former elected officials and former Senators and Members of Congress and Presidential appointees that have all examined this with great care and find that it is not constitutionally defective.

DC VOTE,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2007.

25 LEGAL SCHOLARS SUPPORT
CONSTITUTIONALITY OF DC VOTING RIGHTS

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: DC residents pay federal income taxes, serve on juries and die in wars to defend American democracy, but they do not have voting representation in the Congress.

This lack of representation is inconsistent with our nation's core democratic principles. Justice Hugo Black put it well in Wesberry v. Sanders in 1964: ''No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live. Other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined.''

Congress is currently considering granting voting rights to Americans living in Washington, DC. Lawmakers have been faced with questions about the constitutionality of extending the right to vote to residents of a ''non-state.''

As law professors and scholars, we would like to address these questions and put to

rest any concerns about the constitutionality of extending the right of representation to residents of the District.

While the language of the Constitution literally requires that House members be elected ''by the People of the Several states,'' Congress has not always applied this language so literally. For example, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act allows U.S. citizens living abroad to vote in congressional elections in their last state of residence—even if they are no longer citizens there, pay any taxes there, or have any intent to return.

To fully protect the interests of people living in the capital, the Framers gave Congress extremely broad authority over all matters relating to the federal district under Article I, §8, clause 17 (the ''District Clause''). Courts have ruled that this clause gives Congress ''extraordinary and plenary power'' over DC and have upheld congressional treatment of DC as a ''state'' for purposes of diversity jurisdiction and interstate commerce, among other things. Article III provides that courts may hear cases ''between citizens of different states'' (diversity jurisdiction). The Supreme Court initially ruled that under this language, DC residents could not sue residents of other states. But in 1940, Congress began treating DC as a state for this purpose—a law upheld in D.C. v. Tidewater Transfer Co. (1949).

The Constitution also allows Congress to regulate commerce ''among the several states,'' which, literally, would exclude DC. But Congress' authority to treat DC as a ''state'' for Commerce Clause purposes was upheld in Stoughtenburg v. Hennick (1889).

We believe, under the same analysis of the Constitution, that Congress has the power through ''simple'' legislation to provide voting representation in Congress for DC residents.

Sincerely,

Sheryll D. Cashin, Georgetown University Law Center; Viet D. Dinh, Georgetown University Law Center; Charles J. Ogletree, Harvard Law School; Jamin Raskin, American University Washington College of Law; Samuel R. Bagenstos, Washington University Law School; Brian L. Baker, San Joaquin College of Law; William W. Bratton, Georgetown University Law Center; Richard Pierre Claude, University of Maryland; Sherman Cohn, Georgetown University Law Center; Peter Edelman, Georgetown University Law Center; James Forman Jr., Georgetown University Law Center; David A. Gantz, The University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law.

Michael Gottesman, Georgetown University Law Center; Michael Greenberger, University of Maryland; Pat King, Georgetown University Law Center; Charles R. Lawrence III, Georgetown University Law Center; Paul Steven Miller, University of Washington School of Law; James Oldham, Georgetown University Law Center; Christopher L. Peterson University of Florida, Levin College of Law; Robert Pitofsky, Georgetown University Law Center; David Schultz, University of Minnesota; Girardeau A. Spann, Georgetown University Law Center; Ronald S. Sullivan Jr., Yale Law School; Roger Wilkins, George Mason University; Wendy Williams, Georgetown University Law Center.

DC VOTE,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2007.

Re 25 former elected and appointed officials support DC Voting Rights Act.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We are writing to ask you to extend the basic American right of voting representation in Congress to Americans living in our nation's capital.

Citizens living in Washington, DC pay federal taxes, serve on juries, and send their family members to protect our nation during times of war. They should no longer be denied the very essence of our democratic ideals.

Representative Tom Davis, Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton, and many others have reached across party lines in crafting a bill, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007 (DC Voting Rights Act, H.R. 1433), which corrects this injustice by providing Washingtonians with a full voting member of the U.S. House of Representatives for the first time in the history of our country. These members of Congress should be congratulated for their principled courage and patriotism.

The time has come for all DC residents to have a vote in our national legislature. We ask that you support this bill so that Washingtonians will enjoy the fundamental, democratic right to representation—a right which, as a nation, we are promoting all around the world.

Sincerely,

Jack Kemp, Julius W. Becton, Jr., Ed Brooke, Lawrence Eagleburger, Eric Holder, Thomas P. Melady, Susan Molinari, J.C. Watts, Harris Wofford.

Clifford Alexander, Jim Blanchard, Dale Bumpers, Peter Edelman, Frank Keating, Kweisi Mfume, Sharon Pratt, Togo West.

John Anderson, Sherwood Boehlert, Tom Daschle, Alexis Herman, Timothy May, George Mitchell, Michael Steele, Anthony A. Williams.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this important legislation, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act, is designed to do one thing, enfranchise Americans fully with a voting representative in the House of Representatives. I have the great honor of representing the great State of Maryland. Maryland, at the request of the Federal Government, gave some square miles of its State to our Federal Government and to the people of America.

At that time there were Marylanders living, just a few, but Marylanders living within the confines of what was to become the District of Columbia. Now, this was post-1787, so that the miracle in Philadelphia did not contemplate disenfranchising those voters in the various States, as my friend from Texas mentioned, because the residents that then became, because of the generosity of the State of Maryland, residents of that Federal district, were then residents of the several States.

Washington, D.C. is the only capital in a democracy in the world, in the entire world, that does not have a voting representative in its parliament, in the world. Clearly, the successor residents of the District of Columbia succeed residents of the several States. The continued disenfranchisement of more than half a million Americans is unconscionable, is indefensible and wrong.

Since 1801, when Washington, D.C. became this Nation's capital, the citizens of the District of Columbia have not had representation in the Congress, not in the House of Representatives and not in the Senate. It is wrong, as a matter of principle, because District citizens pay Federal taxes, sit on juries and serve on our Armed Forces, like all other Americans who enjoy full representation in this body do.

If they move tomorrow to Maryland or to Virginia or to Texas or to California, they will be fully enfranchised. They are not second-class citizens, but the area in which they live is being treated as a second-class area, this, the Nation's capital. You cannot cite another capital in the world that does that if they allow any of their voters to be represented in a true democratic institution.

It is wrong politically, because District citizens since 1801 have effectively been a ward of Congress without the opportunity to make their voice felt on the legislation that affects only them. Ironically on this bill, we are going to again have a motion to recommit, which affects only the residents of the District of Columbia.

It is wrong, I suggest to you, morally as well, because the United States professes to have the truest form of representative government in human history. We are proud of that, rightfully so. Yet we deprive the citizens of this Nation's capital of their voice in their national legislature.

Let me add, the United States is the only representative democracy, as I have said, that does that. The absence of representation in Congress for District citizens underscores the failure of the Congress to use the authority vested in it, by the Constitution, to correct an injustice.

I want to say to my friends in this body, so many of you have voted ''aye'' on propositions that only recently the Supreme Court of the United States has said are unconstitutional. You put in language to say, oh, well, it's constitutional because of X, Y and Z, to try to substitute our judgment for the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, but repeatedly you have voted for legislation which the Supreme Court has said is unconstitutional, and you know it.

We have spent $379 billion, 3,200 lives. We will vote tomorrow on a bill that seeks to spend $100 billion more so that the citizens of Baghdad, the citizens of Baghdad can have a parliament in which the citizens of Baghdad have a vote; but too many will vote not to give the same right to our sisters and brothers who live in the District of Columbia.

The authority I refer to for the constitutionality of this is, of course, Article I, section 8 of the Constitution, is the so-called seat of government clause, under which ''The Congress shall have power . . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever,'' exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, for as I remind you, those residents of the several States or their successors, who are now residents of the District of Columbia.

Plain and simple, this sweeping language gives Congress ''extraordinary and plenary'' powers over our Nation's capital city, including the authority to adopt legislation to enfranchise the District's 550,000 Americans with a full vote in this House.

I am far from alone in my view of Article I, section 8. Twenty-five legal scholars, which have just been entered into the RECORD, make that assertion.

As the chairman of the committee, I am not used to quoting Kenneth Starr, and I quote Kenneth Starr, not as the supreme expert, but certainly as not a partisan of my party.

In fact, I would remind every Member of this House, this bill was reported out of the Republican-chaired, Republican-majority Government Reform Committee just last Congress.

Mr. DAVIS is a cosponsor, not only a Republican leader, but the former chairman of a committee and former chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, not just a back-bencher, but a leader in the party, who said this is constitutional, but in any event, it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Starr's tightly reasoned testimony before the House Government Reform Committee in 2004 in favor of the substance of today's measure should be required reading for every Member of the body who believes that somehow this may be a partisan vote. In fact, as we mentioned, we give to Utah as well, as has been historical practice, to usually do two at a time, as we did Alaska and Hawaii.

That doesn't unusually enfranchise, I would suggest, Utah's voters. I come from a State that had an at-large Representative for most of the 1960s. His name was Carlton Sickles. He lived in the county in which I grew up. He was an at-large Representative, yes, before Reynolds v. Sims and Baker v. Carr, but that was for the State legislature purposes. He was an at-large Representative in the State of Maryland. I am not sure that anybody here served with him.

We, the Members of this House, must never be seduced into thinking there is such a thing as settled injustice. Here me, settled injustice. The author of the Dred Scott decision was a Marylander. There is a statue of him, a bust of him, as you enter the old Supreme Court Chamber.

That was the constitutional law. It was wrong. It was wrong legally, it was wrong ethically, and it was certainly wrong morally. It is time, my friends, in this body, today, to stand up, speak out for democracy and justice for our fellow Americans. If we can fight for democracy in Baghdad, we can vote for democracy in Washington, D.C.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I certainly agree with the majority leader on one point that he made and that is that Washington, D.C. is distinctive. However, it is especially distinctive because it is the only capital in the world that exists under the U.S. Constitution, and that is why this bill is unconstitutional.

Madam Speaker, I include for printing in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy in opposition to this bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY: H.R. 1433—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 2007

(DEL. NORTON (D) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND 17 COSPONSORS)

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H.R. 1433. The bill violates the Constitution's provisions governing the composition and election of the United States Congress. Accordingly, if H.R. 1433 were presented to the President, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

The Constitution limits representation in the House to representatives of States. Article I, Section 2 provides: ''The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State legislature.'' The Constitution also contains 11 other provisions expressly linking congressional representation to Statehood.

The District of Columbia is not a State. Accordingly, congressional representation for the District of Columbia would require a constitutional amendment. Advocates of congressional representation for the District have long acknowledged this. As the House Judiciary Committee stated in recommending passage of such a constitutional amendment in 1975:

''If the citizens of the District are to have voting representation in the Congress, a constitutional amendment is essential; statutory action alone will not suffice. This is the case because provisions for elections of Senators and Representatives in the Constitution are stated in terms of the States, and the District of Columbia is not a State.''

Courts have reached the same conclusion. In 2000, for example, a three-judge panel concluded ''that the Constitution does not contemplate that the District may serve as a state for purposes of the apportionment of congressional representatives.'' *Adams* v. *Clinton*, 90 F. Supp. 2d 35, 46–47 (D.D.C. 2000). The Supreme Court affirmed that decision. And just two months ago, Congress's own Research Service found that, without a constitutional amendment, it is ''likely that the Congress does not have authority to grant voting representation in the House of Representatives to the District of Columbia.''

Recent claims that H.R. 1433 should be viewed as an exercise of Congress's ''exclusive'' legislative authority over the District of Columbia as the seat of the Federal government are not persuasive. Congress's exercise of legislative authority over the District of Columbia is qualified by other provisions of the Constitution, including the Article I requirement that representation in the House of Representatives is limited to the ''several States.'' Congress cannot vary that constitutional requirement under the guise of the ''exclusive legislation'' clause, a clause that provides the same legislative authority over Federal enclaves like military bases as it does over the District.

For all the foregoing reasons, enacting H.R. 1433's extension of congressional representation to the District would be unconstitutional. It would also call into question (by subjecting to constitutional challenge in the courts) the validity of all legislation passed by the reconstituted House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), a former chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, the Judiciary Committee is supposed to be the legislative guardian of the Constitution. Unfortunately in this instance, the majority gets an F. This bill is fraught with constitutional questions.

All I need to do is to go back to the report that was issued by then-Chairman Peter Rodino, a Democratic and a liberal icon, when he reported out a constitutional amendment enfranchising the District of Columbia in 1978. That committee report clearly said that giving a vote to the representative of the District of Columbia in this House could not be done statutorily.

□ 1245

And that is exactly what is happening today. And not only can't it be done statutorily, but the Rules Committee last night played a partisan card. It rejected all proposed amendments, including constructive amendments that eliminate some of the legal and constitutional problems relating to the at-large seat in Utah, as well as an amendment offered by my friend from Texas (Mr. SMITH) to have an expedited review of the United States Supreme Court, a review that we gave to the McCain-Feingold law on campaign finance.

There are constitutional questions on this issue. And in the year 2000, the Federal court of D.C. expressly said that, ''We conclude from our analysis that the text of the Constitution does not contemplate that the District may serve as a State for purposes of apportionment of congressional representatives.'' That case was Adams v. Clinton that was decided in the year 2000. Now, that was the more recent case than the Tidewater case which is being used by the proponents of this legislation as saying that the District clause allows us to do this.

Now, rather than enfranchising the citizens of the District in a constitutionally questionable manner, why not do it in a way that is very clearly constitutional? There are three ways to do this, all of which have been rejected by the majority. One is to repropose the amendment to the Constitution which failed in 1978. Second is to admit the non-Federal part of the District as a separate State, with two Senators and two Representatives. That was rejected in 1993, but could be reintroduced. And the third is to retrocede the non-Federal part of the District to Maryland. We can do it the right way. Those are the right ways; this is the wrong way.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out that a constitutional amendment could take 10 years, who knows, to have a part of a State ceded back. The three methods that have been suggested by

the former chairman of Judiciary Committee, who has worked very hard on this, are, in effect, impractical.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to recognize the chairman of the Constitutional Subcommittee on the Judiciary, Mr. NADLER, who has done extraordinary work in this regard, 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, it is a disgrace, a blot on our Nation that the citizens of our Capital do not have a voice in Congress.

Whatever technical issues there may be with respect to rectifying this problem, we must never lose sight of the fact that our democracy is permanently stained by the disenfranchisement of a large group of our citizens who pay taxes, serve in our wars, work in our government, and bear all the responsibilities, but do not have all the rights of citizenship.

Whether you took a cab to work today or rode the Metro or bought a cup of coffee or walked down the sidewalk or were protected by a police officer, your safety, your livelihood, every aspect of your life was made possible by people who have no vote in our democratic society. There is no excuse for that.

Now, we have heard from people who say, well, we should change this, but let's amend the Constitution. We have tried that. Very difficult.

We have heard from people who say, well, we should change this, but let's do it another way that will take forever and that haven't worked. This way we are told, doing it by statute, giving the District of Columbia a vote in the House by statute, is unconstitutional.

Well, it is not unconstitutional. The fact is the Constitution says that the Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District, as may, by cession of particular States, become the seat of the Government of the United States. Exclusive jurisdiction. Very plenary power.

The Constitution also says in Article III, discussing the powers of Federal courts: The judicial power shall extend to controversies between citizens of different States, so-called diversity jurisdiction.

One of the earlier cases cited by the Supreme Court was that citizens of the District of Columbia have standing to go into Federal court and sue citizens of a different State, of any State under diversity jurisdiction, because the District of Columbia, for that purpose at least, is considered a State, and the Supreme Court was very clear on this. And if the District of Columbia is a State for purposes of diversity jurisdiction under Article III of the Constitution, there is no reason why Congress cannot take advantage of that fact and legislate under its exclusive jurisdiction clause that the District of Columbia is a State for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives.

The judicial cases are fairly clear. We have ample constitutional authority to do this, and we should take that up. Let those who are opposed to American citizens having taxation without representation, let those who are supportive of American citizens be subjected to taxation without representation, let those who are opposed to American citizens having the full rights of citizens, let them go to court and argue that it is unconstitutional. Let us assert our authority, because we believe it is constitutional. The courts will ultimately decide if the Bush administration continues to oppose this bill and has threatened to veto.

What I don't hear from the administration is any concern about the injustice of depriving D.C. citizens of the right to vote, which speaks volumes about the administration's hostility to voting rights.

If we are to have the audacity to hold ourselves out to the world as a beacon of freedom and democracy, if we want to lecture other countries about the importance of freedom and democracy, as this Congress and the President regularly seek to do, we need to clean up our own House. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, a member of the Judiciary Committee and a former attorney general of the State of California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, after listening to several Members on the other side of the aisle, I can only come to one conclusion; and that is, the U.S. Constitution is an inconvenient thing.

We have heard that it may take too long to do it the constitutional way. We have even heard suggested here that, if you oppose this, you are against voting rights.

Well, as a former prosecutor, I can tell you I am absolutely, morally convinced of certain people who are not convicted of crimes they committed because of constitutional protections given them during trial; the Constitution was inconvenient, the Constitution did not allow us to do justice. But the Constitution prevailed, because if we ignore the Constitution, we ignore the very compact which is the basis of our relationship with our government. The vote today is more about the representational status of the District of Columbia in this body. It goes to the heart of constitutional governance.

Some in this House would have us believe that the Constitution is so sophisticated, so foreign, so strange that the words used, that only a few people can define its meaning, that the people of America are not capable of understanding the words of the Constitution, and, therefore, we should genuflect at the altar of the elite.

Well, let's look at the words. Article I, section 2 states very simply: The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen by the people of the several States. By the people of the several States.

It says in Article I, section 2: No person shall be a representative who shall not have attained the age of 25, been 7 years a citizens of the United States, and who shall not when elected be an inhabitant of the State in which he shall be chosen.

Madam Speaker, those words are so simple, and yet we try to make them so complicated. Let's at least uphold the Constitution in this debate.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. I refer the former attorney general of the State of California to the list we have right now about 10 decisions in which reviews, under the constitutional authority, D.C. as a State.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished lady, a member of the committee and who has served with great distinction on the House Judiciary Committee for constitutional questions, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE of Houston, Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. CONYERS, may I pay tribute to you? It gives me such a privilege to be able to come to this floor with you as the chairperson of the House Judiciary Committee, along with the ranking member, who is a friend and colleague from Texas. But it is a special honor, and it humbles many of us, because a lot of us were not here for the debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voter Rights Act of 1965. Many Americans think that that bill only pertains and helps people of color, but really what it does is it restores that legislation, the value and the preciousness of the right to vote for all Americans. I am gratified that Chairman CONYERS, who has a history with restoring the rights of Americans to vote, now finds himself on the floor in the doorway of history to be able to reaffirm the Constitution.

And I heard my good friend, and I am glad that you will hear from my colleague from Texas, Congressman AL GREEN, who spent a few days on the bench and I think would recognize a Constitution when he would see it. But I think this is important, because if the American people are listening, there is some suggestion, what kind of irreverent actions are occurring on this floor? Why are we ignoring the Constitution? And I take great umbrage with that. I am sensitive to that. My very fabric of my existence is embedded in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendment. I want the Constitution to be cherished, and I want it to be right.

So let me just recount for you why we can move from one section to the next, and it relates to the constitutionality of what we are doing. And I would only hope that my friends would not be rejecting this bill because, in fact, it is the District of Columbia. And let me remind America that Utah is given an opportunity for its citizens to be represented.

But in 1820, the Supreme Court held that Congress could impose Federal taxes on the District, and it was related to the provision in here that says

representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States. So we tax them based upon language in the Constitution that they equal the States.

Then in 1889, the Supreme Court found that the constitutional prohibition against State laws that interfere with commerce applies to States and the District of Columbia, again equating the District of Columbia to States.

And then in 1934, the Supreme Court found that Congress could treat the District of Columbia as a State.

So in the Constitution it says that: The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of several States.

But it also says that this Congress has jurisdiction in clause 17 under section 8 over the District of Columbia, and that is what we are doing here today. We are correcting a wrong, an ill. We are correcting a disease. We are equating this city to the rights of Iraqis, who are now able to vote for all of those they want to vote for, albeit it is in a troubled situation.

And so I would simply commend my colleagues to this, and to suggest that there was something wrong in the rule for not asking for an expedited Supreme Court review, my friends, the Supreme Court will be able to deliberate on this particular legislation in due time and be able to render a decision and expedited request warrants or suggests there should be a crisis. There was not an expedited request in the election of 2000, and the Supreme Court decided it in 4 or 5 days. For me, that was an emergency.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, if the gentlelady will yield, I ask her, why would we be asking for special standing, we in the Congress? Why would we be asking for an expedited review? Can't the courts decide who gets either of those two special privileges to come to the front of the line?

□ 1300

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the gentleman for his inquiry. He made a very good point: can't the courts reconcile the issues between the two parties on their own expedited time. They can. And that is the example I used with the issue in the election of 2000. As you well know, that case, Gore v. Bush, went to the United States Supreme Court on their own expediting, and a decision was made between four or five days.

My friends, this is a smoke-and-mirror issue. We welcome the Supreme Court's review. But today, we are holding up the Constitution, and I hope that as we hold it up, we will reflect upon those whose blood has been shed on behalf of this country, that we are giving them the right to vote legally, and under the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007, and thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his leadership in shepherding this important piece of legislation to the floor. Today we remove a stain that has blighted our Nation for more than 200 years of shame and correct an injustice to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1433 would permanently expand the U.S. House of Representatives from 435 to 437 seats, providing a new, at-large seat to Utah and a vote to the District of Columbia. Based on the 2000 Census, Utah is the State next in line to enlarge its congressional delegation. The bill does not give the District statehood, nor does it give the District representation in the Senate. Rather, in H.R. 1433 Congress is simply treating the District as a congressional district for the purposes of granting full House representation, as it can pursuant to the grant of plenary power over the District of Columbia conferred by the Constitution in article I, section 8, clause 17.

At the outset, let me address the claim that H.R. 1433 is a weak foundation upon which to base the District's voting rights in the House because it is a statutory rather a constitutionally based remedy. The argument should be rejected for the simple reason that it makes the perfect the enemy of the good. It is like asking a person to remain homeless while she saves to buy a house even though she has enough money to rent an apartment.

Madam Speaker, let us not lose sight of one indisputable and shameful fact: Nearly 500,000 people living in the District of Columbia lack direct voting representation in the House of Representatives and Senate. Residents of the District of Columbia serve in the military, pay billions of dollars in Federal taxes each year, and assume other responsibilities of U.S. citizenship. For over 200 years, the District has been denied voting representation in Congress—the entity that has ultimate authority over all aspects of the city's legislative, executive, and judicial functions.

Madam Speaker, if a person can be called upon to pay Federal taxes and serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, then he or she should at least have the opportunity to vote for a representative who could at least cast a symbolic vote in this Chamber on critical matters facing our Nation—issues like war and peace, equality and justice.

Madam Speaker, taxation without representation is tyranny. It is unconscionable that more than a half million American citizens are being unconscionably denied a vote and a voice in the most important legislative body in the world.

As a supporter of freedom, democracy, and equality, I believe that it is long overdue for the citizens of the District of Columbia to have a Representative in Congress who can vote on the vital legislation considered in this body.

Madam Speaker, it is wrong that we must be reminded daily by license plates in the District of Columbia that "Taxation without representation is tyranny." The people in Boston felt so strongly about this in 1775 that they rebelled in Boston Harbor, launching the "Boston Tea Party."

The principle that political authority derives from the consent of the government is no less applicable when it comes to the District of Columbia. Let us be clear. There is no dispute that hundreds of thousands of American citizens reside in the District of Columbia. We all agree that universal suffrage is the hallmark of a democratic regime, of which the United States is the world's leading exemplar.

None of us believes it is fair that citizens of the District of Columbia pay Federal taxes, risk life and limb fighting wars abroad to protect American democracy and extend the blessings of liberty to people living in foreign lands. In short, there is no moral reason to deny the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to full representation in Congress. The only question is whether Congress has the will and the constitutional authority to do so. As I will discuss, Congress has always had the constitutional authority. For the last 12 years, we have not had the will; but now we do.

CONGRESS CAN GRANT VOTING RIGHTS TO THE DISTRICT UNDER THE DISTRICT CLAUSE

As Professor Dinh argued in his powerful testimony before this Committee, Congress has ample constitutional authority to enact H.R. 1433 under the Constitution's "District Clause." Art. I, § 8, cl. 17. The District Clause empowers Congress to "exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District" and thus grants Congress plenary and exclusive authority to legislate all matters concerning the District. The text, history and structure of the Constitution, as well as judicial decisions and pronouncements in analogous or related contexts, confirms that this broad legislative authority extends to the granting of congressional voting rights for District residents.

The District Clause, which has been described by no less a constitutional authority as Judge Kenneth Starr as "majestic in its scope," gives Congress plenary and exclusive power to legislate for the District. Courts have held that the District Clause is "sweeping and inclusive in character" and gives Congress "extraordinary and plenary power" over the District. It empowers Congress to legislate within the District for "every proper purpose of government." Congress therefore possesses "full and unlimited jurisdiction to provide for the general welfare of citizens within the District of Columbia by any and every act of legislation which it may deem conducive to that end," subject, of course, to the negative prohibitions of the Constitution.

Although, the District is not a State for purposes of Congress's article I, section 2, clause 1, which states that Members of the House are chosen "by the people of the several States," this fact is not dispositive of Congress's authority under the District Clause to give residents of the District the same rights as citizens of a State. Since 1805, the Supreme Court has recognized that Congress has the authority to treat the District like a State, and Congress has repeatedly exercised this authority. No court has ever sustained a challenge to Congress's exercise of its power under the District Clause.

Two related Supreme Court cases illustrate this point. In *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey*, 6 U.S. 445 (1805), the Court held that the diversity jurisdiction provision of article III, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution excluded citizens of the District of Columbia. The Court observed, however, that it was "extraordinary" that residents of the District should be denied the same access to Federal courts provided to aliens and State residents, and invited Congress to craft a solution, noting that the matter was "a subject for legislative, not judicial consideration."

Congress accepted that invitation 145 years later and enacted legislation that explicitly granted District residents access to Federal

courts on diversity grounds. That legislation was upheld by the Supreme Court in 1949 in *National Mutual Insurance Company* v. *Tidewater Transfer Company,* 337 U.S. 582 (1949). A plurality of the Court led by Justice Jackson held that Congress could for this purpose treat District residents as though they were State residents pursuant to its authority under the District Clause. The two concurring justices would have gone even further; they argued that Hepburn should be overruled and that the District should be considered a State for purposes of Article III.

Tidewater strongly supports Congress's authority to provide the District a House Representative via simple legislation. As the plurality explained, because Congress unquestionably had the greater power to provide District residents diversity-based jurisdiction in special article I courts, it surely could accomplish the more limited result of granting District residents diversity-based access to existing article III courts. Similarly, Congress's authority to grant the District full rights of statehood—or grant its residents voting rights through retrocession—by simple legislation suggests that it may, by simple legislation, take the more modest step of providing citizens of the District with a voice in the House of Representatives. Indeed, since Congress has granted voting representation to residents of Federal enclaves in *Evans* v. *Cornman*, 398 U.S. 419 (1970), and to Americans living abroad through the Overseas Voting Act, there is no reason to suppose that Congress has less ability to provide voting representation to the residents of the Nation's capital.

II. CONGRESS MAY DIRECT THE NEXT-ENTITLED STATE TO ELECT ITS ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE

H.R. 1433 also grants an additional congressional seat to the State of Utah as the next-entitled State and directs that State to elect its additional Representative at large, rather than creating an additional single-Member district. Congress plainly has the authority to do so. This statutory scheme does not violate the ''one person, one vote'' principle.

As the Supreme Court held in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964), ''the command of Article I, Section 2 [of the Constitution], that Representatives be chosen 'by the People of the Several States' means that as nearly as is practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's.'' In that case the Court struck down a Georgia apportionment statute because it created a congressional district that had two-to-three times as many residents as Georgia's nine other congressional districts. The Court stated:

> The apportionment statute thus contracts the value of some votes and expands that of others. If the Federal Constitution intends that when qualified voters elect members of Congress each vote be given as much weight as any other vote, then this statute cannot stand.

''One person, one vote'' concerns arise when congressional districts within a State contain different numbers of residents, diluting the voting power of residents in the district with more residents. In contrast, here the proposed temporary ''at large'' district in Utah does not dilute the voting power of any Utah voter.

When Utah holds its at-large election for the new fourth seat, Utah voters may cast a vote in their existing district and in the statewide election for the fourth seat. While it is true that the statewide ''at large'' district will necessarily contain more residents than the other districts, the establishment of that ''at large'' district would create no constitutional dilution concerns. Each person's vote in the ''at large'' district would have equal influence, and the opportunity to cast that vote would not alter in any way the value of that person's vote in her own smaller district.

Nor does a potential ''one person, one vote'' challenge arise on the ground that Utah residents vote in two elections while residents of other States with single-member districts would vote only once. First, the Supreme Court has never held that the ''one person, one vote'' principle applies to the apportionment process. Indeed, the Court has held that Congress is entitled to substantial deference in its apportionment decisions. Second, the proposed at-large election does not give residents of the State more or less voting power than the residents of States with single-Member districts. The example cited by Richard Bress, one of the witnesses who testified before the Judiciary Committee in support of the bill, illustrates why this is so.

Suppose that State A and State B have roughly the same population and are each entitled to four Representatives. State A holds an at-large election for all four of its Representatives, while State B divides its Representatives and voters into four districts. State A's statewide district would have a population four times the size of each district in State B. As compared to the single-district voter in State B, the ''at-large'' voter in State A has a one-fourth interest in each of four Representatives. The single-district voter in State B has a whole interest in one Representative. But in both scenarios, each voter has, in the aggregate, one whole voting interest.

Similarly, as compared to a State with four single-Member districts, the voters in Utah's existing three districts would have proportionately less influence in the election of the Representative from their own district, but would gain a fractional interest in the State's at-large Representative. In short, Utah residents would have no more—and no less—voting power than residents of any other State.

III. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, I believe H.R. 1433 is constitutionally unassailable. Granting voting rights to the citizens of the District of Columbia is a matter of simple justice. I know it is morally right. It is also long overdue. Let us end this injustice and be true to the better angels of our nature. I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 1433.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the deputy and ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it is important to look at the words of the Constitution themselves. It says very clearly, and this is Article I, section 2. This is what talks about who will comprise the House of Representatives, who will comprise the Congress. It says ''it shall be composed of members that come from the several States.'' It is very clear.

Now, all of the people that testified before the Judiciary Committee who were supporting this amendment through legislation said, well, they base that on section 8, which says we can exercise exclusive legislation over the district. But once you open that door you have opened Pandora's box, because that same clause, that same paragraph says, exercise like authority over all places, that should include things like places where we have forts, magazines, arsenals, dark yards and other needful buildings. Once you go there, then every military institution in America could have a representative. Every needful Federal building in America could have a representative. That is what happens when you start bending and twisting the Constitution.

Now, these arguments were had when the Constitution was written. Alexander Hamilton lost. And there is a good position that people should be able to elect their representative, and that was discussed. But I would submit to you that Washington, D.C. is also the only city in the entire country that every Senator and every Member of Congress has a vested interest in seeing that it works properly, that water works, sewer works, and no other city in America has that.

In conclusion, let me just say, south of Columbus, Georgia, used to be an old blacksmith iron work shop with a sign above the door that said ''All types of bending and twisting done here.'' And I would humbly submit the Constitution should not have the same sign on the front of it. The Constitution is clear. Let's don't bend and twist it.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute because the speaker from Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, a valuable member of Judiciary, a highly praised judge, and a supporter of gun rights too, incidentally ignores a decision that just came out of the federal court, just recently, within weeks, Parker v. Williams, which held that the second amendment renders the District's gun ban unconstitutional—which I was sorry to hear, but he probably wasn't—in that ''a well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to bear arms shall not be infringed.''

The court held that D.C. was a State for purposes of the Constitution's second amendment.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the rest of my time.

The gentlelady from Los Angeles, California, has come upon the floor. I know she wants to speak on this, and I recognize MAXINE WATERS from California for 3 minutes on this subject.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you so very much, Madam Speaker, and Chairman JOHN CONYERS.

A lot of people want to know what difference does it make that Democrats are now in the majority. This is a fine example. Chairman CONYERS and others have been working on this issue for so very long.

And I rise in support of H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

In a country where basic human and civil rights were only incrementally given to similarly situated citizens throughout its history, I applaud my colleagues for their courage and integrity to consider this measure and support its passage after 200 years of injustice.

I thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for their leadership and tenacity. Ms. NORTON has consistently fought for the 16 years since she was first elected to Congress as my classmate in the 102nd Congress.

Just like securing the right to vote, or securing civil rights, for that matter, for African Americans, women and other minorities was a long fight with slow rewards, seeking the franchisement of D.C. citizens has been equally as difficult.

Just as it was shameful and unconscionable for African Americans and women to not have a vote until the passage of the 19th amendment, and of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, it is unconscionable for tax-paying citizens in America not to have a vote in Congress in the 21st century.

It is even more ironic that D.C. citizens have no vote in Congress when it operates right in their back yard. To discriminate against tax-paying citizens for over 200 years is an embarrassment to our democracy and undermines fundamental constitutional principles.

Nowhere in the United States Constitution is the word ''State'' defined, but some of our colleagues now wish to gerrymander a definition that would somehow distinguish citizens of D.C. from citizens of every other voting State.

Furthermore, not only does the guaranty clause, which reads that ''the United States shall guarantee a republican form of government,'' but the fifth amendment equal protection clause, which insures that all persons of the United States enjoy equal protection of the laws, make it clear that D.C. citizens should receive voting representation.

Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution guarantees us a republican form of government. And the Supreme Court has defined a republican form of government as one constructed on the principle that the superior power resides in the body of the people. Are D.C. citizens not a part of the people?

Mr. Chairman, in this new Congress we hope to rid America of all traces of disenfranchisement, of impediments to voting. And giving D.C. residents a vote in the Congress is a major part of this goal.

I thank you, Congressman JOHN CONYERS, for your leadership.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia Voting Rights Act.

There is no doubt that citizens of the District of Columbia do not have a full voting representation in the House of Representatives. However, there are ways that these individuals can receive representation without trampling on the Constitution. Unfortunately, this bill is not one of them.

The Constitution does not mince words when it says that Members of Congress may only be elected from the States. Article I, section 2 states that the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.

The Constitution also does not mince words when it distinguishes the District of Columbia from a State. In describing the powers of the Congress, Article I, section 8 describes the seat of Federal Government as a district, not exceeding 10 miles square, as made by cessation of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States.

Furthermore, the text of the 23rd amendment to the Constitution further illustrates that the District was never meant to have the same rights as States. Specifically, it grants D.C. the power to appoint a number of electors, a President and Vice President, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the district would be entitled if it were a State.

The plain language of the Constitution is clear, that D.C. is not a State and that it is not granted the same rights as States. However, the constitutional problems with this bill do not end here. The bill would also establish an at-large representative for Utah, which would allow the citizens of Utah to vote twice, once for their local representative and another time for an at-large representative. This would clearly violate the constitutional principle of one man-one vote by granting Utah citizens disproportionately large voting power.

Finally, the procedure for bringing this bill to the floor is appalling. Debate has been eliminated on a bill that affects the relative voting power of citizens in each of our congressional districts. Ranking Member SMITH offered an amendment which would have provided for an expedited judicial review.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation which is clearly unconstitutional.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia house voting rights act.

There is no doubt that citizens of D.C. do not have a full voting representative in the house of Representatives. However, there are ways that these individuals can receive representation without trampling on the Constitution. Unfortunately, this bill is not one of them.

The Constitution does not mince words when it says that members of Congress may only be elected from the states. Article I Section 2 states that ''The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.'' The Constitution also does not mince words when it distinguishes the District of Columbia from a State. In describing the powers of the Congress, Article I Section 8 describes the seat of Federal Government as a ''District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cessation of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States.''

Furthermore, the text of the 23rd amendment to the Constitution further illustrates that the district was never meant to have the same rights as States. Specifically, it grants D.C. the power to appoint ''a number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State. . .''

The plain language of the Constitution is clear that D.C. is not a State and that it is not granted the same rights as States. However, the Constitutional problems with this bill do not end here. The bill would also establish an at-large representative for Utah, which would allow the citizens of Utah to vote twice—once for their local representative and another time for an at-large representative. This would clearly violate the Constitutional principle of ''one man, one vote'' by granting Utah citizens disproportionately large voting power.

Finally, the procedure for bringing this bill to the floor is appalling. Debate has been eliminated on a bill that affects the relative voting power of citizens in each of our congressional districts. Ranking member SMITH offered an amendment which would have provided for an expedited judicial review of the bill after it is enacted, to determine its constitutionality. It is revealing that the majority decided to block that amendment which would have settled the Constitutional concerns about this legislation.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this ill-crafted legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), a member of the Judiciary Committee and also a member of its Constitution Subcommittee.

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

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, it is an unusual day in which the cosponsor of a bill, not in just this Congress but in the previous Congress, comes to oppose the final passage. It is not that I object to the people of the District of Columbia gaining a vote in this body, just the opposite. For two Congresses I have worked with Chairman DAVIS, now Ranking Member DAVIS, to achieve that.

It is that, for whatever reason, in this Democratically controlled Congress, we have lost democracy. In the regular order of the two committees, amendments were offered, some were passed, some failed. One that was passed was one of mine. It intended to make clear the Maryland relationship to the District of Columbia. It was a

fairly small technical amendment. The Democrat majority, led by Speaker PELOSI, chose to strip that out of what was brought to the floor, to my amazement, but not amusement. And then when I offered the same amendment to the Rules Committee, they voted not to allow it. So that which was voted in the committee of jurisdiction was stripped out by the leadership and then refused to be considered in the body of the whole. That is without any democratic fairness.

I am not here to complain about process. I believed it was an essential piece of language when this legislation was considered. So without it, I feel I am compelled not only to vote against it, but to seek alternate remedies for future legislation.

We cannot, in this body, Madam Speaker, allow the Speaker of the House or the House majority leader to simply eliminate the tradition of how we do business in order to reach democratically produced legislation. So I will be voting against this bill, and it will be a vote against the kind of heavy-handedness that led to this bill being less than it could have been.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, we continue to reserve time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), a valued member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, the United States of America is the greatest Nation in human history. And that is due to a number of reasons, number of facts, number of truths that make that so. But certainly, one of those is the document we call the United States Constitution. And on giving the District of Columbia a voting Member in Congress, the United States Constitution could not be more clear. And let me just read what other Members have read: ''Article I, section 2, the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States. No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of 25 years and have been 7 years a citizen of the United States and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen. Further, when vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.''

State, State, State. Three different times the word State is used. The District of Columbia is not a State. I can't help that inconvenient fact, as someone has said earlier. But those are the facts. You don't have to be a lawyer. You don't have to be a judge. You don't have to sit on the Supreme Court to understand what the Constitution says.

This bill is unconstitutional, and that is why I oppose it.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), another valued member of the Judiciary Committee, and also the ranking member of one of its subcommittees.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and ranking member, Mr. SMITH, for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

I come to the floor here to stand up for this Constitution. That is my oath as it is all of our oaths here. We all stand here on the floor of Congress and take an oath to this Constitution, Madam Speaker. And the language in this Constitution has been many times stated. It is utterly clear. But I want to draw a distinction here that has not been emphasized very much and that is that if you can rationalize that the District of Columbia can constitutionally be conferred a Member by this Congress, then you also have to rationalize that same rationale that two Senators can be conferred upon the District of Columbia as well.

□ 1315

And I point your attention to, Madam Speaker, Article I, section 2 and the operative language: ''The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by,'' and this is the distinct language, ''by the people of the several States.''

In Article I, section 3, when you incorporate the 17th amendment into it, reads: ''The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State,'' just like a Member chosen by the State, but elected by the people thereof; elected by the people thereof in section 3; chosen by the people of the several States in section 2. They each reference ''States.'' There is not a distinction. If you can constitutionally confer a Member of Congress, you can do the same thing for Senators.

And I would point out also that a couple of bright legal minds that have weighed in on this, Ken Starr and Viet Dinh, people whom I do respect, also I believe they made an argument that is taught in law school: How do you analyze both sides of the argument so you can make both sides or defend either side?

And I think it is just an utterly weak argument that they made. And the simple principle was that between 1791 and 1801, that 10-year period of time, Virginia and Maryland, those residents that existed and lived in this District that was contemplated by the Framers of the Constitution were granted temporarily the right to vote in their respective States until such time as this Federal jurisdiction was established.

Just because there is consensus agreement among the House, the Senate, and the President does not constitute a constitutional principle.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Constitution Caucus and as a Representative of the State of New Jersey, I come to the floor to strongly oppose this unconstitutional taking away, diminution, and reducing of voting rights for citizens of my district in the State of New Jersey.

The sponsors of the bill do this in order to accommodate the equally unconstitutional creation of voting rights in an area of this country that is not a State. And it has been pointed out already that there is a legal and constitutional manner to enfranchise these people of the District of Columbia.

But in section 4.5 of the bill, the sponsor gives some citizens of another State, Utah, two votes in Congress for every one vote for my citizens in the State of New Jersey.

The Founding Fathers of this Nation never intended that one State would be more equal than another State. The Founding Fathers of this country never intended that Congress could strip away rights to vote from my State to give it to another. The Founding Fathers never intended that Congress would create a situation that one State would be second class to another State.

I urge my colleagues from New Jersey to vote against this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, I am glad that we are finally discussing the U.S. Constitution. So much legislation goes through this House from both sides where the Constitution is never mentioned as to whether it is constitutional or not.

No question about it: the folks in Washington, D.C. ought to be represented in the House. But the Constitution does not allow it except by constitutional amendment. And history is on the side of what I say.

The 23rd amendment to the Constitution that was approved in 1961 gives the District of Columbia and the people here representation or voting in the Presidential election by giving them three electors. It took a constitutional amendment to give them that right. The arguments were made then that are being made now. D.C. was not a State in 1961 any more than it is a State today.

So let us proceed. Let us proceed with a constitutional amendment if need be and give the folks in Washington, D.C. a representation in this House of Representatives. But do it the right way. Do it the constitutional way, not by just some legislation of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), a senior Member of this body.

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

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, I have a little bit different approach to this. I have been introducing a bill in several sessions which would provide for retrocession of the city of Washington, D.C. minus the Federal portion

to the State of Maryland. This would give the people who reside in Washington, D.C. a chance to vote on Senators. It would give them a chance to vote on legislators. It would give the people who live here a chance to participate in the university system, the highway system, economic development. A lot of things would accrue to the benefit of the people if we would have retrocession of the city minus the Federal portion.

There is precedent for this in the fact that originally we had a portion of it retrocede to Virginia, and I think retroceding the balance to Maryland would make a lot of sense for the people. It would give them what they are seeking, which would be a vote not just for Congress but for Senators, for the legislators, and it would be a way in which they could more effectively participate.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. I want to be clear, however, that I have long been an advocate of voting rights for the residents of the District of Columbia. Beginning with my service on the DC Appropriations Subcommittee in 1987, I have been keenly aware of this unfair situation within our democracy. Virtually every Congress since then I have introduced legislation that would give the District of Columbia residents representation in Congress. Voting is a privilege that our founding fathers intended every American to have, and giving this right to DC residents is a matter of doing what is right. Yet 200 years have passed since DC residents lost their voting rights and they continue to express dissatisfaction over their lack of voting representation in Congress.

Because of this frustrating situation and the numerous failed attempts to grant DC either statehood or a voting representative, I have advocated for a simple, sound and proven process to give DC residents voting rights. This process is known as retrocession or reunion. Through this process, the District, barring a small Federal enclave, would be returned to the State of Maryland, which originally ceded the land in 1790.

Retrocession would be beneficial for both the District and Maryland. The voting rights issue would be resolved, as DC residents would gain not only a voting representative in the House of Representatives but also two in the United States Senate. The residents also would gain new representation on the State level and enjoy access to Maryland's State infrastructure, facilities and assistance programs. On a very local level, Washington, as a city in a state, would regain the local decision-making authority it has been seeking for so long.

Conversely, by gaining the District's nearly 600,000 residents, Maryland would gain a seat in the House and extend its influence in Congress. With the Nation's 2nd highest per capita income, District residents would enhance Maryland's tax base and help create the 4th largest regional market in the country.

Canada offers a prime example of how this proposal could work. Its capital, Ottawa, lies in the province of Ontario and sends representatives to the provincial parliament in Toronto as well as the federal parliament as part of the Ontario delegation. Also, in 1790, Alexandria, Virginia was in a similar position to DC. Alexandria was included in the area chosen by George Washington to become the District of Columbia. A portion of the City of Alexandria and all of today's Arlington County share the distinction of having been originally in Virginia, ceded to the U.S. Government to form the District of Columbia, and later retroceded to Virginia by the Federal Government in 1846, when the District was reduced in size to exclude the portion south of the Potomac River.

I believe this framework is the most logical and constitutionally sound way to give DC residents the voting rights they deserve. Additionally, as I mentioned previously, the precedent already exists. Let's pursue a realistic solution to restore the rights of District residents and provide them with a better future.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY), a former Speaker of the House in Florida.

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

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Speaker, I find almost a surreal debate going on with my friends on the left side of the House saying to us don't you like democracy. We have got soldiers fighting for democracy throughout the world, while we are saying to our friends on the left, don't you like the Constitution?

The question is are we a pure democracy or a constitutional republic? The Constitution is made up of powers delegated by the States, and the States alone, to the Federal Government. The States and the States alone, according to the language of the Constitution, are represented in the U.S. House.

If you believe in democracy, use the constitutional amendment process, use the retrocession process. If you have a quarrel with the Constitution, it is not because you don't like the position of the Republicans and the minority in this House. It is because your quarrel is with the Founding Fathers.

Hamilton tried to get this provision in the Constitution, representation for D.C. The Founding Fathers considered it and they rejected it.

So, again, we are for democracy within a constitutional republic status. We are not an unadulterated democracy. We are a constitutional republic.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this legislation. The matter is a question of basic fairness, but also serious constitutional concern.

As a former Secretary of State for the State of Nevada, I have spent years trying to figure out ways to promote voting, and I support the voting rights of all Americans. I additionally understand the concerns of Utah for its population that lives abroad outside its borders and their desire for an extra seat.

But I will tell you until this year, Nevada has had a 20-year grip as the fastest-growing State in the Nation, and Nevada's population is about even to Utah's, but Nevada is growing significantly faster than our neighbor.

I understand the concerns of my Utah colleagues following the 2000 census; but to give Utah an extra seat at the expense of Nevada would, arguably, slight Nevada.

I know the intent is good, but the means by which we achieve them are just as important, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the most patient Member in the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I want to make it conspicuously clear that I love the Constitution. And I understand that there are constitutional scholars on both sides of this issue.

There were constitutional scholars on both sides of Dred Scott. There were constitutional scholars on both sides of Plessy vs. Ferguson. There were constitutional scholars on both sides of Brown vs. The Board of Education.

The question is which side are you on? Which side are you on today?

I stand with the half million people, more than a half million people, in the District of Columbia who do not have full representation in the United States Congress. Which side are we on today?

I stand with ending 206 years of injustice on people who are citizens of the United States who live in the District of Columbia. I stand on the side of ending taxation without representation. I stand with the chairman and I want to especially say that I stand with the majority leader, who stood here and made me proud of him today. Just when I think that the stock of the chairman of this committee and the majority leader can't go any higher, it goes up.

I stand for government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 full minute to RUSH HOLT of New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the constitutional history of the United States has been the expansion of the voting franchise. Our history has been to expand the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

With respect to the District of Columbia, the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have the power to exercise exclusive legislation. It does not say that the price is the loss of the franchise.

As a youngster who lived here in the District of Columbia, I was told by some that residents of D.C. were special. My colleague from Texas used the

word ''distinctive'' awhile ago, that somehow we were honored to have Congress govern us even though we did not have representation.

What a strange honor. It is truly paradoxical and ironic that residents of the seat of government of the greatest democracy in the world should not themselves have the right of direct representation, 600,000 citizens, citizens without the complete basic rights of citizens. Giving D.C.'s 600,000 residents direct representation of Congress is long overdue.

I rise today in support of the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007, and I would like to commend my colleagues ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and TOM DAVIS for their tireless efforts to bring this important measure to the Floor for a vote.

The United States Constitution, a relatively short and simple document, has utterly transformed the world in its 200 year history. It has served as a model for fledgling democracies everywhere, because of its establishment of a system under which the citizenry grant limited powers to the government and choose the individuals who will represent them in that government. The Constitutional history of the United States has been the expansion of the voting franchise. Our history has been to expand the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

As for the District of Columbia, however, the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power "to exercise exclusive legislation over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may . . . become the seat of government of the United States." It does not say that the price is disenfranchisement.

The importance of creating a neutral jurisdiction for the seat of the federal government under the exclusive control of Congress made sense at the time. As a youngster who lived in the District of Columbia many decades ago, I was told by some that residents of DC were special, distinctive as the gentleman, Mr. SMITH, that we were honored to have Congress govern us even though Congress worked without representation from us. What a strange honor! It is truly paradoxical that the residents of the seat of government of the greatest democracy in the world should not, themselves, have the rights to direct representation. The District of Columbia was created in 1790 and, in 1800, it had a population of just over 8,000. Today, it is home to about 600,000 citizens—citizens without the complete basic rights of citizens.

If enacted, H.R. 1433 would treat the District of Columbia like a congressional district for the purposes of allowing direct representation within the House of Representatives. This measure was reported out favorably by the House Committee on the Judiciary Committee by a margin of almost two to one, and subsequently by the House Committee on Oversight and Government by a margin of 25 to four. [Giving Washington D.C.'s 600,000 residents direct representation in Congress is long overdue;] I fully support this measure and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio, DENNIS KUCINICH, a distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

D.C. residents shoulder the burden of a colossal injustice. They live within a system of governance that extracts the full range of taxes paid by all other U.S. citizens without the benefit of voting representation in the United States Congress.

The history of D.C. is the history of democracy denied. Its citizens have given the full measure of their allegiance to the United States. They fought in wars for the United States. They have paid taxes. They have provided labor, resources, and space to the United States Government. Yet for 200 years District residents have been bystanders in the governance of their Nation and city.

''Taxation without representation'' is not just a good slogan. It is a plight that sparked revolution. We attempt to create democracies around the globe, but to deny democracy in the shadow of the U.S. capital, it is now time to end that.

Voting rights, civil rights, human rights are all one. Support this resolution.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Virginia, JAMES MORAN.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to the arguments against this bill, and no one has made the argument that this is not the right thing to do. The opposition is hiding behind the language of the Constitution. I say ''hide'' because there are any number of interpretations and any number of conservative constitutional scholars who have said this is fully constitutional.

But it is the right thing to do because there is no jurisdiction, no State, no local government that has had more legislation passed in this body affecting them than the onerous provisions directly affecting the citizens of the District of Columbia and uniquely affecting them.

Forty-four thousand veterans are in the District of Columbia. Every D.C. resident pays Federal taxes.

1330

They are solid American citizens and there are more of them than in the entire state of Wyoming. They deserve voting representation.

Let me say one further thing. I represent the area in Alexandria that used to be part of the District of Columbia. When that area retroceded back to Virginia, on the front page of the Alexandria Gazette they described the freed men and freed women on their knees begging for citizens of Alexandria not to do this—not to deprive every black person of all their rights. But the entitled white people of Northern Virginia voted to deny them their rights because of racism. The history of this disenfranchisement of D.C. residents is not a pretty one. It needs to be undone.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to my friend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support for voting rights for residents of the District of Columbia.

I would note, Madam Speaker, that this month is Women's History Month, and it took women many, many long years to gain the right to vote. It took a constitutional amendment in 1920 to give women the right to vote. But today we can vote to give the vote to the residents of the District of Columbia.

I would note that it was not until 1965 that the landmark Voting Rights Act was signed into law to outlaw discriminatory practices like literacy tests and to ensure that all Americans, regardless of race, had access to the ballot. Today we have the opportunity to take another historic step in the right direction by ending the disenfranchisement of hundreds of thousands of tax-paying Americans.

The people of the District of Columbia contribute to our national economy, they fight in our wars, and it is simply wrong that they not have representation.

I rise in strong support of voting rights for these residents.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1433, the "District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act," introduced by my good friend and colleague, Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

She has been a steadfast champion for her constituents on many issues, and has worked tirelessly to bring this legislation to the floor today.

I want to commend her for her commitment to the residents of the District of Columbia, who for too long have been denied a voice in the House of Representatives.

We have seen through our own history the great struggles that have been endured to win the right to vote.

For women, it took a constitutional amendment in 1920 to give us the right the vote.

It was not until 1965 that the landmark "Voting Rights Act" was signed into law to outlaw discriminatory practices like literacy tests and to ensure that all Americans, regardless of race, had access to the ballot box.

Today, we are taking another step in the right direction by ending the disenfranchisement of hundreds of thousands of tax-paying Americans.

It is undemocratic that we can determine the taxes that District residents pay to the Federal Government, but they have not been able to elect a representative who has a say in what those taxes will be.

The people of the District of Columbia contribute to our national economy and they fight in wars.

It is simply wrong that their representative in the House does not have full voting rights.

The House of Representatives is known as "the people's house" yet for the people living in the District of Columbia, their voices have been silenced for far too long.

It is sadly ironic that the citizens living in the Nation's Capital do not have full representation in the House.

With this legislation, we will change history.

I urge my colleagues to support his legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, let me summarize the reasons we should oppose this legislation. D.C. is not a State, and the Constitution clearly limits representation in the House to States.

Supporters of this bill claim Congress has the authority to enact this bill under a broad reading of the so-called ''District clause'' in Article I, section 8 of the Constitution. However, Article I, section 2 clearly says, ''The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.''

The bill unfairly subjects many citizens to unequal treatment as well. H.R. 1433 grants Utah an additional Representative who will run statewide or at large. The at-large provision violates the principles of one man, one vote. Voters in Utah would be able to vote for two Representatives, their district Representative and their at-large Representative, whereas voters in every other State would only be able to vote for their one district Representative. The result would be that Utah voters will have disproportionately more voting power than the voters of every other State, and that, too, is clearly unconstitutional.

In 2000, the Federal District Court in D.C. itself stated, ''We conclude from our analysis of the text that the Constitution does not contemplate that the District may serve as a State for purposes of the apportionment of congressional representatives.''

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, this unconstitutional approach is completely unnecessary. Most of the District of Columbia, other than a few Federal buildings, could simply be returned to the State of Maryland. That process of retrocession is clearly allowed by the Constitution. That process could grant representation in the House to those in Washington by a simple majority vote. D.C. voters could then be represented by both House and Senate Members, an improvement over the current legislation.

Madam Speaker, finally, and for many good reasons, the administration also opposes this legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) for the purpose of a unanimous-consent request.

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

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that this is long overdue.

Madam Speaker, I am elated that this bill is finally reaching the House floor for a vote—that we might finally be granting a voice in Congress to half a million patriotic taxpaying Americans. I know that my colleague, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, is elated as well.

Democracy for District residents is long overdue. There are over 500,000 residents living in DC and they pay some of the highest income taxes in the Nation, but they do not have full representation in Congress. This is unacceptable. DC residents should have the voice and voting rights that the other 50 States in this country share.

Voting is fundamental to the Democratic process. It is the one act that allows the widest participation of the American public in our political process. Every voter who goes to the polls should be assured that his or her vote will be counted and the candidates they put in office will be able to have the voting power to voice their needs in this House.

Madam Speaker, I am hopeful that when this bill passes, I will soon be able to call my colleague from the District of Columbia Congresswoman HOLMES NORTON and she will be joining me on the floor to vote and represent the people of Washington, DC to the fullest.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished former member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the chairman.

Madam Speaker, this bill is about justice, it is about fairness and about democracy. What a terrible message we send when the people in the capital of the world's greatest democracy do not have a vote in the people's House.

I have the privilege of representing the district right next to Washington, D.C., and it is simply wrong that when you cross the border from Washington, D.C., into my district, you go from a district where you have no voting representation in Congress to one where you do.

We need to make sure that all the people in this country share the right to a vote in the people's House. I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and his leadership in bringing this very important legislation to the floor.

This is a happy day indeed. It is an historic day. It is a day when the people of the District of Columbia will finally have their voices heard and represented.

This is a personal joy for me as well, because when I was born all those many years ago, my father served in the Congress, and he became the Chair of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee. As such, that was a time when there was no Mayor, no home rule, no anything; that committee practically ran the District of Columbia. My father was a strong advocate for home rule for the District, and, of course, we had hoped eventually, and still do, statehood.

It took a long time, but at last today we will get a vote once again for Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. She has really been a champion for the District. Even without the full vote, her impact is felt here, but it is the right thing to do for her to have the vote.

Congressman DAVIS, as Chairman DAVIS and now as ranking member, has always been a strong advocate for this, as has HENRY WAXMAN, the Chair of the Government Reform Committee, and you, Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of the Judiciary Committee.

How impressive it was to see the Iraqi vets, these young people, coming back from the Iraq war, and those serving in Afghanistan, where they were willing to make any sacrifice for our country. Their courage and patriotism is honored by all of us. They came and pled to us for the District of Columbia to have the vote. They live here, they went to war from here, they wanted to come home to the fullness of democracy for the District of Columbia.

Today's vote affirms an enduring principle of our democracy, the right to be heard and represented. They fought for that in Iraq. They should have it here in the District.

For more than 200 years, the people of the District of Columbia have been denied full representation. This carefully crafted, bipartisan legislation corrects a serious flaw in our democracy. America is at its best honoring the cause of freedom and justice when all voices are fully represented.

The effort to politicize the issue of fundamental fairness disrespects the ideals of this Nation and the people of the District of Columbia. We must honor our democracy. House Democrats will not rest until full representation in the House is granted to the District of Columbia.

This is an important day on which I congratulate Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and the people of the District of Columbia for having this right come due.

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

Madam Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD under yesterday's date, March 21, a CRS report handed to me by ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON that validates the fact that the one man, one vote principle is not violated by the Utah creation of an at-large district.

Madam Speaker, we have had a lot of predictions from Members of the Congress who may be on the Supreme Court someday. They predicted unconstitutionality and constitutionality. Let's leave it up to the Court. But, remember, those challenging on the basis of unconstitutionality have the burden.

I close with this observation: The three recommendations we have had, a constitutional amendment; retrocession, giving D.C. back to Maryland; or statehood, are not going to work.

I urge support for this measure before us today.

CRS REPORT FOR CONGRESS: CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING: THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF CREATING AN AT-LARGE DISTRICT

(L. Paige Whitaker, Legislative Attorney)

SUMMARY

Among other provisions, H.R. 1433 (110th Cong.), the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007, would expand the U.S.

House of Representatives by two Members to a total of 437 Members. The first of these two new seats would be allocated to create a voting Member representing the District of Columbia, and the second seat would be assigned in accordance with 2000 census data and existing federal law, resulting in the addition of a fourth congressional seat in the state of Utah, which would be a temporary at-large district. This report is limited to discussing only the constitutionality of the creation of an at-large congressional district. While it is not without doubt, based on the authority granted to Congress under the Constitution to regulate congressional elections and relevant Supreme Court precedent, it appears that federal law establishing a temporary at-large congressional district would likely be upheld as constitutional.

H.R. 1433 (110TH CONG.), THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 2007

Among other provisions, H.R. 1433 (110th Cong.), the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007, would expand the U.S. House of Representatives by two Members to a total of 437 Members. It specifies that the first of these two new seats would be allocated to create a voting Member representing the District of Columbia, and that the second seat would be assigned in accordance with 2000 census data and existing federal law, which would currently result in the addition of a fourth congressional seat in the state of Utah. This report is limited to considering only the issue of the constitutionality of the creation of an at-large congressional district.

H.R. 1433 (110th Cong.) was introduced on March 9, 2007, and supersedes H.R. 328, which was introduced earlier in the 110th Congress. On March 13, the House Government Oversight and Reform Committee reported H.R. 1433, by a vote of 24–5, and on March 15, the House Judiciary Committee reported the bill by a vote of 21–13.

BRIEF CONSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS

The U.S. Constitution provides the states with primary authority over congressional elections, but grants Congress the final authority over most aspects of such elections. This congressional power is at its most broad in the case of House elections, which have historically been decided by a system of popular voting. Article I, §4, cl. 1 provides that:

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.

The Supreme Court and lower courts have interpreted this language to mean that Congress has extensive power to regulate most elements of congressional elections, including a broad authority to protect the integrity of those elections.

The Constitution does not specify how Members of the House are to be elected once they are apportioned to a state. Originally, most states having more than one Representative divided their territory into geographic districts, permitting only one Member of Congress to be elected from each district. Other states, however, allowed House candidates to run at-large or from multimember districts or from some combination of the two. In those states employing single-member districts, however, the problem of gerrymandering, the practice of drawing district lines in order to maximize political party advantage, quickly arose.

Accordingly, Congress began establishing standards for House districts. Congress first passed federal redistricting standards in 1842, when it added a requirement to the apportionment act of that year that Representatives ''should be elected by districts composed of contiguous territory equal in number to the number of Representatives to which each said state shall be entitled, no one district electing more than one Representative.'' (5 Stat. 491.) The Apportionment Act of 1872 added another requirement to those first set out in 1842, stating that districts should contain ''as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants.'' (17 Stat. 492.) A further requirement of ''compact territory'' was added when the Apportionment Act of 1901 was adopted stating that districts must be made up of ''contiguous and compact territory and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants.'' (26 Stat. 736.) After 1929, there were no congressionally imposed standards governing congressional redistricting; in 1941, however, Congress enacted a law providing for various redistricting contingencies if states failed to redistrict after a census—including at-large representation. (55 Stat 761.) In 1967, Congress reimposed the requirement that Representatives must run from single-member districts, rather than running at-large. (81 Stat. 581.)

Both the 1941 and 1967 laws are still in effect, codified at 2 U.S.C.§§2a and 2c. In Branch v. Smith, the Supreme Court considered the operation and inherent tension between these two provisions. It does not appear, however, that the question of congressional authority was in serious dispute in this litigation. Rather, the Court noted in passing that the current statutory scheme governing apportionment of the House of Representatives was enacted in 1929 pursuant to congressional authority under the ''Times, Places and Manner'' provision of the Constitution. Consequently, it seems likely that Congress has broad authority, within specified constitutional parameters, to establish how Members' districts will be established, including the creation of at-large districts.

It might be suggested that creating an at-large congressional district in a state could violate the ''one person, one vote'' standard established by the Supreme Court in Wesberry v. Sanders. In Wesberry, the Supreme Court first applied the one person, one vote standard in the context of evaluating the constitutionality of a Georgia congressional redistricting statute that created a district with two to three times as many residents as the state's other nine districts. In striking down the statute, the Court held that Article I, section 2, clause 1, providing that Representatives be chosen ''by the People of the several States'' and be ''apportioned among the several States . . . according to their respective Numbers,'' requires that ''as nearly as is practicable, one man's vote in a congressional is to be worth as much as another's.''

While it is not beyond dispute, it does not appear that the creation of an at-large district under the circumstances outlined in H.R. 1433 would be interpreted to create a conflict with the ''*one person, one vote*'' standard. Under H.R. 1433, each Utah voter would have the opportunity to vote both for a candidate to represent his or her congressional district as well as for a candidate to represent the state at-large. Each person's vote for an at-large candidate would be of equal worth. Further, each person's vote for an at-large candidate would not affect the value of his or her vote for a candidate representing a congressional district. Accordingly, all Utah residents' votes would have equal value, thereby arguably comporting with the one person, one vote principle.

Based on the authority granted to Congress under the Constitution to regulate congressional elections and relevant Supreme Court precedent, it appears that a federal law establishing a temporary at-large congressional district would likely be upheld as constitutional.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield my time to be managed by the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, soon to be, her voters willing, the actual Representative of the District of Columbia in every way possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me his time.

Madam Speaker, this bill is covered with the full handprints of scores of Members, beginning on the other side of the aisle with Congressman TOM DAVIS, who planted and tirelessly cultivated the seed; and Utah Members CANNON and BISHOP, joined by Mr. MATHESON, the State's only Democratic Member.

However, it was leadership that got us to this historic day, especially Speaker PELOSI's personal insistence, Majority Leader HOYER's outspoken energy, Chairman CONYERS' decades of persistence and Chairman WAXMAN's indispensable guidance.

I am inspired daily by the citizens of this city, personified by Emory Kosh, a staff assistant in my office here in the House whose second child was born while he was serving in Iraq. Emory's military service follows in the tradition of D.C. residents, who first fought in the Revolutionary War to establish ''the Republic for which we stand,'' have fought and died for their country in every war since, and, like other Americans, have always been obliged to pay Federal income taxes, today ranking second among the 50 States and the District of Columbia in taxes paid to support the Government of the United States. Today, I come forward in their name.

Our forefathers in this city were the three Virginians who signed the Constitution and the three signers from Maryland. Yet some seriously argue that the Virginians, the Marylanders and the other Framers fresh from the Revolutionary War, waged specifically to obtain representation, contributed land where thousands of their own residents resided, some of them veterans of the Revolutionary War, and then signed away their rights in the new Constitution.

However you vote on the District's voting rights, do not slander the Framers. For two centuries, the fault has been right here in the Congress, not the flawed vision of the Framers.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I come to the House today to express my support for the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007.

I believe after much consideration that this legislation is a constitutional remedy to a historic wrong. Now, while many have focused on the political consequences of such a move, I believe the only question for a Member of Congress on such matters is this: What does justice demand and what does the Constitution permit this Congress to do about it?

The fact that more than half a million Americans live in the District of Columbia and are denied a single voting representative in Congress is clearly a historic wrong, and justice demands that it be addressed. At the time of the adoption of our present system of government, the Federal city did not exist apart from a reference in the Constitution. And when the District of Columbia opened for business in 1801, only a few thousand residents lived within her boundaries. Among our Founders, only Alexander Hamilton would foresee the bustling metropolis that the District of Columbia would become, and he himself was an advocate of voting representation.

The demands of history in favor of representation for the Americans living in Washington, D.C. are compelling. In establishing the Republic, the single overarching principle of the American founding was that laws should be based on the consent of the governed. The first generation of Americans threw tea in Boston Harbor simply because they were denied a voting representative in the British Parliament. Given their fealty to representative democracy, it is inconceivable to me that our Founders would have been willing to accept the denial of representation to so great a throng of Americans in perpetuity.

But the demands of justice are not enough for Congress to act. As many of my colleagues have eloquently stated, under the principles of limited government, a republic may only take that action which is expressly authorized in its written constitution. In this regard, I believe that H.R. 1433 is constitutional. And I am not alone in this view.

In support of this legislation, Judge Kenneth Starr, former independent counsel and U.S. Solicitor General observed: ''There is nothing in our Constitution's history or its fundamental principles suggesting that the framers intended to deny the precious right to vote to those who live in the capital of the great democracy they founded.''

Now, opponents of D.C. voting rights understandably cite the plain language of Article I of the Constitution that the House of Representatives be comprised of representatives elected ''by the people of the several States.'' Now if this were the only reference to the powers associated with the Federal city, it would be persuasive, but it is not. Article I, section 8, clause 17 provides that ''Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'' over the District of Columbia.

In 1984, it would be Justice Scalia who would observe that the seat of government clause gives the Congress ''extraordinary and plenary power'' over our Nation's capital.

And Congress has used this power to remedy the rights of Americans in the District of Columbia in the past. In 1949, the Supreme Court upheld legislation that extended access to the Federal courts to citizens of the district even though Article III expressly limited jurisdiction of those courts to citizens of States. As Judge Starr observed: ''The logic of this case applies here,'' and I agree.

But one caveat, Madam Speaker. None of this argues for the District of Columbia ever to be granted a right to elect Members to the Senate. From the inception of our Nation, this House of Representatives was an extension of the people. The Senate, from the inception of our Nation, was an extension of the States. If the people of the District of Columbia would like two seats in the United States Senate, under the Constitution, they will have to become a State.

You know, the Old Book tells us what is required: do justice, love kindness, and walk humbly with your God. I believe that justice demands that we right this historic wrong. The American people should have representation in the people's House. I believe that kindness demands that we do the right thing for all Americans regardless of race or political creed, and I believe that humility demands that we do so in a manner consistent with our Constitution.

The D.C. House Voting Rights Act meets this test, and I am honored to have the opportunity to continue to play some small role in leading our constitutional Republic ever closer to a more perfect Union.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia and my colleague, the delegate from the District of Columbia, for their yeoman's work on this legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Oversight Committee without whose leadership we could not have come to this day, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Today, we are considering a bill that will bring democracy to the District of Columbia. This bill will grant the District of Columbia a full vote in the House of Representatives. They have been denied full representation in Congress for over 200 years, and this will help right this long-standing injustice.

But I want to use my time to point out that there have been two champions of this legislation who deserve recognition. One is Congresswoman NORTON who has been working tirelessly on behalf of her constituents to forge a compromise that has bipartisan support; and the second is the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and its former Chair, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Last year as chairman of our committee, he led the charge for voting rights for the District. It was his inspiration that brought this compromise to the point now where I expect this bill will pass the House of Representatives and go on its way to the other body. This is a bill that is long overdue. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill.

H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007, will grant the District of Columbia a full vote in the House of Representatives.

District of Columbia residents have been denied full representation in Congress for over 200 years. District residents pay billions of dollars in federal taxes yet get no vote in Congress. This bill will help right this longstanding injustice.

There have been two champions of this legislation who deserve recognition. One is Congresswoman NORTON, who has worked tirelessly on behalf of her constituents to forge a compromise that has bipartisan support. The second is the Ranking Minority Member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Representative DAVIS. Last year, as Chairman of the Committee, he led the charge for voting rights for the District.

The District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act includes a number of important provisions.

This bill will increase the size of the House by two seats. One of those seats will go to the District of Columbia and the other seat will go Utah, the next state in line to get a congressional seat. The bill prevents partisan gerrymandering by creating the new seat for Utah as an at-large seat and by ensuring that Utah does not redistrict its other congressional seats until apportionment is conducted following the 2010 census.

H.R. 1433 also contains a nonseverability clause providing that if a court holds one section of this bill invalid or unenforceable, all other sections will be invalid or unenforceable. This is an important safeguard because it means that no section of this legislation can have legal effect unless the entire bill has legal effect. Under this legislation, Utah cannot be granted a seat in the House without the District also being granted a seat or vice versa.

H.R. 1433 is a step in the right direction toward providing the residents of the District fair representation in Congress. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from

Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the ranking member and appreciate his indulgence.

I strongly oppose the underlying bill, as I believe it to be unconstitutional.

The House of Representatives stands on the verge of voting on a flatly unconstitutional, historically egregious bill, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007. This bill would grant the District of Columbia a full voting seat in the House of Representatives by circumventing the Constitution. While I agree that it is an injustice that any United States citizens not have voting representation in Congress, the contorted logic some have used to justify this bill is quite troubling.

In supporting this proposal, Kenneth Starr wrote, ''There is nothing in our Constitution's history or its fundamental principles suggesting that the Framers intended to deny the precious right to vote to those who live in the capital of the great democracy they founded.'' While this may be true, the fact remains that the Constitution exclusively affords House representation to the states. Just because the District of Columbia was denied a seat in the People's House does not mean that Congress can ignore the Constitution.

Advocates of the DC Voting bill are discounting as unpersuasive the ''plain language'' of Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution, which states, ''The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several states.'' As if that weren't enough, the next sentence declares, ''No Person shall be a Representative who shall not . . . when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.''

It is indisputable that House representation is constitutionally limited to the states. In fact, the Bush administration recently declared the bill unconstitutional, citing 12 provisions in the Constitution that expressly link congressional representation to statehood. Certainly, no one is claiming that the District of Columbia is one of the 50 states.

Sadly, constitutionality is not a concern of proponents of this legislation. The central argument from supporters of this bill is fairness. They argue that Members of Congress have a moral responsibility to right this wrong by any means. The Founding Fathers would be aghast at this brazen disregard for the Constitution in pursuit of a quick fix.

Supporters of this feel-good legislation frequently cite the ''District Clause'' of the Constitution as justification, which reads, ''Congress shall have power . . . to exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District.'' It is correct that Congress has the power to govern the District of Columbia, but this does not mean that the residents of the District of Columbia have the right to a seat in Congress, giving them the power to legislate over the 50 states.

The District Clause is found in section 8 of article I, the same section that gives Congress the power to ''establish Post Offices'' and to ''make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces.'' Surely no one would propose granting Fort Gordon a seat in the House, but the promotion of this would follow the same logic.

To be clear: I support representation for the residents of the District of Columbia but not under this bill's approach. It is truly unjust that these tax-paying citizens are denied the right to have their voice heard in the people's House. But Congress cannot create voting rights for D.C. residents by simply ignoring or contorting the Constitution because it is our will. There are two proper, constitutionally just courses of action to remedy this unfairness.

First, the Founders gave Congress and the people the authority to amend the Constitution. This course would provide for a 51st state of the District of Columbia. But as the constitutional amendment process can be protracted and complicated, I support the second course—retroceding the non-federal portion of Washington, D.C., to the State of Maryland. Following this plan, most of the residents would have full representation in the House and Senate, as residents of Maryland. This is a commonsense proposal with historic precedent. In 1846, the land west of the Potomac was ceded back to the Commonwealth of Virginia, and these people now enjoy full congressional representation.

There is a great responsibility in supporting the republican form of government that our Founders created. And where injustices lie in the Constitution, Congress is right to try to correct them. But the greatest respect is owed to our Founders and our Nation as the longest surviving democracy in history. There is a reason for that and it has much to do with respecting the genius of our founding document. We must not ignore the principles of the constitutional republic our Founders laid out.

It is fundamentally antithetical to pursue representative fairness while disregarding the Constitution. I am hopeful that supporters of this bill will see the great fault in their logic, and resolve the injustice of the residents of the District of Columbia not having a voting representative in Congress properly within the bounds of the Constitution.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the Chair of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for yielding me this time. I also want to commend the chairman of oversight, the Honorable HENRY WAXMAN, and the ranking member, TOM DAVIS, for their leadership on this tremendous legislation. But I also want to add accolades for the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia who has put her heart, mind and soul into this legislation; and without her leadership, we obviously would not be here this afternoon.

I have heard many people talk from both sides. I have heard individuals say that the Constitution denies the opportunity, and I am thinking of the Constitution as a living document. I don't want to keep the Constitution where it might have been. Representative AL GREEN made the most eloquent statement a few moments ago when he suggested there are always individuals on different sides of the Constitution. You can be on the right side, or you can be on the wrong side. You can be on the old side, or you can be on the new side; and the side that we are on this afternoon is the side that gives the residents of the District of Columbia the opportunity to help make more perfect this Union that we are a part of.

I stand firmly in support of this legislation. Again, I commend my colleagues on Oversight and Government Reform and urge all of the Members to vote in favor of giving the District of Columbia residents the right to vote.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1433, the ''District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007.'' I want to extend a thank you to Representatives TOM DAVIS and HENRY WAXMAN, and especially to Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for their hard work and dedication in introducing and moving this legislation forward to provide the District of Columbia the right to vote with full representation in the House of Representatives.

The legislation before us today will give voting representation to over 500,000 District's residents and increase the size of the House from 435 to 437 voting members. The right to vote is the most basic act of citizenship. Voting representation for District residents who pay Federal taxes, defend our country during war, and contribute to the economic viability of other states, should not be disfranchised because they chose to live in the District of Columbia.

The Constitution, ratified in 1789, provided for the creation and government of a permanent home for the national government. Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, called for the creation of a Federal district to serve as the permanent seat of the national government and granted Congress the power, ''to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States. . . .'' The Constitution grants Congress plenary power to govern the District of Columbia's affairs. This includes granting voting representation in the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia.

On March 13, 2007, H.R. 1433 was passed by a decisive vote of 24 yeas to 5 nays in the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and reflects bipartisan support for this legislation.

Madam Speaker, Congress is attempting to correct a longstanding inequity for residents in the Nation's Capital—taxation without representation. We in this body must up hold the Constitution by not denying a large mass of people their fundamental right to voting representation. Congress has the power to correct the wrongs of the past for District residents and it lies in our power to grant the people of DC the right to voting representation.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, it is often said that if opportunity doesn't knock, build a door. With this bill, we are doing just that.

Using the materials at hand today, we can open a portal to full democratic participation that for too long has remained locked. The circumstances are right, the stars are aligned, and the proposal is sound.

Four years ago, we saw a confluence of events that set the stage for the compromise we have before us today. Two injustices met to create this opportunity to correct both. On the one hand, a long-ignored historical anomaly denies the citizens of the District of Columbia voting representation in the House of Representatives. On the other hand, a more recent problem with the census denies the citizens of Utah the additional House vote that a true count would have yielded.

As it happens, one jurisdiction is predominantly Democratic, the other predominantly Republican. The circumstances opened the way to a politically neutral solution to both problems.

Throughout our Nation's history, it has been just this kind of win-win compromise that, however rooted in the fleeting circumstances of the day, provide enduring solutions to seemingly intractable problems.

Each of us swears to uphold the Constitution, its letter and spirit. That living document is at its heart the most fundamental right of citizens in a democracy. All the citizens. So we rely on the plenary power found in the District clause to restore the full right of citizenship to our disenfranchised countrymen and women.

After researching every possible avenue to right these wrongs and give the citizens of the District of Columbia and Utah, the next State that is eligible for a vote under the formula, the representation to which they are entitled, we concluded the approach before us today is both constitutionally sound and politically viable.

The former is our sworn duty. The latter is a practical imperative.

In 4 years, I have found no evidence that any Member of this body seriously plans to attempt retrocession or campaign for a constitutional amendment. There is a good reason for that: they are politically not viable. Most Members, including me, don't waste their time tilting at windmills.

By now, every Member is aware of the constitutional arguments. I ask that you think carefully about what you hear today. Every first-year law student in this country learns that you can't just read the Constitution once over literally to figure out what it means. But that is what the other side's arguments are. That is where it stops, and that is where it starts.

Those opposing this bill ignore 200 years of case law and clear instruction from the Court that this is a congressional matter and requires a congressional solution. Under their literal reading of the Constitution, District residents would have no right to a jury trial under the sixth amendment because you have to be a State to have that right.

D.C. residents would have no right to sue people from outside D.C. in the Federal courts; only people from States have that right under Article III, section 2.

The full faith and credit clause would not apply to D.C. because that only applies to States under a literal reading of the Constitution.

And the Federal Government would not be allowed to impose Federal taxes on the District. The Constitution says direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States. Article I, section 2, clause 3.

But in each of these cases, the Supreme Court has held that Congress can consider the District a State for purposes of applying these fundamental provisions. If Congress has the authority to do so regarding these lesser rights and duty, there should be no question we have the same authority to protect the most sacred right of every American: to live and participate in a representative Republic.

It should also be pointed out that Congress granted voting representation in 1790 when it accepted the land that would become the Federal city. It then removed those rights, by statute, 10 years later. Those facts are undisputed. No amendment to the Constitution was considered necessary then. And those opposing the bill today will not explain, only assert, the claimed need for a constitutional amendment to reverse a decision that was made through enactment of a statute.

This problem should be solved. A lot of people today will talk about the Framers and tell us that the Framers intended for the Federal city to have no direct representation.

Do you really believe that if the capital had stayed in New York, the city would have been disenfranchised? Do you believe that if the capital had stayed in Philadelphia, the city would have been disenfranchised? Of course not, and neither should the people of Washington, D.C.

What we know is men and women who fought and died to create this country were willing to die for people who might disagree with them politically. D.C. residents are paying Federal taxes. They are fighting and dying in the Middle East to bring democracy to that part of the world.

This is no mere legal or political science exercise. It's a crisis. Your fellow Americans are being denied the full rights and benefits of representative government. We have before us this unique moment in our history, the opportunity to fulfill the promise of the Constitution and make our democracy whole again.

□ 1400

I hope we hear opportunity knocking, and I hope we hear the faint, but unmistakable whisper of conscience and of history, urging us all to seize the moment with courage and humility.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 2007]

RIGHTS AND WRONG

Historic legislation giving the people of the District a vote in their national government is being debated in the House of Representatives. Prospects for its passage have never been better. The Democrats who control the House have kept a promise to move the bill forward, but the disenfranchisement of American citizens shouldn't be about partisan politics. It should be about what is right and wrong.

Indeed, the legislation working its way through the House sprang from he sense of injustice of a Republican House member from suburban Virginia. Rep. Thomas M. Davis III believes it is grotesque that D.C. residents are denied congressional representation. he came up with an ingenious way to get politics out of the equation. Two seats would be added to Congress—one for the mostly Democratic District and the other for heavily Republican Utah. The bill is on a fast track thanks to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.). The House Oversight and Government Reform Committee approved the measure yesterday, with every Democrat and six Republicans voting for it. The Judiciary Committee now takes it up, and a battle is expected.

It's hard to make a case for depriving people of a voice in Congress when they pay federal taxes, serve on federal juries and send family members off to war. It's also pretty embarrassing that the Untied States, while preaching democracy to the rest of the world, remains the only democratic country where people in the capital city are without representation. So opponents of D.C. voting rights have latched onto the only argument they can make with a straight face—that the bill is unconstitutional.

Former judges and constitutional scholars such as Kenneth Starr, Patricia Wald and Viet Dinh, not to mention the American Bar Association, believe the bill is constitutional. They argue that Congress has repeatedly treated the District as if it were a state and that this treatment has been upheld. For his part, Mr. Davis has delved into history to make a compelling argument that the lack of a vote was never the aim of the Founding Fathers but rather an ''undemocratic accident.''

We concede that serious people hold the contrary view. No court has ever weighed in on the D.C. Voting Rights Act, so the constitutional question is open. That, though, is an issue for the courts to decide, in the event of a legal challenge. It should not be an excuse for Congress to continue to deny a basic right to more than half a million people.

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 22, 2007]

D.C. DUE VOTING RIGHTS

(By Jack Kemp)

How's this for irony: Headlines recently proclaimed that the White House was opposed to giving the vote to the more than 600,000 residents of our nation's capital, who, incidentally, are paying federal income taxes to send members of their families to Iraq and Afghanistan so as to guarantee the right to vote for the residents of those nations' capitals.

Even as the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives was passing the bill, cosponsored by Reps. Eleanor Holmes Norton, D–D.C., and Tom Davis, R–Va., a spokesman for President Bush was saying the bill is unconstitutional without showing a modicum of sympathy or even a modest understanding of this irony.

The White House spokesman is putting the president in the position of outspoken opposition to expanding the democratic ideal here in the nation's capital, while simultaneously the White House argues the president has the constitutional authority to defend freedom and extend democratic rights to the people of Baghdad and Kabul.

I wrote last May: ''Throughout our nation's history, District of Columbia citizens have given the full measure of their allegiance to the United States. They have fought in and died in every war in which the United States was engaged, they have paid billions in taxes, and they have provided labor and resources to the U.S. economy and government. Yet for 200 years, District residents have been bystanders in the governance of their nation.''

With regard to the constitutional arguments, one of the leading conservative lights in the House of Representatives, Mike Pence of Indiana, recently wrote, ''Opponents of D.C. voting understandably cite the plain language of Article I that the House of Representatives be comprised of representatives elected by 'the people of the several states.' If this were the only reference to the powers associated with the federal city, it would be most persuasive, but it is not. Article I, Section 8, Cl. 17 provides, 'The Congress shall have power . . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever' over the District of Columbia.''

Pence courageously and wisely voted yes against White House wishes and, sadly, those of the GOP leadership.

In 1984, Justice Antonin Scalia observed that the Seat of Government Clause of the Constitution gives Congress ''extraordinary and plenary'' power over our nation's capital. Scalia added that this provision of the Constitution ''enables Congress to do many things in the District of Columbia which it has no authority to do in the 50 states . . . There has never been any rule of law that Congress must treat people in the District of Columbia exactly the same as people are treated in various states.'' United States v. Cohen, 733 F.2d 128, 140 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

Chief Justice John Marshall acknowledged in the early 19th century that ''It is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which are open to aliens, and to the citizens of every state in the union, should be closed upon (district citizens).'' But, he explained, ''This is a subject for legislative, not for judicial consideration.''

Marshall thereby laid out the blueprint by which Congress, rather than the courts, could treat the District as a state under the Constitution for the purposes of enfranchisement.

Neither I, nor Tom Davis nor Mike Pence, is arguing for the District of Columbia to become a state. Indeed, from the inception of our nation the founders believed the House of Representatives was the House of the people. I believe passionately that the architects of the American Constitution left us the tools to ensure that all American people should have a voice and vote in the ''people's house.''

I'm troubled by people in the White House who show compassion for the people of Baghdad and Kabul, as they should, but can't find it in their hearts to show anything but indifference to the cries for justice in the nation's capital.

What these presidential advisers are doing is rigidly interpreting the Constitution in such a way as to make the Party of Lincoln into a party that condemns the people of our nation's capital, including four of my 17 grandchildren, from ever participating in the great issues of the day as debated and decided in the House of Representatives.

Indeed, this is taxation without representation.

Republicans have historically supported civil, human and voting rights, including the passage of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments. We have a great history of bipartisan support for civil rights, but it was our presidential candidate in 1964 who refused to take a stand for civil and social justice for African-Americans.

My question is, does this president want to continue the legacy of Lincoln, Grant and Eisenhower, or that of Barry Goldwater in 1964?

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 2007]

MORE THAN WORDS

National Democratic party leaders are on record with their unequivocal endorsement of the District's bid for full voting rights in the House of Representatives. Support is always welcome, but what's needed is action. It's time for the Democrats who control Congress to act on legislation to end the disenfranchisement of citizens living in the nation's capital.

The Democratic National Committee voted last weekend to support the measure, promising a grass-roots lobbying campaign. It's a welcome boost for a bill that has languished too long. Sponsored by Rep. Thomas M. Davis III (R–VA.) and the District's nonvoting delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton (D), the measure would add two seats to the House—one for the heavily Democratic District and the other for largely Republican Utah. The bill enjoyed widespread bipartisan support in the past Congress but was never scheduled for a floor vote, to what should be the everlasting embarrassment of the Republican leadership.

Democrats are in a position to push the bill for approval, but internal party squabbling has slowed its movement. Some Democrats balked at doing anything for Utah until they were convinced that the District seat wouldn't have a chance unless balanced against Utah, which probably would get an extra seat anyway after the next census reapportionment. In recent days, Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D–Calif.) has raised the concern that the bill would give Utah an extra electoral college vote in the 2008 presidential election and could hurt Democrats in a close race. The question is whether Democrats will allow that highly remote and partisan concern to stand in the way of their claimed support for fair representation for District residents.

Party insiders are confident that the disagreements will be ironed out, and they stress that, unlike the Republican leadership, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D–Calif.) and Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer (D–Md.) are genuinely committed to voting rights for the District. We have no reason to doubt that. But the strength of the bill crafted by Mr. Davis and Ms. Norton is that it takes into account the self-interest of both parties while weighing the needs of the people of the District and Utah. Tinkering with that formula could doom the bill, and no matter how good the intentions of lawmakers, the District deserves results.

[From the Virginian-Pilot, Mar. 21, 2007]

SENSIBLE COMPROMISE ON D.C. VOTING

''Taxation without representation'' has been a bedrock excuse for American political dissent since Boston Tea Party days.

Which brings us to the perennial crack in the teacup—the 600,000 residents of the District of Columbia, many of whom are required to pay taxes but none of whom gets to elect a voting member of Congress.

Now, Reps. Tom Davis, R–Va., and Eleanor Holmes Norton, the District's non-voting representative to Congress, have teamed to sponsor an innovative plan thought to have the best shot in years of closing the gap between principle and practice.

The D.C. Voting Rights Act of 2007 would expand the number of U.S. House seats from 435 to 437, balancing a predictably Democratic D.C. vote with one from a new, predictably Republican Utah district.

Previous expansions of congressional membership sought similar balance. At the last census, Utah came within a whisker of getting an additional seat. It fell short, Utahans claim, only because hundreds of young Mormon missionaries were on the road and weren't counted.

The Norton-Davis legislation passed both the House Government Operations Committee, which Davis used to chair, and the Judiciary Committee, but never made it to the floor when Republicans controlled the House.

Now, the Democrats in charge expect to bring the proposal to a floor vote, probably later this month.

Opponents of the bill question its constitutionality, noting that Article 1 says members should be chosen by ''the people of the several states.'' Norton-Davis counters that the District actually had a voting representative for several years around the turn of the 19th century, so the precedent already is set.

Various constitutional scholars have opined that the framers clearly intended for all the nation's citizens to have voting representation at the highest levels of government. Conservatives ascribing to that view include former U.S. Circuit Judge Kenneth W. Starr, who served on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

So long as a reasonable constitutional reading supports the legislation, and it does, Norton-Davis ought to pass.

A large block of taxpaying citizens should not to be disenfranchised through no fault of their own. Tom Davis and Eleanor Holmes Norton have offered a reasonable fix.

[From the Columbian, Jan. 4, 2007]

IN OUR VIEW—FAIR IS FAIR

And D.C. residents are not getting a fair deal.

Here are 435 voting members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Washington, the 15th largest state with 6.3 million residents, has nine of them. That's 2.068 percent of the House.

Wyoming, the nation's smallest state with 509,000 people, has one House member—0.229 percent.

With 550,000-plus residents, the District of Columbia, which would rank one above Wyoming if it were a state, has zero voting members in the House.

That's 0.000 percent.

That's not fair.

Congress can rectify this inequality and fix a glitch in the Utah's House apportionment at the same time. Our federal lawmakers should enact a proposal to increase House voting members to 437. One new seat would go to the District of Columbia and one to Utah. The D.C. seat would almost certainly be won by a Democrat and Utah's by a Republican.

The reasons for D.C. being shorted on representation for more than two centuries are numerous and of debatable legitimacy. What is indisputable is that more than a half-million Americans living in the very city that is the seat of federal government face federal taxation without representation, and it isn't fair. Utah's two U.S. senators and the state's political establishment support this idea, which died in the Republican-controlled Congress last month. They make a convincing case that in the 2000 census, Utah was undercounted because many of the state's young Mormons were out of state doing missionary

work. Had they all been counted, the argument goes, Utah would have earned a fourth House member and some other state would have lost one.

There are two legitimate concerns. One is that the Constitution says members of the House shall be chosen by ''the people of the several states'' and D.C. is not a state. But, many scholars say the Constitution also gives Congress power ''to exercise exclusive legislation'' over D.C. and therefore may give the District a voting member of the House.

Then there's the fear that if Congress starts down this road, it will add House members on political whims in the future. But that hasn't been the practice. In fact, Congress added two seats in 1959, giving one each to the new states of Alaska and Hawaii, but after the 1960 census cut the total back to 435. The new states kept one each and other states gave up the two, based on population.

A legitimate case can be made that D.C. should get one seat and Utah should get nothing until the next census. But this Utah-D.C. scenario is the best chance in decades for the District of Columbia to get rightful representation. In the name of fairness, Congress should make it happen.

[From the Battle Creek Enquirer (MI), Jan. 5, 2007]

PROPOSAL WOULD GIVE D.C. AND UTAH NEW HOUSE SEATS

For years, the fact that residents of Washington, D.C., have no voting representation in Congress has been a political hot potato. In 1961, the 23rd Amendment to the Constitution gave them the right to vote in presidential elections, and a decade later Congress voted to allow the district to send a nonvoting delegate to the House. That delegate currently is Eleanor Holmes Norton, who is allowed to vote on matters at the committee level, but not once they come to the House floor.

Now Congress may soon consider a bill that would increase the voting membership of the House from 435 to 437, adding new seats both for the District of Columbia and Utah.

The argument for giving Utah a fourth House seat is supported by those who insist the 2000 census undercounted Utah's population because of the many young Mormon men who travel out of that state as part of their missionary work.

Since D.C. is considered a Democratic stronghold and Utah is dominated by Republicans, the proposal has gained bipartisan support and could be taken up early in this congressional session.

The District of Columbia was created to provide an independent site for federal government that did not favor anyone state. Congress moved there from Philadelphia in 1800, and shortly thereafter the question of voting rights for D.C. residents became an issue. The lack of a voting representative long has been a sore point for many of the district's approximately 600,000 residents, who pay federal taxes and must abide by rules established by Congress.

Congress approved a constitutional amendment to provide a voting representative for district residents in 1978, but it failed to be ratified by three-fourths of the states.

There is debate among scholars as to whether increasing the number of House members requires a constitutional amendment, but supporters of this latest proposal insist that it does not. They say that all that is required is for Congress to revise a 1929 law that fixed House membership at 435 seats. That limit was boosted to 437 in 1959 in order to give representatives to the new states of Alaska and Hawaii, but then went back to 435 with the reapportionment after the 1960 census.

Washington, D.C., is the only national capital in any democratic nation where residents do not have full voting rights. We think district residents should have a voting representative in Congress, and there is merit to the D.C.-Utah proposal that we hope will be considered soon by federal lawmakers.

[From washingtonpost.com, Mar. 22, 2007]

D.C. VOTING: A GOP ISSUE—OPPOSITION TO A HOUSE SEAT GOES AGAINST PARTY TRADITION

(By Carol Schwartz)

Having personally written to President Bush and Congress numerous times over the years urging them to support voting rights for the citizens of our nation's capital, I was disheartened to learn that the Republican leadership is working to defeat legislation that would add a voting member from the District of Columbia and a voting member from Utah to the House of Representatives, and that the president is thinking about vetoing the bill. As a fellow Republican, I beseech them to reconsider.

News accounts indicate that Republican opposition is based largely on ''constitutional concerns.'' However, respected constitutional scholars have argued that a congressional vote for the District is well within the bounds of the Constitution. Former solicitor general Kenneth Starr and Patricia M. Wald, a former chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, jointly wrote, ''There is nothing in our Constitution's history or its fundamental principles suggesting that the Framers intended to deny the precious right to vote to those who live in the capital of the great democracy they founded.'' Viet Dihn, a Georgetown University law professor and principal author of the USA Patriot Act, argued in a paper submitted to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that it is constitutional to give the District a vote.

Regardless of the outcome of this debate, why would the president—who has committed so much to fighting for democracy around the world—and Republican members of Congress not stand on the side of democracy for the 572,000 residents of the District of Columbia? Who is going to challenge in court the rectification of this centuries-long injustice? And if someone is cruel enough to try, let the Supreme Court decide otherwise.

I want to remind my fellow Republicans that historically our party has been at the forefront of struggles to enfranchise citizens and expand basic rights. It was a Republican Congress, the 38th, that proposed the 13th Amendment to abolish slavery. It was a Republican Congress, the 39th, that proposed the 14th Amendment, guaranteeing due process and equal protection under the law. It was a Republican Congress, the 40th, that proposed the 15th Amendment, guaranteeing citizens the right to vote regardless of their race. And it was a Republican Congress, the 66th, that proposed the 19th Amendment, guaranteeing women the right to vote.

I had hoped that the recent Republican Congress would continue this admirable tradition. The introduction of a D.C. voting rights bill by a Republican, Rep. Tom Davis (Va.), was a good start. Although the bill made it out of committee, unfortunately it never went to the House floor. President Bush and Congress still have the opportunity to advance the democratic cause here at home. And they should, particularly since ours is the only capital city in any of the world's democracies where citizens do not have voting representation in their national legislature.

In doing so, Republican members would uphold a proud tradition as well as be in good company. For generations, respected Republican statesmen have expressed support for voting rights for D.C. residents. Former Senate majority leader Robert Dole, during an earlier voting rights effort, said, ''The Republican Party supported D.C. voting representation because it was just, and in justice we could do nothing else.'' Former Senate minority leader Howard Baker, describing representation in the legislature as the ''bedrock of our republic,'' said that Congress ''cannot continue to deny American citizens their right to equal representation in the national government.'' Former president Richard Nixon said, ''It should offend the democratic sense of this nation that the citizens of its capital . . . have no voice in Congress.'' And former senator Prescott Bush, the president's grandfather, said in 1961, ''Congress has treated the District with slight consideration. We have treated it like a stepchild, in comparison with the way we have treated other States. . . . They should also be entitled to representation in the Congress.''

It is obvious that this injustice has persisted far too long. Our country's leaders have within their power the ability to address it now. It is time to give the residents of the District of Columbia—who pay federal taxes and who were subject to the military draft—a fundamental right that all other Americans enjoy: our long overdue vote in the United States House of Representatives. I implore the president and Congress to do what I believe they know in their hearts is right.

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 20, 2007]

D.C. VOTING RIGHTS AND CONGRESSIONAL POLITICS

(By Tod Lindberg)

When I moved to Washington 21 years ago and decided to live in the District rather than Maryland or Virginia, I knew I was voluntarily choosing to forgo something most Americans take entirely for granted, namely, their say in choosing a representative in the House and two members of the Senate. In truth, I was not especially bothered by this lost opportunity for political participation then, nor am I now.

You could say, moreover, that no one lives in the District involuntarily. If voting for a member of Congress and senators is a sufficiently high priority for you, you can probably find your way to a location that allows you to do so. And you could remark, as well, the special constitutional status of the District as precisely not a state, equal among other states, but rather a place where the representatives of all the states, that is, Congress as a whole, has jurisdiction. One might even deem this constitutional provision to have been an innovative and admirable solution to the late 18th-century problem of the undue influence a state might have were it home to the nation's capital.

Nor is the District some sort of island of authoritarianism in a sea of democracies. D.C. residents have for more than a generation enjoyed substantial home-rule powers, including the ability to elect a legislative body, the D.C. Council, and a mayor who has genuine and not merely symbolic power. It is undeniable that Congress second-guesses these locally elected officials from time to time, and indeed reserves the right to intervene on a massive scale in case of local mismanagement, a judgment Congress alone will make, not subject to appeal by local residents. We saw this in the days of the Control Board. But in the ordinary course of events, substantial political decisions are the province of locally elected officials. And

even at the national level, the District is not entirely cut out, since it has three votes in the electoral college that decides the presidency, the same number as the least populous states.

Nevertheless, how exactly is it a good thing that residents of the District, uniquely among American taxpayers, have no representation in Congress? I think critics of the proposal now emerging to replace the District's participation-limited delegate with a full-fledged voting member of Congress owe us an explanation of why it's better for the country for residents of the District not to be able to have a share in selecting a member of the national legislature. That includes the White House, which has expressed opposition to the legislation on constitutional grounds.

If the provision of the Constitution holding that members of Congress shall come from the states (by implication, not from anywhere that isn't a state) is dispositive, then why not let the Supreme Court be the body that says so? Since at least some legal scholars believe that the provision cited is not the last and dispositive word on the subject, why pre-empt the question? Or rather, please, let us hear the reason from the executive branch why the president would choose to pre-empt by asserting his view of the Constitution in his veto message when the legislation gets to his desk.

No, presidents and lawmakers shouldn't be casual about the responsibility they accept in their oaths of office to protect and defend the Constitution. But in this instance, we have a true anomaly, hundreds of thousands of people who lack what every other American taxpayer has, an equal say in the selection of a lawmaker.

It's not obvious that taking action to address this anomaly would harm any other interest the Constitution protects. Oh, one can spin out elaborate and paranoid scenarios, according to which the representative from the District of Columbia becomes the chairperson of a powerful committee and then, uh, well, what exactly? Earmarks federal dollars to construct bike paths in D.C.? Federally funded bike paths may be stupid, but they are no more stupid in the District than in any congressional district.

In fact, addressing this anomaly of disenfranchisement would fit into a centuries-long tradition of expanding the franchise to those whom contemporaneous reasoning now concludes are unreasonably excluded. If taking such action requires a constitutional amendment, let the Supreme Court say so.

It seems to me that the only other possible objection, besides the constitutional one, is politics. And it's a pretty serious one, in that the representative from the District would be a Democrat for the foreseeable future. Why would Republicans be willing to go along with an extra Democrat? But that's the beauty of the proposed legislation: In adding a seat to Republican-friendly Utah, thereby increasing the size of the House from 435 to 437, lawmakers came up with a reasonable way to address a longstanding injustice without harming anyone unduly. They devised a fair political solution to a fair political objection.

They don't do this so often, in the scheme of things, that we should neglect supporting them when they do.

[From Roll Call, Feb. 28, 2007]

VOTE FOR D.C.

Now that Democrats have control of the House, it's simply inexplicable that legislation to give voting rights to the District of Columbia's delegate is not moving rapidly toward passage.

Voting rights for D.C. has broad support in the majority party, including that of both Speaker Nancy Pelosi (Calif.) and House Judiciary Chairman John Conyers (Mich.). Yet no hearings have been scheduled on H.R. 328, co-sponsored by D.C. Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D) and Rep. Tom Davis (R–Va.), to give Norton voting rights while giving Utah a fourth Congressional seat and enlarging the House to 437 Members.

The bill does present constitutional problems, as a recent Congressional Research Service report details. Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution stipulates that the House shall be made up of Members chosen every two years by the people of the several states. Since D.C. is not a state, but a constitutionally designated federal district, a CRS analysis concluded last month that ''it is difficult to identify either Constitutional text or existing case law that would directly support the allocation by statute of the power to vote in the full House of the D.C. delegate.''

On the other hand, Article 1, Section 8 grants Congress exclusive legislative authority ''in all cases whatsoever'' over the District. As another CRS report suggested last month, there is a conflict here. We suggest that Congress resolve it by passing the Norton-Davis bill promptly and then await a court test to determine its constitutionality. If the measure is struck down, Congress should look for other methods to grant voting rights to the District, which the principle of representative government demands.

The other options include a constitutional amendment; ''retrocession,'' giving D.C. residents the right to vote in Maryland; and Congressional action making D.C. (or at least part of it) a state. Everyone of these solutions presents a political problem—the fact that D.C. is overwhelmingly Democratic—that the Norton-Davis bill neatly skirted by balancing a vote in D.C. with a vote in overwhelmingly Republican Utah.

Meanwhile, the House has taken symbolic action by giving D.C., as well as other U.S. possessions—Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands—a vote when the House meets as a Committee of the Whole. But their votes don't count if they make the difference in the outcome of legislation. This amounts to the right to participate but not to have an effect.

D.C., with about 570,000 residents, has a larger population than Wyoming and is shy by only about 100,000 of matching three other states—which, of course, have two Senators and at least one House Member. We hope that the Democratic Congress will pass a measure granting D.C. full voting rights—and that President Bush will sign it. In the meantime, however, the Judiciary Committee and the House should get on with passing Norton-Davis as an interim step toward justice.

[From the Washington Post, May 3, 2005]

A VOTE IN THE HOUSE

WHEN THE HOUSE of Representatives votes on federal taxes or decides solemn questions such as when citizens must go off to war, the District's representative, Eleanor Holmes Norton, has to stand and watch as her Democratic and Republican colleagues decide the fate of her constituents. Despite having served and died in 10 wars and paid billions in federal taxes, D.C. residents are still voteless in Congress. That inexecusable situation exists despite polls showing that the American public favors congressional representation for D.C. residents. Today Rep. Thomas M. Davis III (R–Va.) will launch a second effort to rectify at least half of the problem by sponsoring a bill that gives the District a vote in the House. The measure would still leave the District unrepresented in the Senate. The Davis proposal, however, is a substantial advance in D.C. voting rights and deserves strong bipartisan support in Congress.

Mr. Davis's measure would achieve the goal of giving the district a single vote by increasing the size of the House by two and reapportioning seats. Given the most recent census, the likely result would be an extra seat for Utah along with the District. And given party registration and voting patterns in the two jurisdictions, the Utah seat is likely to be held by a Republican and the District's by a Democrat. The new arrangement would last, under Mr. Davis's proposal, until the regular 2012 reapportionment, at which time the House would revert to 435 members to be divided by population among the District and the states. No matter what happens to the size of Utah's delegation at that point, the District would keep its seat.

This should be a win-win situation. For those hoping to address the controversy over the last census count, when Utah just barely lost out on a fourth seat, Mr. Davis offers a remedy. As far as the District is concerned, the bill will most assuredly give D.C. residents what Mr. Davis has called ''the primary tool of democratic participation: representation in the national legislature.''

Unfortunately, blind partisanship may trump democracy unless members take a stand against the present injustice. Fear that the Republican-dominated Utah state legislature would redraw lines to doom a Democratic member of the House caused Democrats to balk at the Davis proposal in the last Congress. We have stated on other occasions our own dislike for the way redistricting is being conducted in most states—amounting to little more than state-sanctioned gerrymandering benefiting incumbents, the majority party or both—and have offered our own thoughts on a proper alternative. However, depriving more than half a million District residents of a fundamental right enjoyed by all other Americans because of partisan politics is neither a proper nor an acceptable response by the Democratic Party. A D.C. vote in the House is the right thing to do. We remain fully committed to the District having two senators as well as representation in the House. The Davis proposal takes the nation's capital halfway there.

[From the Hill]

LET D.C. PLAY

The people of the District of Columbia have finally gotten back their rightful representation in Major League Baseball; the Washington Nationals have swiftly become an established and moderately successful National League team. It now seems odd that there were people who argued the D.C. residents already had a local team—by which they meant the Orioles, beyond the Maryland state line in Baltimore. All that has changed; when there is a pennant to be won, the District will no longer have to sit on the sidelines.

Something like this happy event is now possible in the political arena, too, with Rep. Tom Davis's (R–Va) legislation that would temporarily increase House membership to 437 by giving D.C. one voting seat, and Utah an extra one. After the next census, the number would fall again to 435, but Washington would keep its seat, and the remaining 434 would be divided among the states according to population.

This as it should be. It is an injustice and an embarrassment that people who live in the nation's capital are disenfranchised. They have no less a moral right to a say in the policies that govern them than any other American citizens. It is pleasing that they now have another chance of acquiring the

legal right as well. No partisan calculations should cloud principle when lawmakers vote on this issue. Davis's bill deserves to become law.

If the baseball analogy may be stretched yet further, however, it is also worth noting that the new team did not adopt the same name as the team that abandoned Washington a generation ago: the Senators. There are those who argue that the District should also have two senators in the upper chamber of Capitol Hill, but the case for this is less convincing than for voting representation in the House.

The House is a proportional body, in that seats are apportioned according to population numbers. But the Senate is not representative in that way—never was, and never was intended to be. Indeed it was, as is often being said these days, designed as a counter-weight to the power of the more purely representative body. Tiny states such as Delaware and Wyoming have two senators, just as huge ones such as California and Texas have two. Until the passage of the 17h Amendment in 1913, senators generally were chosen by state legislatures rather than directly elected by the people.

Senate representation is the preserve of formal statehood and there are reasonable arguments on both sides as to whether D.C. should become a state. Whatever the dispute in principle, however, there is no chance of D.C. statehood soon. Perhaps it will come, but for now it's enough that House representation is on the table again.

[From Roll Call, May 4, 2005]

GIVE D.C. A VOTE

If the District of Columbia were a state, it would rank third in per-capita income taxes paid to the federal government. In America's wars of the 20th century, the District suffered more casualties than several states did. So there is no excuse for the nation to continue to leave D.C. residents without any representation in Congress.

Ideally, the District should be represented in both the House and Senate, as called for in Democratic-backed legislation introduced by D.C. Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D) and Sen. Joe Lieberman (D–Conn.). Unfortunately, that bill has zero chance of passing and being signed into law. So, as an interim measure—and we acknowledge it may be a long interim—we urge leaders of both parties to get behind the bill just reintroduced by Rep. Tom Davis (R–Va.) to give D.C. a vote in the House. The measure would temporarily enlarge the House by two, adding one seat for the District and one for heavily Republican Utah—a constructive nod toward the partisan balance that seems to be a prerequisite for passage.

The Constitution gives Congress all the power it needs to give D.C. a vote in Congress. In fact, Congress has the power ''to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'' over the capital district. Legal scholars, including conservatives such as former federal appeals court judge Kenneth Starr, agree that the Constitution permits Congress free rein on the issue of representation. While statehood would require a constitutional amendment, voting representation would not.

We're glad to see that the idea of giving the District representation has attracted the support of Republicans. Davis' measure has 11 GOP co-sponsors, including two from Utah. Two other bills, both of which would give D.C. residents voting rights in Maryland by different means, are also sponsored by Republicans, Reps. Dana Rohrabacher (Calif.) and Ralph Regula (Ohio).

Unfortunately, the GOP sponsors have not been able to interest their party's leaders in their measures. In fact, when Republicans took control of the House in 1995, one of their first acts was to reverse a Democratic rule allowing the D.C. Delegate to vote in the Committee of the whole House when that vote was not decisive in the outcome. We hope that Davis, the influential chairman of the Government Reform Committee and former chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, can convince his leaders of the merits of the cause.

Some Democrats have been opposed, both because they support full representation and because they fear that Utah's GOP-dominated Legislature might eliminate the state's lone Democratic district in the process of a mid-decade reapportionment. The state's GOP Members should pledge not to pursue such a course.

There's not much that Republicans and Democrats are doing together in this Congress. One thing that they can do, however, is expand democracy right in their own backyard.

[From Human Events.com, Mar. 17, 2007]

WHY I VOTED FOR D.C. REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE

(By Rep. Mike Pence)

Last week in the House Judiciary Committee, I voted in favor of legislation granting the residents of the District of Columbia the right to full voting representation in the House of Representatives. I believe this legislation is a constitutional remedy to a historic wrong. While many have focused on the political consequences of such a move, the only question for a Member of Congress on such matters is this: what does justice demand and what does the Constitution of the United States permit Congress to do to remedy this wrong?

The fact that more than half a million Americans living in the District of Columbia are denied a single voting representative in Congress is clearly a historic wrong and justice demands that it be addressed. At the time of the adoption of our present system of government, the federal city did not exist apart from a reference in the Constitution. When the District of Columbia opened for business in 1801, only a few thousand residents lived within her boundaries. Among the founders, only Alexander Hamilton would forsee the bustling metropolis that Washington, D.C. would become and he advocated voting representation for the citizens of the District.

The demands of history in favor of representation for the Americans living in Washington, D.C. is compelling. In establishing the republic, the single overarching principle of the American founding was that laws should be based upon the consent of the governed. The first generation of Americans threw tea in Boston harbor because they were denied a voting representative in the national legislature in England. Given their fealty to representative democracy, it is inconceivable to me that our Founders would have been willing to accept the denial of representation to so great a throng of Americans in perpetuity.

But the demands of justice are not enough for Congress to act. Under the principles of limited government, a republic may only take that action which is authorized by the written Constitution.

In this regard, I believe that the legislation moving through the Congress is constitutional. And I am not alone in this view. In support of this legislation, Judge Kenneth Starr, former independent counsel and U.S. solicitor general observed, ''there is nothing in our Constitution's history or its fundamental principles suggesting that the Framers intended to deny the precious right to vote to those who live in the capital of the great democracy they founded''.

Opponents of D.C. Voting understandably cite the plain language of Article I that the House of Representatives be comprised of representatives elected by ''the people of the several states''. If this were the only reference to the powers associated with the federal city, it would be most persuasive but it is not. Article I, Section 8, CI. 17 provides, ''The Congress shall have power . . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'' over the District of Columbia.

Justice Antonin Scalia observed in 1984, that the Seat of Government Clause, gives Congress ''extraordinary and plenary'' power over our nation's capital. Scalia added that this provision of the Constitution ''enables Congress to do many things in the District of Columbia which it has no authority to do in the 50 states. . . . There has never been any rule of law that Congress must treat people in the District of Columbia exactly the same as people are treated in various states''. United States v. Cohen, 733 F.2d 128, 140 (D.C. Cir. 1984)

And Congress has used this power to remedy the rights of Americans in the District of Columbia in the past. In 1949, the Supreme Court upheld legislation that extended access to the federal courts even though Article III expressly limited the jurisdiction of the federal courts to suits brought by citizens of different states. As Judge Starr observed, ''the logic of this case applies here, and supports Congress's determination to give the right to vote for a representative to citizens of the District of Columbia''.

None of which argues for the District of Columbia to ever be granted the right to elect members of the United States Senate. In the most profound sense, from the inception of our nation, the House of Representatives was an extension of the people. I believe our founders left us the tools in the Constitution to ensure that all the American people have a voice in the people's house.

The Senate, from the inception of our nation, was an extension of the states. Senators were appointed by state legislatures until 1915. The Senate was and remains the expression of the principle of federalism in the national legislature and should ever be so. If the people of the District of Columbia would like two seats in the United States Senate, they will have to become a state.

The old book tells us what is required, ''do justice, love kindness and walk humbly with your God.'' I believe that justice demands we right this historic wrong. The American people should have representation in the people's house. I believe that kindness demands that, like Republicans from Abraham Lincoln to Jack Kemp, we do the right thing for all Americans regardless of race or political creed. And I believe humility demands that we do so in a manner consistent with our constitution, laws and traditions. The D.C. Voting bill meets this test and I am honored to have the opportunity to continue to play some small role in leading our constitutional republic ever closer to a more perfect union.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, has the gentleman yielded back his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I want to end this debate by finally letting genuine constitutional scholars speak to this bill.

To guarantee the Framers' promise to the citizens of Maryland and Virginia, who contributed their land to form this Capital City, the very first Congress enforced the District clause of the Constitution by law, guaranteeing the status quo during the 10-

year transition period, and they said, by law thereafter, as memorialized in the Constitution itself.

The Framers had left Congress fully armed with ''exclusive jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever,'' which former Court of Appeals Judge Kenneth Starr, who testified in favor of the bill, said, left Congress with power ''majestic in scope.''

Professor Viet Dinh, President Bush's former Attorney General for Legal Policy, his point man on the Constitution in the Ashcroft Justice Department, testified in two separate committees that the bill is constitutional. He said that since the birth of the Republic, the courts and the Congress itself have treated the District as a State in treaties and in statutes and in applying the Constitution to the city. Members who reject the views even of conservative scholars and of the Supreme Court and the Federal courts supporting their views should be confident to send this bill to a conservative Supreme Court.

Members are elected officials who can neither run nor hide behind their personal and inexpert views on the Constitution. Another branch will be held fully accountable for that weighty decision. Our decision, in just a few minutes, is just as weighty, today when the world sees us at war, we say, to spread democracy and wants to know whether we practice democracy or merely preach it. Our decision comes down to whether this House wants to be remembered for granting the vote or denying it, and whether this place will be the people's House or the House for some of the people.

Mr. WYNN. Madam Speaker, I represent the 4th District of Maryland which abuts the District of Columbia. These citizens are our friends, neighbors, and relatives. It is time to give the citizens of the District of Columbia full representation in the House of Representatives. It is time to end the injustice of ''taxation without representation'' for the District and give these good citizens the right to vote.

For 206 years, the citizens of the District of Columbia have paid taxes, served in the military and worked hard for this great country and yet, for over 200 years these citizens have been denied the right to representation. The United States is the only democracy in the world that, to date, has deprived the residents of its capital city full voting representation.

We have sent thousands of soldiers overseas and spent billions of dollars fighting to bring democracy to the rest of the world. We must stand on the side of democracy in our country and give our own citizens in the District of Columbia the right to vote and an opportunity for full representation in this great democracy.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia Fair and Equal House Voting Rights Act of 2007.

Today, the House of Representatives has a chance to correct an injustice that affects the nearly 600,000 residents of the District of Columbia. These citizens pay Federal taxes, serve in our military and the Federal Government and graciously host millions of American and foreign tourists every year, yet they remain unable to have their views represented in Congress. It is indeed ironic that the capital of our Nation, where our government and many non-governmental organizations work to promote freedom and liberty in other countries, is not representative of the ideals that we urge others to value. We have the chance to rectify this glaring problem today.

One of the primary justifications of the American Revolution was our forefathers' opposition to ''taxation without representation.'' Indeed, in my home town Warwick, angry Rhode Islanders attacked and burned the British customs ship H.M.S. *Gaspee* in 1772 to demonstrate their opposition to British rule—one of the earliest acts of rebellion leading to the American Revolution. Fortunately, the residents of the District of Columbia have not resorted to such extreme tactics to achieve justice, but they have been more than patient, waiting more than 200 years for a right that is enjoyed by 300 million other Americans.

The bipartisan legislation before us today would give the District of Columbia a voting member in the House, as well as create a second new seat for Utah, thereby raising the number of Members in the House to 437. It would finally grant Washingtonians a voice in Federal legislation involving health, governance, budgeting, taxes, gun control and other matters directly affecting their lives and livelihoods. Our current system of disenfranchisement for District residents does not befit a nation as noble as the United States, and it is time for change.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1433 so that we may grant fair representation to the residents of Washington, DC.

Mr. CANNON. Madam Speaker, today, the House is presented with a unique opportunity to address two prevailing problems with representation in the House.

One relates to whether the District is entitled to a Representative and the other whether Utah is owed an additional seat in Congress because of the illegitimate counting of residents after the 2000 census.

Utah lost out on a 4th seat because of a census bureau decision to count, and to enumerate to their respective home States, government employees residing temporarily abroad, but not count similarly situated missionaries.

Had the Bureau either not counted any Americans residing temporarily abroad, or counted all such Americans and not just those employed by the Federal Government, Utah would have been awarded a fourth seat.

Although this legislation provides Utah the seat it deserves and was denied in the 2000 census, I do have concerns with the language in the bill which ties the hands of the Utah legislature.

The preemption language is offensive and demeans the historic role of States in the reapportionment process.

I offered an amendment that was rejected by the Rules Committee on a 7–4 vote that would have simply removed the language of the bill mandating the ''at large'' seat in Section 4 and left it to the State to decide.

The amendment would have changed ''shall'' to ''may'', and would not have prohibited an at large seat, but rather would have provided Utah the opportunity to choose whether to redistrict or not.

The intent of my amendment was to reaffirm the role of the State in the decisionmaking process, but the Democrats treated the 10th Amendment of the Constitution as words without meaning by rejecting my amendment.

Although I will vote in favor of this legislation, as this bill moves forward I will continue my efforts to push for inclusion of my amendment to protect the State's role in the process.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1433, I am pleased we are moving quickly to consider this legislation, to finally give Washington, DC voting rights in the House of Representatives.

This bill would establish the District of Columbia as a congressional district and thus grant the citizens of the District representation in Congress.

The legislation also would grant an additional congressional seat to Utah based on the results of the 2000 Census.

Unlike some previous versions of this legislation, H.R. 1433 would make these two seats permanent.

The Oversight and Government Reform Committee has led the charge on granting the city of Washington, DC the right to have a full vote in the House of Representatives.

The citizens of the District pay Federal taxes, so it is only right they have a say in Federal affairs.

Madam Speaker, I urge the support of this important and historic legislation.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1422, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act.

Our Constitution clearly states that Members of Congress should be chosen by residents of States.

However much we might revere our Nation's capital and appreciate its residents, our Founders decided not to make it a State.

In fact, Alexander Hamilton offered an amendment at the 1788 Constitution ratification convention to give D.C. representation in the House, but his amendment was rejected.

In 1978, the 95th Congress passed a similar amendment, but only 16 of the required 38 States ratified it in the 7 year time period before it expired.

The message from these votes is clear: only residents of States may have representation in Congress.

The Constitution lays out a method for adding a new State to our Nation.

If we truly want D.C. to have congressional representation, we can either work to make D.C. a State, make it part of an existing State, or we can either amend the Constitution, like the 95th Congress attempted to do.

And if we actually did this the right way, we wouldn't spend years in litigation while D.C. residents' votes hang in the balance.

Listen up America! This bill is merely a shortcut around the tools we have at our disposal, and is therefore blatantly unconstitutional.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I strongly support the DC House Voting Rights Act. It is long overdue to give the nearly two-thirds of a million residents of our Nation's Capital the fundamental right of representation.

This is not a partisan issue. Maintaining a fair and responsive government is a duty that transcends politics.

This legislation fairly addresses both parties by granting one seat in the House to the District and one additional seat to Utah, which is next in line to receive an additional House seat based on its population. This elegant and equitable solution leaves the overall composition of the House unchanged as the District seat is anticipated to be Democratic and the Utah seat Republican.

Given this bipartisan spirit, I am disappointed that the administration is fighting to deny citizens their basic voting rights. I hope the President has the good sense to withdraw his veto threat. Any concerns this administration has regarding this bill's constitutional appropriateness are best left up to the judicial branch to clarify.

I am proud to support this important legislation and urge its speedy passage into law. Residents of the District have waited long enough.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I am, Madam Speaker, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Smith of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1433 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 6. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PERSONAL PROTECTION.

(a) REFORM D.C. COUNCIL'S AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT FIREARMS.—Section 4 of the Act entitled ''An Act to prohibit the killing of wild birds and wild animals in the District of Columbia'', approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 809; sec. 1–303.43, D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Nothing in this section or any other provision of law shall authorize, or shall be construed to permit, the Council, the Mayor, or any governmental or regulatory authority of the District of Columbia to prohibit, constructively prohibit, or unduly burden the ability of persons not prohibited from possessing firearms under Federal law from acquiring, possessing in their homes or businesses, or using for sporting, self-protection or other lawful purposes, any firearm neither prohibited by Federal law nor subject to the National Firearms Act. The District of Columbia shall not have authority to enact laws or regulations that discourage or eliminate the private ownership or use of firearms.''.

(b) REPEAL D.C. SEMIAUTOMATIC BAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(10) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(10), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

''(10) 'Machine gun' means any firearm which shoots, is designed to shoot, or can be readily converted or restored to shoot automatically, more than 1 shot by a single function of the trigger, and includes the frame or receiver of any such weapon, any part designed and intended solely and exclusively, or combination of parts designed and intended, for use in converting a weapon into a machine gun, and any combination of parts from which a machine gun can be assembled if such parts are in the possession or under the control of a person.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO PROVISIONS SETTING FORTH CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 1(c) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 651; sec. 22—4501(c), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) 'Machine gun', as used in this Act, has the meaning given such term in section 101(10) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975.''.

(c) REPEAL REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(a) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2502.01(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''any firearm, unless'' and all that follows through paragraph (3) and inserting the following: ''any firearm described in subsection (c).''.

(B) DESCRIPTION OF FIREARMS REMAINING ILLEGAL.—Section 201 of such Act (sec. 7–2502.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) A firearm described in this subsection is any of the following:

''(1) A sawed-off shotgun.

''(2) A machine gun.

''(3) A short-barreled rifle.''.

(C) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 201 of such Act (sec. 7—2502.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''Registration requirements'' and inserting ''Firearm Possession''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO FIREARMS CONTROL REGULATIONS ACT.—The Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 is amended as follows:

(A) Sections 202 through 211 (secs. 7–2502.02 through 7–2502.11, D.C. Official Code) are repealed.

(B) Section 101 (sec. 7—2501.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking paragraph (13).

(C) Section 401 (sec. 7—2504.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking ''the District;'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''the District, except that a person may engage in hand loading, reloading, or custom loading of ammunition for firearms lawfully possessed under this Act.''; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking ''which are unregisterable under section 202'' and inserting ''which are prohibited under section 201''.

(D) Section 402 (sec. 7—2504.02, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking ''Any person eligible to register a firearm'' and all that follows through ''such business,'' and inserting the following: ''Any person not otherwise prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under Federal of District law, or from being licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code,''; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) The applicant's name;''.

(E) Section 403(b) (sec. 7—2504.03(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''registration certificate'' and inserting ''dealer's license''.

(F) Section 404(a)(3) (sec. 7—2504.04(a)(3)), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''registration certificate number (if any) of the firearm,'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iv), by striking ''holding the registration certificate'' and inserting ''from whom it was received for repair'';

(iii) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking ''and registration certificate number (if any) of the firearm'';

(iv) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking ''registration certificate number or'';

(v) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking ''or registration number''; and

(vi) in subparagraph (E), by striking clause (iii) and redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (iii) and (iv).

(G) Section 406(c) (sec. 7—2504.06(c), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) Within 45 days of a decision becoming effective which is unfavorable to a licensee or to an applicant for a dealer's license, the licensee or application shall—

''(1) lawfully remove from the District all destructive devices in his inventory, or peaceably surrender to the Chief all destructive devices in his inventory in the manner provided in section 705; and

''(2) lawfully dispose, to himself or to another, any firearms and ammunition in his inventory.''.

(H) Section 407(b) (sec. 7—2504.07(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''would not be eligible'' and all that follows and inserting ''is prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under Federal or District law.''.

(I) Section 502 (sec. 7—2505.02, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(i) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) Any person or organization not prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under Federal or District law may sell or otherwise transfer ammunition or any firearm, except those which are prohibited under section 201, to a licensed dealer.'';

(ii) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) Any licensed dealer may sell or otherwise transfer a firearm to any person or organization not otherwise prohibited from possessing or receiving such firearm under Federal or District law.'';

(iii) in subsection (d), by striking paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(iv) by striking subsection (e).

(J) Section 704 (sec. 7—2507.04, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking ''any registration certificate or'' and inserting ''a''; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking ''registration certificate,''.

(3) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2(4) of the Illegal Firearm Sale and Distribution Strict Liability Act of 1992 (sec. 7—2531.01(2)(4), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or ignoring proof of the purchaser's residence in the District of Columbia''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''registration and''.

(d) REPEAL HANDGUN AMMUNITION BAN.—

(1) DEFINITION OF RESTRICTED PISTOL BULLET.—Section 101(13a) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7—2501.01(13a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(13a)(A) 'Restricted pistol bullet' means—

''(i) a projectile or projectile core which may be used in a handgun and which is constructed entirely (excluding the presence of traces of other substances) from one or a combination of tungsten alloys, steel, iron, brass, bronze, beryllium copper, or depleted uranium; or

''(ii) a full-jacketed projectile larger than .22 caliber designed and intended for use in a handgun and whose jacket has a weight of more than 25 percent of the total weight of the projectile.

''(B) The term 'restricted pistol bullet' does not include shotgun shot required by Federal or State environmental or game regulations for hunting purposes, a frangible projectile designed for target shooting, a projectile which the Attorney General of the United States (pursuant to section 921(a)(17) of title 18, United States Code) finds is primarily intended to be used for sporting purposes, or any other projectile or projectile core which the Attorney General finds is intended to be used for industrial purposes, including a charge used in an oil and gas well perforating device.''.

(2) REPEAL OF BAN.—Section 601 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2506.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) by striking ''ammunition'' each place it appears (other than paragraph (4)) and inserting ''restricted pistol bullets''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(e) RESTORE RIGHT OF SELF DEFENSE IN THE HOME.—Section 702 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2507.02, D.C. Official Code) is repealed.

(f) REMOVE CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR POSSESSION OF UNREGISTERED FIREARMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 706 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2507.06, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) by striking ''that:'' and all that follows through ''(1) A'' and inserting ''that a''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to violations occurring after the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) REMOVE CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR CARRYING A FIREARM IN ONE'S DWELLING OR OTHER PREMISES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(a) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 651; sec. 22—4504(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking ''a pistol,'' and inserting the following: ''except in his dwelling house or place of business or on other land possessed by that person, whether loaded or unloaded, a firearm,''; and

(B) by striking ''except that:'' and all that follows through ''(2) If the violation'' and inserting ''except that if the violation''.

(2) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS.—Section 5(a) of such Act (47 Stat. 651; sec. 22—4505(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) by striking ''pistol'' each place it appears and inserting ''firearm''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', or to any person while carrying or transporting a firearm used in connection with an organized military activity, a target shoot, formal or informal target practice, sport shooting event, hunting, a firearms or hunter safety class, trapping, or a dog obedience training class or show, or the moving by a bona fide gun collector of part or all of the collector's gun collection from place to place for public or private exhibition while the person is engaged in, on the way to, or returning from that activity if each firearm is unloaded and carried in an enclosed case or an enclosed holster, or to any person carrying or transporting a firearm in compliance with sections 926A, 926B or 926C of title 18, United States Code.''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to violations occurring after the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. SMITH of Texas (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued reading the motion to recommit.

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I withdraw any objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, the motion to recommit I have offered contains a bipartisan proposal by Representatives MIKE ROSS and MARK SOUDER, the District of Columbia Personal Protection Act.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have suggested today that District of Columbia citizens have the right to vote in Congress. If that is the case, then they must also agree that the citizens of the District should have a constitutionally guaranteed right to possess firearms.

Currently, D.C. citizens are prevented from owning any handgun at all. Even those who lawfully own and store a rifle or shotgun are prohibited from using them to defend themselves, their families or their homes.

District law threatens honest people with imprisonment if they unlock, assemble or load their guns even under attack. Although the District has the most stringent gun control laws in the Nation, they still suffer from one of the highest murder rates. Since January 1 of this year alone, 35 people have been murdered in the District. Last year over 150 people were murdered, and 2,000 suffered gun assaults.

This violence continues unabated, despite the strict gun control laws. It is time to restore the rights of law-abiding citizens to protect themselves and to defend their families.

On March 9, 2007, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit struck down some, but not all, of the District of Columbia's gun control laws as unconstitutional. The court agreed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, the Justice Department and constitutional scholars, present and past, that the second amendment protects the right of individuals to possess firearms. This court decision, which will continue to wind its way through the judicial system, compels Congress to act now to protect all second amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, the prohibition of firearms in the District of Columbia is as ineffective as it is unconstitutional. It is high time we rectify this wrong.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), who in the last Congress passed a piece of legislation very similar to the motion to recommit that we consider now.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank Mr. SMITH for his leadership on this motion to recommit and his long-standing leadership in the Judiciary Committee, and for including the Personal Protection Act in our motion to recommit.

This has been passed by the House in two different forms, in the appropriations bill and as a free-standing bill. It is the first clear gun control vote, and possibly the only one we will have this year. It is a matter of whether you believe the District of Columbia should have the second amendment.

We can dispute what the Constitution says in other areas, but clearly the Constitution says that people have the right to own and bear arms for self-protection. This legislation has been upheld now, in terms of homes, by the D.C. District Court, but it is only a district court ruling. This would codify it, make it clear that there are not second-class citizens on this second amendment.

D.C., while it has had a decline in the homicide rate, it is less than the rest of the country, it has led the country repeatedly. It is five times the national average in murders, in spite of having the most stringent gun control law that restricts the right to bear arms. Up until the D.C. court ruling, for a gun in your home you had to have it locked, disassembled, with a key in another location, without the bullets in it. And when a criminal came into your house, you would have to go find the key for the cabinet, put your gun together, go find a bullet to protect yourself. This needs to be codified by Congress that we passed multiple times.

The majority of Members of Congress are sponsors of this bill, and we need to make sure that the District of Columbia residents have this protection. There are many charges made, false charges, machine guns, all this type of stuff. This is the same right that people throughout America have that has been constitutionally upheld, and if we can pass this law, we will once again make the citizens of the District of Columbia have the same second amendment rights as the rest of America.

H.R. 1399, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PERSONAL PROTECTION ACT

WHAT WOULD THE LEGISLATION DO?

H.R. 1399 would allow law-abiding citizens of the District of Columbia (D.C.) to exercise their second amendment right to own rifles, shotguns and handguns by repealing the current draconian registration requirements and bans. More specifically, it would: repeal the registration requirements for firearms; eliminate criminal penalties for possession of firearms; repeal the ban on semi-automatic firearms; repeal the ban on the possession of ammunition; permit the storage of

armed firearms in one's home or place of business; and eliminate the criminal penalties for carrying a handgun in a person's home or business.

H.R. 1399 would not affect any law directed at true criminal conduct, and would leave in place strict penalties for gun possession by criminals and for violent crime committed with guns.

WHAT ARE D.C.'S CURRENT GUN LAWS?

Washington, D.C. has perhaps the most restrictive gun control law in the United States. Yet, at the same time, Justice Department figures show that the District is usually ''the murder capital'' of the country. It's no coincidence that when law-abiding Americans are unable to defend themselves and their families, violent crimes and murder will increase. Here are some of the particulars of the current D.C. law:

All handguns are banned unless they were owned and registered in the District before 1977;

The citizens of the District—even the few remaining legal handgun owners—are prohibited from even carrying their handguns in their own homes;

All guns must be registered with the Metropolitan Police Department;

Even rifles and shotguns that can be legally registered and owned in the District, must be stored unloaded, and disassembled or locked—rendering them useless for self-defense—unless the gun is kept at a place of business. Apparently the D.C. government thinks it's more important to let people protect their business assets than to protect their homes and families;

The D.C. Code absurdly defines many (if not most) semi-automatic firearms as ''machine guns'' based on their ammunition capacity, rather than on how they work. This definition is totally inconsistent with federal law.

The ''District of Columbia Personal Protection Act'' would fix each of these injustices and restore constitutional self-defense rights to the law-abiding citizens of the District.

Under this bill, D.C. citizens would enjoy the same self-defense rights as residents of the 50 states. The bill would allow honest citizens to own rifles, shotguns and handguns, without the current bureaucratic registration requirements. And it would allow law-abiding people to use guns to protect their homes and families.

The bill would not affect any law directed at true criminal conduct, and would leave in place strict penalties for gun possession by criminals and for violent crime committed with guns.

HAS D.C.'S GUN BAN WORKED?

The ''gun control capital'' of the United States is repeatedly also the violent crime and murder capital of the nation—not coincidentally.

Prior to the enactment of the gun ban, the homicide rate in D.C. had been declining, but it increased after the ban was imposed in 1976. By 1991, D.C.'s homicide rate had risen more than 200 percent. By comparison, the U.S. homicide rate rose only 12 percent during the same period. As of 2002, D.C.'s homicide rate is almost double the rate when its handgun ban took effect. As of 2002, it is almost five times higher then the national average. (Source: FBI, Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia).

According to Justice Department crime statistics, 2003 saw D.C. once again earn its infamous distinction as murder capital of America. It was the 15th time in 16 years that the District has earned this dubious distinction. (Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics).

A January 2004 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) report found no conclusive evidence that gun control laws help prevent violent crime, suicides or accidental injuries in the United States. The national task force of healthcare and community experts found ''insufficient evidence'' that bans on specific guns, waiting periods for gun buyers and other such laws changed the incidence of murder, rape, suicide and other types of violence.

WHAT'S THE CONSTITUTIONAL JUSTIFICATION FOR H.R. 1399?

On March 9, 2007, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit overturned D.C.'s gun control law, ruling it unconstitutional. The majority wrote (in a 2–1 decision):

''To summarize, we conclude that the Second Amendment protects an individual right to keep and bear arms. That right existed prior to the formation of the new government under the Constitution and was premised on the private use of arms for activities such as hunting and self-defense, the latter being understood as resistance to either private lawlessness or the depredations of a tyrannical government (or a threat from abroad). In addition, the right to keep and bear arms had the important and salutary civic purpose of helping to preserve the citizen militia. The civic purpose was also a political expedient for the Federalists in the First Congress as it served, in part, to placate their Anti-federalist opponents. The individual right facilitated militia service by ensuring that citizens would not be barred from keeping the arms they would need when called forth for militia duty. Despite the importance of the Second Amendment's civic purpose, however, the activities it protects are not limited to militia service, nor is an individual's enjoyment of the right contingent upon his or her continued or intermittent enrollment in the militia.''

The U.S. Appeals Court also concluded that the current D.C. law ''. . . amounts to a complete prohibition on the lawful use of handguns for self-defense. As such, we hold it unconstitutional.''

In addition, the Appeals Court rejected the argument that the second amendment does not apply to D.C. because it is not a state.

HOW DOES ''HOME RULE'' FIT INTO THIS?

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power ''To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever'' over the District.

When Congress chose to delegate home rule to the District in the 1970s, it specified that legislation by the District must be ''consistent with the Constitution of the United States'' and ''reserve[d] the right, at any time, to exercise its constitutional authority as legislature for the District, by enacting legislation for the District on any subject''. (District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act (P.L. 93–198), secs. 302 and 601.) Numerous court cases have reaffirmed congressional authority over the District.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. This is the most startling double hypocrisy I have ever heard of on a bill of this magnitude. Very clever, whoever dreamed this up. The motion to recommit would deny everyone in this House the right to vote on whether citizens would gain the right to vote, and at the same time arm them with military-type weaponry that is being used in Iraq right now to destroy aircraft and bring down helicopters.

We would also repeal the District's strong ban on handgun ammunition that can pierce body armor worn by police officers and other law enforcement officials at a time when security has become a top priority in the District, making military-style assault weapons readily available.

Now, the most important person I have ever met in my life, with due respect to all the great people I have had the honor of working with as a Member of Congress, is Martin Luther King, Jr. If he is looking down on us now to see if we are working for justice and peace in our country, in our Capital and throughout the world, I am sure he would be as dismayed as I am by putting a gun control vote up for a motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Let me just say to my colleagues, I think the gun ban in the District is ridiculous, and I would join with my colleagues in overturning it. The problem is this motion doesn't do that. Instead of bringing this motion back to the floor forthwith for a vote up or down to continue this resolution and send it to the Senate with the gun ban, it sends it back to the committee; is that correct, Mr. SMITH? It does not send it back to the floor, this sends it to committee. So essentially this vote doesn't go anywhere. You can get your vote on gun rights, but it kills the bill, and that is the intention of this. And it is put there to put Members in a difficult situation. If you want to get a vote on District voter rights, you have to vote against this.

I would hope that we can have a free vote on the District gun ban later on. The courts have overturned it. I don't think it is a good law. But this doesn't overturn it because this kills the bill, and with it kills the amendment.

I would urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

I now turn to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and recognize her at this time.

Ms. NORTON. I ask my colleagues not to be fooled. The House will give you plenty of times to vote on guns in the District of Columbia. This is not a motion to recommit, it is a motion to shoot the bill dead.

Most of the time you can vote for the motion to recommit and still save the bill. Not true here. If you vote for the motion to recommit, you will kill this bill. Please do not do it.

This matter is in the courts. No matter what we do here, it is a nullity because it is now in the Federal courts, and it is in the Federal courts, on a constitutional question, and that will rule the day.

These people are trying to kill voting rights for the District of Columbia.

They have prevailed on guns here before, they will do it again. Those of you who are for guns and for voting rights for the District of Columbia, vote against the motion to recommit or else you are voting against voting rights for the residents of the District of Columbia.

□ 1415

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 260, further proceedings on the bill will be postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SOUDER. Did I understand because of the motion to recommit that the gentleman from Michigan has asked us to not vote and delay proceedings?

I didn't understand the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Further proceedings have been postponed.

Mr. LINDER. Parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. What I heard the Speaker say was under the rule it is postponed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LINDER. Is it in the rule that there will be no vote on this issue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Consideration of H.R. 1433 has been postponed under section 2 of House Resolution 260.

Mr. SOUDER. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SOUDER. Proceeding on this bill or on all things in front of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Further proceedings on this bill have been postponed.

Mr. CONYERS. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

Mr. BOEHNER. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, there is a motion to recommit that is under consideration on the floor at this moment. Wouldn't it be appropriate for the House to continue to finish the work on this motion before further legislative action is postponed? Because there is, in fact, a pending question before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is operating under section 2 of the rule, and will state it: ''During consideration of H.R. 1433 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.''

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, the Chair recognized the gentleman from Texas for a motion to recommit. The motion, in fact, has been debated. To stop before we complete action on that motion does not seem to be covered under the rule, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Section 2 provides for further consideration to be postponed.

Mr. CONYERS. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, as I understand the Chair's ruling, this is no different than any other proposal on a bill where the vote could be postponed under the rule. That has been, I point out to my colleagues, done on numerous occasions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This postponement was enabled by section 2 of the rule, which has been stated.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Section 2 of the rule states that the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

What time would that be?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is within the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Can the Chair enlighten the Members of the House as to when the Chair might rule as to what time we would be voting on this?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A decision will be forthcoming. The gentleman should check with his leadership.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. The gentleman from California mentioned that this was no different than any other rule. Isn't it true that this section 2, under the rule, is a new and unique section that has been added to this rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Authority to postpone consideration is not new, but the gentleman is correct that it has not before been used in these circumstances.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. MCHENRY. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, under the operational rule of the House today, it says, the rule specifies that notwithstanding the previous question. The previous question has already been ordered on this legislation. Therefore, the pertinent rule the Speaker is specifying is not operational under this rule; is that not correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not correct.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, additional parliamentary inquiry. Why am I incorrect?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will read the rule again:

''Section 2. During consideration of H.R. 1433 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.''

The Chair was authorized to postpone further consideration notwithstanding the fact that the previous question was ordered to passage.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1591, U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 261 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 261

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1591) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 1591 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1430

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all

Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 261.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 261 provides for the consideration of the emergency supplemental, the U.S. Troops Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act. The rule provides 4 hours of general debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except for clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted. The rule waives all points of order against the bill as amended and provides that the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, with a deep appreciation for how critical this bill is, the Rules Committee reported out a rule that allows for 4 hours of what will be a full debate. It allows for the consideration of clear and concise legislation that everyone in the Congress is familiar with. It is a responsible rule, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

But we are here today to debate much more than procedure, Mr. Speaker. We meet today on the fourth day of the fifth year of the war in Iraq, a conflict that has gone on longer than the Korean War, even longer than the Second World War, that war being fought against the greatest threat to world security.

The scenarios painted by politicians here about the war in Iraq don't affect the men and women fighting it or living it. They actually know what the world for them really is. And what is that reality? This is a war being fought by soldiers who often do not have the equipment they need or the care they are owed. And it is not improving security for the Iraqi people. It is depleting our military and endangering the security of this Nation; and that is to this day based on a flawed strategy that desperately needs to be changed.

Under such circumstances, for this Congress to support an open-ended commitment to this conflict, passing yet another blank check as past Congresses have done, would be a dereliction of duty. By contrast, passing a bill that has a chance of changing a stagnant situation in Iraq is not micromanaging; it is living up to what we owe our soldiers and the Iraqi people, to give them a fighting chance for success.

The supplemental makes America's continued involvement in Iraq conditional on the situation there improving. America's soldiers will no longer be asked to fight in an open-ended war whose goal line keeps moving. The bill would require Iraqi leaders to make the political compromises necessary to produce a working government, or risk losing the American military support. It will require the President's own security benchmarks to be met if American soldiers are to continue sacrificing their safety for that goal. And it will be the first step toward ending the war.

Ending this flawed conflict is crucial not just for Iraq, but also for the future of our own military and, hence, to our own national security.

This Congress was aghast when it learned of the conditions of Walter Reed. But every day, the men and women of our military are suffering beyond reason. Let me briefly share one story with you that I recently heard, the story of a young lieutenant awaiting his second deployment to Iraq.

His first tour saw him bravely patrolling dangerous streets north of Baghdad. He returned last December, expecting a year on base during which to rest and train a new platoon. Instead, with the escalation in place, he will be heading back months sooner. The soldiers under his command are not getting the time they need to train properly for their mission. The vehicles and equipment they use to train for war are failing and often break. They are physically weary, many still suffering from the lingering effects of leg and back injuries. Others are in counseling for post-traumatic stress disorder. Most of the soldiers who were married before the war are now divorced. Their lives outside the conflict are coming apart.

This lieutenant and his soldiers personify sacrifice. They never complain. When those in the military are given a mission, he told me, they find a way to complete it. That creed is why our Armed Forces are so strong.

But what this officer did tell me is that our Armed Forces cannot go on like this. He said that we are in danger of destroying our system of national defense. We see soldiers being sent back tour after tour, some too injured to wear the body armor. Our services are desperately trying to find a way to meet new troop requirements, sending back the wounded.

Mr. Speaker, this war is a dramatic misuse of our military. In the name of our national security, it is undermining the only true guarantor of national security that we have, our Armed Forces. And for years this Congress has let it happen, but not anymore.

Today the House will finally recognize that our military is at the breaking point, not because of any inherent weakness, but because it is being asked to complete a flawed mission. And so that mission itself must change.

Let me add as well that while our soldiers may stoically bear the burdens of short leaves and shoddy equipment, that in no way means that we in Congress should allow it to happen.

This bill respects our men and women in uniform enough to put their needs at the forefront of national priorities. From now on, if they are asked to go into battle without being fully armored, fully rested, and fully trained, then the President himself will have to stand before them, look them in the eye, and explain why he thinks our national safety is worth that level of sacrifice.

The legislation will also provide desperately needed funds for veterans' health care. Our country is seeing more wounded soldiers returning from abroad than at any point in 40 years, and yet our health care system has failed thousands of them. It is unconscionable, and it is long past time that that state of affairs is radically changed.

And, finally, this bill both increases funding for the ongoing conflict in Afghanistan and for a variety of other critically important national security objectives. Taken together, it represents the beginning of what will be a responsible and ethical shift in our national security priorities away from a war in Iraq that we can't end and back towards where it ought to be.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the first real chance that Democrats have had since 2003 to change the course of the war in Iraq, and we intend to do it. We will do it not because we are conceding anything to those who would do our Nation harm, not because we lack the will to fight for security, and not because, as some would have you believe, we are giving up. With this first step, we will change the course of this war because the future of the people of America depends on it, because a basic level of respect for our soldiers demands it, and because the long-term security of our Nation requires it.

This is an important and historic bill, and I am proud to support it. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same thing.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York, the distinguished Chair on the Committee of Rules for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in the strongest possible opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation. I could start this debate by quoting my Democratic colleagues on the Rules Committee when they decried Republican tactics over the last few years, how they railed against closed rules and chided me personally. I am a big guy, I can handle it. But they attacked me personally constantly for denying amendments that were offered by both Democrats and Republicans. I could quote every instance that they promised to do better, to have the most open and fair Congress in the history of this country, and to not have late-night meetings. But today, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to do that. I am going to recognize that that would simply distract from this very, very important issue. Instead, I

am going to simply provide the House, Mr. Speaker, and you witnessed much of this last night, with a factual account of what took place in the wee hours of this morning.

Shortly before 1 a.m., the Rules Committee on party-line votes reported out two self-executing closed rules, and denied the consideration of some 70 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee from both Republicans and Democrats as well. That is what happened. There is no denying it. You, Mr. Speaker, witnessed it yourself when you were upstairs in the Rules Committee.

So regardless of the process, this supplemental appropriations bill is a constitutionally dubious attempt at micromanaging the Iraq war into what I believe would be inevitable defeat if it succeeds. It enjoys such limited support on the other side of the aisle that it had to be ladened with unrelated pork in order to win enough votes to have any hope of passing. It is a cynical ploy that will leave dire consequences for the region, and for our own security, in its wake.

The Constitution lays out a very clear system of checks and balances derived from the ideas of the Framers of our Constitution. By giving the three branches of government distinct roles, we guard ourselves against tyranny; we guard ourselves as individuals against tyranny in each branch.

The President cannot wage war without authorization or funding from Congress. But if authorization and funding are granted, the President serves as the Commander in Chief with the authority to execute the war.

Mr. Speaker, this bill ignores the intentions of those Framers, and it attempts to turn the Constitution on its head. James Madison, Father of the Constitution, the author of the Constitution in Federalist No. 51, wrote, and I quote, ''In framing a government that is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the government to control the governed, and in the next place oblige it to control itself.''

Mr. Speaker, Madison recognized the inherent challenges in designing a government that is both effective and limited. He knew that, without checks and balances, tyranny would, in fact, ensue.

This bill attempts to diminish these checks and balances. It tries to turn Congress into a collection of 535 Commanders in Chief. This legislation of micromanagement is based on a disastrous strategy. Its authors fund the war, and then mandate its failure. They seek to tie the hands of our military commanders, and then force them to retreat when they are unable to meet impossible timetables. They mandate the withdrawal with no regard for the situation on the ground, and then they sweeten the deal with $15 billion in money that is unrelated spending that has got a little something in there for practically everyone: $283 million for the milk income lost contract program; $74 million for peanut storage costs; $1.3 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers. Billions and billions of dollars for these projects, some worthy, some not.

□ 1445

But none of them related to the troops, and what this is, this is a war funding supplemental. None of these are emergency items.

Their only connection to emergency supplemental appropriations for the war, Mr. Speaker, in Iraq, is that they are necessary to build support for this bill, a bill that trades victory for electoral gains. Make no mistake, this legislation is a political solution for Democrats, not a strategy for winning in Iraq.

And what would the consequences of defeat be? The National Intelligence Estimate, the 9/11 Commission, and our people on the ground have all made it very clear that a precipitous withdrawal would have catastrophic consequences. The carnage of the battle of Baghdad that we are witnessing today will be just the beginning. Violence will spill out across the country and spread to the entire region.

In our absence, Iran and Syria will be utterly unfettered in their ability to incite a regional war that threatens global security, with enormous casualties suffered by the people of the region.

Proponents of a policy of defeat often point to our diminished standing in the international community. But what about our standing with the Iraqi people? Terrorist attacks on our own soil have demonstrated that our security and their security are directly linked.

And, Mr. Speaker, Operation Iraqi Freedom has bound us even more closely. We have a commitment to help the Iraqi people establish lasting security through democracy. We have a commitment not to abandon them to be slaughtered by terrorists.

And if we retreat, we not only abandon the Iraqi people, we draw terrorism back to our own doorstep. Have we so soon forgotten the tragedy of attacks on our homeland?

We took the war on terror to the terrorists and have suffered not one attack since September 11 of 2001.

With this bill, we would bring the war on terror back home. Only this time we will have strengthened the terrorists ourselves with a road map for success. We will have demonstrated precisely what it takes to defeat the United States of America. We will have clearly signaled to them that they must simply bide their time until the mandated retreat, at which time they will be able to terrorize with impunity.

I, like many Americans, Mr. Speaker, have been discouraged by this war. We all feel the toll that it has taken. And we are keenly aware of the price that we are paying, especially in a human sense. Every one of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, has, as I have, looked in the faces of constituents whose family and friends have made the ultimate sacrifice in this war. Their pain is very real, and their loss is profound.

I regularly talk to a man called Ed Blecksmith whose son J.P. was tragically killed 2 years ago this past November in the very famous battle of Fallujah. And he has, time and time again, said to me, if we don't complete this mission, my son J.P. will have died in vain.

But we do not honor those who have sacrificed by abandoning their mission. We do not honor those in the field who are fighting, as we speak, by tying their hands and depriving them of the means to succeed. We will honor them by winning the war in Iraq so that our men and women come home having completed their mission.

We know that their mission will not be complete in the immediate future. As President Bush and General David Petraeus have both acknowledged, success will take months, not days or weeks. But there are signs of hope that the President's new plans, under General Petraeus, are working.

As Brian Williams of NBC reported from the field in Iraq, he said, ''This change in policy, getting out, decentralizing, going into the neighborhoods, grabbing a toehold, telling the enemy we are here, talking to the locals, that is having an obvious and palpable effect. There are hopeful signs.'' That was said by the NBC news anchor, Brian Williams.

Mr. Speaker, to abandon our mission now would be disastrous. I urge my colleagues to reject the policy of defeat, reject the return of terrorism to our homeland, and reject this unconstitutional power grab whose sole purpose is to cede victory to our enemies.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that this is a difficult day for me.

I voted against this war from the very beginning when this vote was not politically popular. I was an original member of the Out of Iraq Caucus.

As far back as 2005 I introduced legislation to end funding for the war, which I believe has been one of the worst political, military, diplomatic and moral blunders in our Nation's history.

My bill calls for the immediate, safe and orderly withdrawal of all of our troops from Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to join me in that legislation.

I want this war to come to an end today. Unfortunately, and to my deep disappointment, not enough of my colleagues, Democrat or Republican, believe as I do.

I have come to the conclusion that defeating the supplemental bill before us today would send a message to George Bush and DICK CHENEY that they will continue to have a free pass

from this Congress to do whatever the hell they want to do.

The Bush administration, with their ''Mission Accomplished'' banners and their shifting rationales, must be held to account. We simply cannot trust them any longer. I lost my trust in this administration a long, long time ago.

I fear that defeating this bill would result in more of the same, more deceit and empty promises, more ignored benchmarks and missed deadlines, more American casualties, more debt passed on to our children and our grandchildren, more harm to our reputation around the world, and more war.

I cannot do that. I will not do that. So I will vote ''yes.''

This is not the bill that I want. This is not the bill that I would have written. But it is the bill that the Appropriations Committee has presented to us today, and it is a bill that reflects the hard reality that this is the toughest measure that we can get passed and get 218 votes for.

For the first time, we can mandate real and meaningful deadlines that clearly reflect the disgust so many of us have with how this war has been conducted.

This bill also provides $1.7 billion to address the health care needs of our veterans, particularly those suffering from traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder. Too many of our veterans can't even get diagnosed, let alone treated. That is wrong, and this bill begins to fix it.

Quite frankly, I have concluded that this bill is the best that we can do, for now. I say that very deliberately, ''for now,'' because those of us who oppose this war will continue our efforts to end it. I want all of our troops out of Iraq and back home with their families where they belong.

I will propose much stronger language and, indeed, continue to press for the immediate withdrawal of all of our troops in the defense bills that are coming in the weeks ahead.

My old boss, Joe Moakley, stares at me from his portrait every day in the Rules Committee. He used to say that if the Democratic Party were in Europe, we would be 16 different parties.

So I want to just take a moment to commend the leadership of DAVE OBEY and JACK MURTHA and STENY HOYER, JIM CLYBURN and RAHM EMANUEL for all of their hard work these past few weeks. They have anguished over this issue, as all of us have.

And I especially want to commend our Speaker, NANCY PELOSI. She has been a forceful and effective opponent of this war from the very beginning, and I know she will continue to do all that she can to bring all of us, Republicans and Democrats, together to finally bring this terrible war to an end.

I am grateful to my colleagues in the Out of Iraq Caucus for their continued and forceful leadership. And I also want to thank all of the national and grass-roots activists and organizations who have done so much to oppose this war. I truly believe that the American people are way ahead of the politicians in Washington on this issue, and it is my hope that some day soon Congress and the White House will catch up.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2½ minutes to a very hardworking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Pasco, Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this closed rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, since the war on terror began, the Rules Committee has granted an open rule for every wartime supplemental spending bill brought to the floor, thus giving every Member an opportunity to offer an amendment and have their say on those supplemental bills.

In the Rules Committee last night, we heard passionate testimony from several Members on both sides of the aisle. Some Members spoke about the need to continuing funding our troops to complete our mission, while others offered hard deadlines for withdrawal, regardless of consequence.

In the end, over 50 amendments were offered to the Rules Committee to be made in order for consideration on the House floor today. Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, not one single amendment, let me repeat that, not one of the 50 amendments will be allowed to be considered by the full House. And, Mr. Speaker, I am truly disappointed with that.

The bill we have before us today contains restrictions on funding and conditions on what our troops are able to do that are simply, to me, unacceptable. We have military leaders for a reason. Making 435 Members of Congress commanders in the field is a formula for failure, which I am deeply concerned will have a long-term consequence on our security here at home.

By placing restrictions on funds, hamstringing our military and calling for an arbitrary withdrawal, this bill will jeopardize the ability of our troops to do their jobs to defend America.

A wartime spending bill, Mr. Speaker, should have, above all else, to provide the support that our men and women in uniform need to accomplish their mission. By placing conditions on funding, this bill fails to do that. Conditions on funding make it impossible for our military leaders and our troops on the ground to respond to ever-changing conditions on the battlefield.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill has more than just military funding. And I am disappointed now that it is only now, in an effort to attract votes for a bad bill that we know will never be signed into law, the Democrat leadership has decided to include in this bill an extension of rural county payments.

I tried earlier this year to attach an extension to another bill. That bill became law. I also tried to have a long-term extension brought up on a vote, but the Democrat leadership said no, time and time again. Allowing the extension to come to the floor only on a bill that we know will be vetoed amounts to nothing more than false promises.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and thank you very much for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I have appended to this podium the faces of 90 people who never should have lost their lives in this war.

Mr. Speaker, when I voted against using troops in Iraq more than 4 years ago, I believed then, and still believe today, that this was not a war of necessity, but rather for the Bush administration a war of choice and convenience. As we have learned since that vote, the concern that I and others had was, indeed, justified.

Today's vote is not a vote on supporting our troops. After all, there is no choice when it comes to supporting our military. We all stand by them, Republicans and Democrats alike, especially when they are in harm's way.

But should we send our troops into battle without proper body armor? For over 4 years the Bush administration has said ''yes.'' Democrats have said ''no.''

Should we force our troops into second and third and fourth tours of duties with shortened times in between those tours? The Bush administration continues to say ''yes.'' Democrats say ''no.''

Should we welcome home our troops with inhumane conditions at our VA hospitals around this Nation, not just at Walter Reed, and a shortchanged veterans health care system? The Bush administration says ''yes.'' Democrats say ''no.''

Should we stay the course of rhetorical arguments filled with fear and deception, like I have heard here today? Or should we finally start holding this administration and the Iraqi Government accountable? For over 4 years the Bush administration has said ''stay the course.'' Democrats and the American people demand accountability and a plan to bring our men and women home.

Choices arise only when we start asking ourselves the real questions about how we can best support and protect our troops. On these issues, there are very clear choices between the Bush administration's ''stay the course'' stubbornness and the Democratic plan for accountability.

□ 1500

This bill is not the end-all-be-all when it comes to getting us out of Iraq. It is not the long-term solution which

so many of us crave. But it is the first step, a very necessary step, on the road to holding the administration and the Iraqi Government accountable and bringing our troops home.

Many Democrats did not vote for this war, but make no mistake about it, one way or another we will end it. Incidentally, whatever happened to exit strategy? Most importantly, we will do so in a manner that enhances our security here at home and contributes to the restoration of order and stability in the Middle East region and throughout the world.

This is an excellent rule, Madam Chairman, and the bill that has been fashioned by the Speaker and the leadership of this House is a correct start to adhere to the wishes of the American people.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to another hardworking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Miami (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for the time.

I rise to strongly oppose this rule and the underlying legislation that is being brought to the floor. For obviously substantive grounds, I oppose the legislation being brought to the floor.

I think that we are at a decisive time, more even than a critical time, a decisive time in the conflict in Iraq. And I think that now to be substantively, as this legislation does, tying the hands of our military personnel and, in effect, saying, well, if things don't go totally appropriately, totally correctly, if they don't go right, then you must withdraw.

And I think about other wars in the past and what would have happened if we would have had those kinds of requisites. If we had tied the hands of the military leaders in the past, there would have been disaster then. There would be disaster now if this legislation passes.

And for procedural reasons also, Mr. Speaker, I am strongly against this legislation. As strongly as I oppose some of the amendments that were brought forth to the Rules Committee, I supported the right of Members to bring forth those ideas and have them considered, but the majority in the Rules Committee rejected them.

During the time that we were in the majority, we never brought a wartime supplemental bill to this floor with a closed rule. It is unfortunate that the majority is doing so today.

For the substantive reasons that I have mentioned and many others, Mr. Speaker, as well as the significant procedural reasons that I have touched upon, that this House is being closed down with regard to the ability to present amendments today, I urge rejection of this rule as well as of the legislation being brought forth today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me time and her leadership on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is on the cusp of an historic step, a first step to changing Iraq policy, enacting a fixed timetable to bring our troops home. The bill made in order under this rule is not perfect, but it deserves our strong support because it offers us our best chance at forcing a change of direction in Iraq after 4 long years of mismanagement.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed this war from the beginning, and I believe we must bring our troops home soon and in a responsible way. The President's reckless insistence on sticking to a failed policy in Iraq underlines the need for Congress to show leadership. This legislation gives us the chance for the first time to take a concrete step towards bringing the war to a close.

This bill does not go as far as I would like. I support a more rapid redeployment of our troops from Iraq. I also strongly believe the President should not be allowed to waive the legislation's troop readiness requirements. But it has become clear in recent weeks that this is the most aggressive approach that can obtain the necessary votes to pass this House. That is the reality here. This is, after all, the legislative branch. That means we can't change the policy if we can't pass the bill.

Enacting a fixed timetable to bring our troops home is a very significant leap forward in our Iraq policy. It provides a foundation for further action and increases pressure on the President. That is why the President opposes it so strongly. Defeating this bill would ultimately play into the President's hands, resulting in the eventual passage of a blank-check bill that places fewer restraints on the President.

Ultimately Congress faces a choice: Do we set a timetable to bring the troops home while providing for the troops in harm's way, or do we give the administration a blank check for a war without end?

I choose to begin steps to end the war. For that reason I urge all Members to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from New York, the distinguished chairman of our committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER for the time and for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in the next twenty-four hours, this Congress will undertake a historic first step to changing our Iraq policy.

The bill made in order under this rule is not a perfect bill. But it deserves our strong support because it will bring a critical change of direction in Iraq after four long years of mismanagement.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed this war from the beginning. And I believe we must bring our troops home soon and in a responsible way. Our men and women in uniform have done everything we have asked of them.

They have endured multiple deployments and extended separation from their loved ones. They have followed orders into combat often without the proper body armor or equipment.

These are signs of an inexcusable lack of leadership from the President. Rather than change direction, the President has chosen to send tens of thousands of additional troops to Iraq.

This goes against the advice of his generals . . . against the advice of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group . . . and against the expressed wishes of the voters.

The President's reckless insistence on sticking to a failed policy in Iraq underlines the need for Congress to show leadership.

I support Congress taking firm steps to change our Nation's direction in Iraq. And I have cosponsored legislation to establish a timetable for redeployment of our troops.

As I said at the beginning, Congress has a historic opportunity to demonstrate its responsible leadership with this bill. And that's the prism through which I evaluate my vote this week.

The decision comes down to this—do we want to enact a bill that has flaws but does contain a fixed timetable to bring our troops home? Or do we want to vote down the fixed timetable and endorse President Bush's ability to continue to wage this war without any limits?

This bill does not go as far as I would like. I support a more rapid redeployment of our troops from Iraq. I also strongly believe the President should not be allowed to waive the legislation's troop readiness requirements.

Because of his gross mismanagement of the conflict, I believe the President has abdicated any right to deference on that front.

Having said that, it has become clear in recent weeks that this is the most aggressive approach that can obtain the necessary votes to pass the House of Representatives.

That is disappointing to me, but that is the reality here. This is, after all, the legislative branch. That means we can't change the policy if we can't pass the bill.

Enacting a fixed timetable to bring our troops home is a very significant leap forward in our Iraq policy. It provides a foundation for further action and increases pressure on the President. That is why the President opposes it so strongly.

To defeat this bill would result in the eventual passage of a blank check bill that places even fewer responsibilities on the President.

I believe it is simply unacceptable to give the President permission to mismanage the war as he chooses.

Ultimately, Congress faces a choice: Do we set a timetable to bring the troops home while providing for our troops in the field at every moment?

Or do we give the Administration a blank check for a war without end? I believe Congress must choose the former.

This legislation, whatever its flaws may be, enacts a timetable to bring our troops home while giving them the resources they need for protection while they are still in harm's way. For that reason, I am voting yes on the supplemental appropriations bill.

I urge all Members to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to

another hardworking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Dallas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire if the gentleman has notified the Blue Dog Caucus that it is time for them to rush out front of their offices and put an extra $25 billion on the national debt. Have we given that notice yet for their offices to begin doing that?

We will find out whether they are going to vote for this 25 extra billion dollars that I think is way too much in the emergency supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, once again the Democrats are refusing to operate under the rules they campaigned on to open up the political process and use PAYGO rules to fully fund and offset any new mandatory spending.

Today is a particularly egregious example of their irresponsible leadership as they threaten to leave our troops in the lurch by micromanaging the war against the United States by terrorists, while also leaving American taxpayers holding the bag by declaring hundreds of millions of dollars in new mandatory spending as an ''emergency.''

SCHIP is an important program where States are given a fixed annual allotment to assist them in providing health care coverage to near-poverty children and pregnant women. However, a few States want to use their SCHIP program to provide health care services to expanded populations that go well beyond the scope of the original program, even though they signed an agreement stating that they promised to pay for any additional costs with their own State funds or to offset those within the Medicaid program.

Despite this agreement, Mr. Speaker, a number of States have told Congress that overspending their Federal allotment was their intention all along. Once again they come to Uncle Sam to get a bailout.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an emergency. This is a loophole being exploited by the Democratic leadership. So today the Democrat leadership is telling these States, You don't have to keep your promises to the Federal Government, and you don't have to worry. We don't mind exploiting a loophole in the rules and calling this an ''emergency'' even though we have known for years that this would happen.

Mr. Speaker, I am voting against this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill.

It is the responsibility of this Congress, ladies and gentlemen, to demand accountability from this President and insist on concrete results from the Iraqi Government. Ladies and gentlemen, our troops are laying their lives on the line every single day. The least we can do is demand and require Iraqi accountability. This bill embraces that responsibility and sets the stage for handing over control of security of Iraq to the Iraqis.

It is also the responsibility of this Congress to provide our troops with the resources they need to do their jobs. And let there be no confusion. This bill provides full funding for our men and women in uniform, who continue to serve the country with great courage and dedication.

This bill also provides $1.7 billion in new funding for veterans' health care, something that is direly needed. The state of veterans' health care in America is in crisis, and our troops deserve better.

In addition, this bill will help us refocus our efforts on those who attacked us on September 11 by increasing funding for the war against al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan.

It is deeply troubling to me that this war in Iraq has undermined our efforts to address the urgent threats in the war on terror. After failing to kill Osama bin Laden when we had the chance at Tora Bora, the administration turned its attention to Iraq, allowing the Taliban to regain lost ground in Afghanistan.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our goals in Iraq must reflect reality. For far too long Congress served as nothing more than a rubber stamp for this President's disastrous policy in Iraq. Those days, Mr. Speaker, are over. Iraq has descended into a bloody civil war that cannot be resolved by the American military. Even our military commander in Iraq, General Petraeus, has said there is no military solution to this conflict.

The Sunni-Shia divide goes back 1,400 years. America alone cannot reverse 14 centuries of division and hate.

I support the rule, and I support the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Goddard, Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this supplemental funding is one of the most important bills that Congress will be considering this year, and I am very disappointed that the Democrat leadership has mandated that this bill come to the floor under a closed rule.

I have heard the Democrats say that this is not a perfect rule. It is perfectly wrong; that is what it is.

What does a closed rule mean? It means voices will not be heard. It means ideas will be silenced. A closed rule means that no amendments will be allowed to the bill, that no alternative plan to fully fund the troops will be allowed.

I only have 2 minutes to discuss this, not enough time to explain to the American people how this puts our troops at risk or question why the Speaker believes she has the right to micromanage the war in Iraq.

We spent a whole week debating the nonbinding resolution on Iraq, and now we have only 4 hours of how to best fund and support our troops. It is not enough time to explain title IX, where the language of the bill prevents our troops from receiving reinforcements or replacements. It is not enough time to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the supplemental will fulfill the goals of al Qaeda's leader al-Zawahiri. It is not enough time to show the American people how this supplemental replaces the Iraqi National Congress by imposing on their government demands, demands to change their Constitution, demands to change their laws.

This is an unfair rule that represents broken promises for a more open Congress made by the Speaker. This is a rule that should be defeated.

I am going to vote ''no'' on this, and I encourage my colleagues to also vote ''no'' on this rule. It is an unfair bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, the President's Iraq policy has been a complete catastrophe. It must be challenged. It must be changed. We must end this war.

The question we face is clear: Will Congress rubber-stamp a fifth year of a failed policy, or will Congress finally, after 4 straight years of lock-step compliance with an incompetent administration, compel a new direction that ends the war?

The President has arrogantly asserted that he will veto any measure with a timetable. Mr. Speaker, I will not support any bill without a timetable. If I had a chance to write this bill, like my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), I would bring our troops home yesterday. But I did not write this bill, so I must measure it based on three criteria: Does it impose accountability on the President and Iraqis? Does it revoke the President's blank check? Does it establish a date certain with the force of law that will end this war?

□ 1515

This bill meets each of these objectives. Regrettably if this bill fails, the war will continue, unchecked and unabated.

It is time for the Iraqis to accept responsibility for shaping their own future. Even President Bush has acknowledged the importance of imposing measurable benchmarks of success on the Iraqi Government. This legislation replaces Presidential lip service with congressional force of law.

There is a reason the President threatens to veto this bill: It is because Congress is finally revoking his blank check.

Mr. Speaker, there is no easy way to clean up the mess in Iraq or to avert further suffering. Our obligation remains to decide, at this time and place, whether to stay the President's course or to end this war as soon as possible.

I will support this bill because it finally puts us on the path to end the unconscionable war.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). All Members are reminded not to make improper references regarding the President's character.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I thank you for admonishing the prior speaker. The words that he used could have been taken down. We don't need people out here on the floor calling the President names.

I appreciate what the Speaker said to him, and I hope other Members will listen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not posed a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Marietta, Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), a former member of the Committee on Rules, who works hard on the Armed Services Committee now.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only in strong opposition to this ''our way or the highway'' rule, but also to the underlying bill, which I believe encroaches on the constitutional principle of separation of power, particularly the President's authority as Commander in Chief.

Regretfully, this rule prevents every single Member of this body, both Democrats and Republicans, from offering an amendment to an emergency wartime supplemental appropriations act, a highly unprecedented attack on the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the majority is insistent on a force pullout from Iraq, but the language in this supplemental puts this war and the soldiers' lives on autopilot. This legislation makes a flash-point decision about the war, about our men and women on the ground, with little regard to the actual facts 6 months, a year, and indeed 17 months from now. It looks like ''Magic 8–Ball'' foreign policy.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee. Unfortunately, it was not made in order, but it would have required this Congress to reevaluate the situation in Iraq at each of these timelines in the so-called Murtha language. So whatever the benchmarks, then we would have to come back and vote again, clean up or down vote, whether or not we want to bring the troops home.

Mr. Speaker, that is especially important at the drop-dead date of August of 2008, when this bill basically says no matter what, the troops come home, even if we have got the bad guys on the run. I think every Member of this body would want to support an amendment like this, so that we would once again be able to vote and reconsider, considering the situation on the ground.

So this legislation sets a dangerous precedent, and I respectfully ask my colleagues, oppose the rule, oppose the underlying bill. Let's work, both Republican and Democrat alike, let's produce a supplemental that will actually pass this House, pass the Senate and be signed by the President. Do right by our American soldiers, and our people and the people in Iraq.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Rules Committee Chair.

Mr. Speaker, the Iraq Accountability Act under this rule is the most responsible way to chart a new direction to the Bush-Cheney stay-the-course policy in Iraq, to bring our troops home and to protect our national security.

The American people are way beyond the politicians at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. Nevertheless, our government is at a crossroads. On the one hand, some want to continue to endorse the Bush-Cheney war without end, a war that the administration sought because they were blinded by the prospects of oil profits. They want to continue a blank-check, rubber-stamp, diplomatically impotent position.

On the other hand, I urge my colleagues to patriotically stand up for a greater Nation, be strategically smarter and support our brave men and women in uniform. That is the responsible course of action.

Ensuring that our troops in the field have all of the resources they require is the responsible thing to do. Focusing again in a meaningful way on al Qaeda and the Taliban is the responsible thing to do. Improving health care for injured soldiers and veterans is the responsible thing to do. And oversight of the misspending and waste by the executive branch is the responsible thing to do.

Requiring the Iraqi Government to provide for its own defense is the right and responsible thing to do, so that we can take our brave men and women in uniform out of the middle of the Iraqi civil war and bring our troops home.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am particularly concerned that the reckless Bush escalation will continue to undermine our country's readiness and ability to address other threats to our national security. Indeed, in recent testimony before our committee, the Army Chief of Staff testified that America will run a strategic risk by implementing the escalation and staying on the same course in Iraq.

The American people are demanding a new direction from the White House. This includes one of my neighbors in Tampa, Armando B. Arias.

Mr. Arias would meet anyone's definition of ''patriot.'' He loves his country and has served in two separate wars—World War II and Korea. When I asked him a few months back when I knocked on his door in West Tampa what he most wanted his new Congresswoman to work on, he replied immediately, ''get out of the war and ring our kids home.''

I am proud to be here today to keep that commitment to Armando Arias and Americans everywhere who are demanding fundamental change.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this rule and the Iraq Accountability Act.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the ranking Republican on the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Janesville, Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, this bill takes the cake. Let me tell you why this bill takes the cake. For all the talk about fiscal discipline we have received from the new majority, this bill represents an egregious violation of the budget rules that the Democrat majority set for itself just recently.

Last year in the 109th Congress, we decided to put in place a new tool of fiscal discipline, one that said if it is really an emergency, then it should be an emergency, but don't put pork and unrelated programs into emergency spending bills. So we set up a procedure, a procedure that set aside $6.45 billion to be reserved for domestic emergencies. If we had more money needed above that, the Budget Committee would meet, the Budget Committee would determine whether or not a particular program met the definition of a legitimate emergency, and then it would raise the corresponding amount, which then the Appropriations Committee could use.

Last night we met in the Budget Committee. We could have easily added a discussion or a vote on whether or not this extra $22 billion fit the definition of a legitimate emergency and raised the amount, but what did this new majority do, after putting in place these rules that we had from the 109th Congress to this 110th Congress? They waived them. They are gone. All of this talk about fiscal discipline, all this talk of PAYGO, of paying for things, what happened? Gone. Waived.

We added an amendment last night in the Budget Committee during the resolution markup to continue these rules next year so that we can't pork up emergency spending bills. Both parties have been guilty of this. Please note that I say that. What happened? They voted it down. So not only are we not living by the rules put in place just in January, we canceled the rules for next year.

So what happens? This bill puts $22 billion in unrelated, unrequested spending, having nothing to do with the war, in here. And the idea that we police emergencies, that we make sure that when you do an emergency spending bill with no offsets, that it really is an emergency, and that we police it and we look at it in the Budget Committee, gone.

The days of fiscal discipline have left. Last night in this budget, the

Democrat majority passed the largest tax increase in American history. The reason they passed the largest tax increase in American history is because that is the only way they can balance the budget to also accommodate all the new spending they called for, because this budget had zero savings, no controls on spending, nothing but tax increases. And now they are waiving the rules so that they can bring any emergency spending bill they want without checking as to whether or not it truly is a legitimate emergency.

Mr. Speaker, for this, and many, many, many other reasons, fiscal discipline, using the rules and obeying the rules and not handcuffing our generals, I ask for a ''no'' vote on this rule and a ''no'' vote on the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee and fellow New Yorker for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for months I have said that our country needs a plan to ensure the timely redeployment of our troops out of Iraq. The previous Congress failed in their duty to provide oversight and refused to ask the tough questions regarding the management of this poorly planned and ill-conceived war. To say, as some of my Republican colleagues have, that passage of this legislation would somehow embolden our enemies or send the wrong message to our allies is just a blatant distortion of the truth.

The U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act lays out for the first time a responsible and realistic strategy for completing our mission in Iraq and bringing our brave troops home as soon as possible. This is a responsible and deliberate plan to change the direction in Iraq without jeopardizing the safety and well-being of our soldiers. The legislation sets a responsible timeline for the phased redeployment of U.S. troops in Iraq with a date certain by August 2008 at the latest.

The war in Iraq increasingly strains our military, creating a crisis in the U.S. troop readiness and decreasing our ability to respond to new threats. With more than 3,200 troops dead, more than 24,000 troops wounded, and more than $400 billion of taxpayer dollars spent, we have paid too high a price.

We have a choice: We can continue the administration's open-ended commitment to a civil war in Iraq, or we can finish the job and begin a responsible redeployment of U.S. forces.

The U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act goes beyond a new direction for Iraq. It begins a new direction for our country, one in which veterans are taken care of, families provided for, and brave men and women in harm's way have the resources they need to get the job done.

The legislation provides $1 billion to fight the global war on terror by putting the focus back where it should have been all along, Afghanistan and Osama bin Laden. The legislation would also provide $2.5 billion in additional funding to ensure our troops are properly equipped.

I would recommend a ''yes'' vote.

The legislation would also provide $2.5 billion in additional funding to ensure that our troops are properly equipped and trained; $2.8 billion for Defense Health Care; and $1.7 Billion for veterans' health care—including millions to address the maintenance backlog at VA health care facilities like Walter Reed—ensuring our veterans and troops get the care they need and deserve.

I am proud to associate myself with this legislation because it will change our direction in Iraq, and provides the new direction for our country that the American people demanded last November.

My constituents did not send me to Washington to serve as a rubber stamp for the Administration. I was sent to Washington to stand up against the mismanagement of this war and misplaced priorities of the Administration.

True victory will be achieved when we bring all of our brave troops home—alive and uninjured. I would ask that if my children were serving in Iraq, and we as a nation should ask nothing less for our brave troops.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Bridgeport, Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the former chairman of the National Security Subcommittee, who has made 15 trips to Iraq.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this closed rule allows only an up-or-down vote on the Democrats' proposal regarding needed military spending, but it contains an unrealistic timeline for the withdrawal of troops, and it includes bloated spending for nonmilitary expenditures.

We all want to do the right thing for our troops in Iraq and the Iraqi people. This bill does not give us the opportunity to do either.

I offered three amendments to the Rules Committee, and none were made in order because it made no amendment in order. One was to increase funding for our community action programs in Iraq, like Mercy Corps, who hire Iraqis in their organizations, and then the Iraqis are hired to do the work.

A second amendment would have required the President to come in with a timeline and to then require the Iraqis to meet it, and needing a 60 percent vote of support of this timeline or we leave even sooner.

The third was to encourage this Congress to debate the Iraqi Study Group recommendations, which both Democrats and Republicans agree with.

We could have done something on a bipartisan basis. We expect Iraqis to work out their differences and are critical when the Sunnis and Shias are unable to find common ground. Yet we in this Congress, Republicans and Democrats, are unable to work out our differences, and we don't even have to fear a bomb being blown off or an assassination attempt.

We went into Iraq on a bipartisan basis. Two-thirds of the House and three-quarters of the Senate voted to go in. It is absolutely imperative we get out of Iraq on a bipartisan basis.

I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to allow us to have a bipartisan approach.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Lafayette, Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

□ 1530

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I rise in opposition to the rule and to this underlying bill, and I will tell you that it gives me no satisfaction to vote against a bill that has so many things that are important to my State in terms of gulf coast recovery and the relief effort after the hurricanes.

But I cannot in good conscience vote for a bill that is going to do unspeakable harm to our troops in the field and to our national security. I want to point out the fiscal fantasy also in this bill. I want to point out one item. There is $15 million in this bill for rice farmers in my district for salt water mitigation. That is twice the number of dollars that we needed months ago for this. So if we have that kind of bloating in the bill on one small item, I can't imagine what this $28 billion extra in the bill is all about.

This bill is fiscal fantasy, and it does unspeakable harm to our national security. For those reasons, I oppose it vehemently.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair and my good friend for yielding.

This bill will end the war in Iraq. This is the first enforceable challenge to the President's plan to escalate and continue a stay-the-course, open-ended commitment to a war, a war that was launched with massive deception, and an unnecessary war.

One gentleman questioned Congress' power. Congress' power under Article I, section 8 is very broad. We have the ability to modify the original authorization for war, and that is essentially what we are doing here by saying there will be an end to this war.

A year ago, just 1 year ago this March, the President said it will be up to ''future Presidents,'' plural, not just the next one, plural, ''and future governments of Iraq'' to determine when our troops might come home. That is not acceptable.

Our troops are mired in the midst of a civil war. Oh, they have dragged out the old, If we don't fight them there, we'll fight them here. Well, unfortunately, the Republicans are contradicted by the Bush-appointed National

Intelligence Director who says al Qaeda is not looking to have a base in Iraq and al Qaeda would be extraordinarily unlikely to attempt, and has no capability to attack the United States from Iraq; but they are looking to move back into Afghanistan, Afghanistan where we should have stayed focused, a legitimate war against the Taliban, al Qaeda, and Osama bin Laden. Remember him? Dead or alive; dead or alive. He is still planning attacks against the United States of American, and Bush wants to mire us down day after day in a civil war.

The Iraqis have to want to end this war. This bill will give them a motivation to begin to lay aside their ages' old grudges and begin to meaningfully cooperate and coordinate and share their oil wealth. That is the only way this is going to end. It is a civil war. They have been fighting it for 1,400 years. We need this bill. We need to motivate the Iraqis to bring an end to this war, and we need to refocus on the real threats to America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the former attorney general of California, my friend from Folsom, a hardworking member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, once again on this floor we have heard an argument stated much like was stated in the argument on the bill immediately preceding. Here we are dealing with a rule on a spending bill, and we are told by a number of speakers on the other side of the aisle that they would prefer that we do the constitutional thing, that is, that we exercise the power of the purse in the way we are allowed to; that is, to cut off funding for our troops to immediately get them home.

But we have heard the reason why they don't bring that to the floor: they don't have the votes. And they use that as a reason why they bring, therefore, unconstitutional restrictions on the power of the President as Commander in Chief. Much like we heard on the bill before this, because it is the right thing to do with respect to the District of Columbia, we should ignore the words of the Constitution.

The problem is, once again, we are being told by those on the other side of the aisle that the Constitution, the Constitution, is an inconvenient truth.

The fact of the matter is the Founding Fathers tried to create a delicate balance between the war powers in the House and the war powers in the executive branch. And they said the President is Commander in Chief and once we go to war, he makes those decisions. We have the power of the purse. We have the power of the purse. If you truly believe that we are in the wrong position in Iraq, have the courage to present to this floor that question which we are given the power to consider under the Constitution. But don't come to the floor and use as your excuse for bringing something which is unconstitutional that you don't have the votes to do the right thing.

This goes beyond this question of the war, as important as it is. It is whether or not we as Members of the Congress who swear an oath to uphold the Constitution can on a daily basis ignore that Constitution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this conversation is 4 years too late. If we had this conversation 4 years ago, we would have known that we had the wrong intelligence, the wrong country and the wrong war. This administration is now borrowing $10 billion a month with the help of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. If they are truly concerned about fiscal responsibility, $10 billion should catch their attention. We borrow the money.

Let's talk about our troops and supporting our troops. If we were to support our troops, first of all we would take them out of a civil war. Secondly, we would care for them while they are here. Third, while they were there, we would make sure that they have the equipment they need. We know this administration has failed on all levels.

Our President says we need to listen to the generals. All of the generals are saying that we have weakened our military.

Let's support our country and let's support our defense. Make our military strong again so we can practice self-defense.

This administration and its allies have hurt us abroad, hurt our reputation, and will spend us into financial disaster if we allow them to. Fortunately, Congress has the power of the purse, and we will exercise it. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Indianapolis, Mr. BURTON.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, people who are watching this debate across the country are getting confused with all of the rhetoric that is going on. It boils down to two things: the Democrats, who promised fiscal responsibility, in this bill are spending $31.5 billion more than the President requested. They are busting the budget already when they promised America fiscal responsibility. So America, remember that. Remember that. They said they are going to balance the budget and they are not going to raise your taxes. They are already trying to raise your taxes. So raising your taxes and spending $31.5 billion more than they said they would on this bill.

Finally, the second issue is capitulation. If we do what they want, if we redeploy, as they call it, it is a withdrawal, and the vacuum that is going to be filled in Iraq will be filled by the radicals, the radical terrorists, al Qaeda and their fellow travelers. It is capitulation and budget busting. That is what they are all about today.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy at this time to yield 1 minute to my friend from Cherryville, North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

This an Iraq war and an Afghanistan war supplemental bill to fund the troops in harm's way.

Now let me get this straight. The majority has put together a bill that will help defeat Islamic extremists in Iraq and Afghanistan by funding $283 million worth of pork barrel spending for a milk program, a domestic milk program in the United States.

They believe the key to victory in Iraq is setting aside $74 million for peanut storehouses in Iraq. No, I'm sorry, not Iraq, Georgia.

They believe they can defeat Islamic extremists by $25 million worth of spinach subsidies for United States farmers.

Beyond that, they think that we can fund the war by spending $25 million for United States livestock. Now, Mr. Speaker, the American people know what this is about. This $25 million of livestock is literally pork for pork. It is the most ironic thing in this bill.

I would say that the failure of the majority is they don't understand ''emergency'' and ''war spending.''

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule for H.R. 1591. In fact, Madam Chair, you have set the rule, and we need rules of the road. That is why we need to pass H.R. 1591.

This is not the average spending bill taken up by the Congress. This legislation represents a very personal decision that needs to be made by each and every Member of this body about the future of our Nation. The fact is, and I address, if I may through the Chair, my respected brothers and sisters in the opposition.

The fact is that this bill was not necessitated by the acts of Congress. No, no. This supplemental is necessary because our Nation faces an emergency due to the multitude of failures from this administration. Why are you carrying their water?

Funding will be provided to make certain that the disgrace of Walter Reed will not be repeated. This supplemental makes certain that our troops are not redeployed in and out of Iraq without proper rest, without proper preparation. We all support that, don't we? And our support in Iraq will be brought to an end responsibly.

We recently observed the 4-year anniversary of the war in Iraq. And yet during those 4 years, Congress stood on the sidelines providing endless funding without questioning. No more; no more.

Today, Congress finally fulfills its constitutionally mandated responsibility, provides real oversight for the

funding of this war, and holds this administration accountable for its actions. That is what this rule, that is what this legislation is all about.

We have the opportunity here, all of us, to undo some of the severe damage caused by the unnecessary war. I ask Members to vote for the rule and for the bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentlewoman if there are any further speakers on her side.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I have no further speakers, and I will close.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in 1859 that great philosopher and religious leader John Stuart Mill wrote: ''War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse.''

We have yet to hear from the other side of the aisle about how we are going to win the global war on terror. We haven't heard, as my friend, Mr. LUNGREN, just said to me, the ''V'' word. How are we going to be victorious in this war?

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule. This is the largest supplemental spending bill in the history of this planet; and it is being brought up under a closed rule.

Our colleagues in the other body will have an opportunity to amend and discuss and debate this. Only a few Members of the Democratic leadership fashioned this measure, Mr. Speaker. It is unfair. It sends the wrong message to our troops. We must be victorious in this war.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and if they pass this rule, a ''no'' vote on the underlying legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule governing the debate of H.R. 1591, ''U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health, and Iraq Accountability Act.'' There is no more important issue facing the Congress, the President, and the American people than the war in Iraq. It is a subject upon which no one is indifferent, least of all members of Congress. Beginning with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, many good ideas have been advanced by members of Congress to bring to a successful conclusion the American military engagement in Iraq.

It is in that spirit that I commend the leadership and the Chairwoman of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for their patient and careful crafting of the Iraq Emergency Supplemental that will come before us later today. I support this rule and I support the supplemental because I support our magnificent servicemen and women in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, nearly every decision reached by a legislative body is a product of compromise. The rule and bill before us are no different. If it was left solely to us, any of us could no doubt add or subtract provisions which we think would improve the bill. For example, I offered four amendments to H.R. 1591. Let me describe them.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 1 terminates the authority granted by Congress to the President in the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force in Iraq. The resolution is terminated because the objectives for which the authorization was granted have all been achieved. Let me explain.

Congress authorized the President to use military force against Iraq to achieve the following objectives:

1. to disarm Iraq of any weapons of mass destruction that could threaten the security of the United States and international peace in the Persian Gulf region;

2. to change the Iraqi regime so that Saddam Hussein and his Baathist party no longer posed a threat to the people of Iraq or its neighbors;

3. to bring to justice any members of al Qaeda known or found to be in Iraq bearing responsibility for the attacks on the United States, its citizens, and interests, including the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001;

4. to ensure that the regime of Saddam Hussein would not provide weapons of mass destruction to international terrorists, including al Qaeda; and

5. to enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

Thanks to the skill and valor of the Armed Forces of the United States we now know for certain that Iraq does not possess weapons of mass destruction. Thanks to the tenacity and heroism of American troops, Saddam Hussein was deposed, captured, and dealt with by the Iraqi people in such a way that neither he nor his Baathist Party will ever again pose a threat to the people of Iraq or its neighbors in the region. Nor will the regime ever acquire and provide weapons of mass destruction to international terrorists.

Third, the American military has caught or killed virtually every member of al Qaeda in Iraq remotely responsible for the 9–11 attack on our country. Last, all relevant U.N. resolutions relating to Iraq have been enforced.

In other words, every objective for which the use of force in Iraq was authorized by the 2002 resolution has been achieved, most with spectacular success thanks to the professionalism and superior skill of our service men and women. The point of my amendment was to recognize, acknowledge, and honor this fact.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

The Armed Forces of the United States have performed magnificently. They won the war they were sent to fight. Their civilian leadership has not succeeded in winning the peace. Rather than undertaking a misguided and futile surge in troops, the United States should surge diplomatically and politically.

That is why Jackson Lee Amendment No. 2 called for the creation and appointment of a high-level Special Envoy for National and Political Reconciliation in Iraq (SENPRI) to launch a new offensive on the diplomatic front. This Special Envoy—who would be an individual of the stature of former Secretary of State Colin Powell, Madeleine Albright, or James Baker—would be commissioned to undertake the peaceful reconciliation of the major stakeholders in a free and democratic Iraq, particularly the Sunnis, Shiites, and Kurds.

The SENPRI shall meet with any and all such persons, organizations, and entities, and make such recommendations as he deems necessary and expedient for bringing about national and political reconciliation in Iraq, including recommending the assistance of a bona fide international peacekeeping force where necessary.

A real diplomatic surge requires a full-court press designed to engage all six of Iraq's neighbors—Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait—more constructively in stabilizing Iraq. These countries are already involved in a bilateral, self-interested but disorganized way.

As the Iraq Study Group report makes clear, none of these countries wants to live with an Iraq that, after our redeployment, becomes a failed state or a humanitarian catastrophe that could become a haven for terrorists or a hemorrhage of millions more refugees streaming into their countries. To avoid this catastrophe, there needs to be national reconciliation between the contending factions in Iraq. A Special Envoy dedicated to achieving this goal would help a great deal in bringing about this reconciliation.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, the Armed Forces of the United States have performed magnificently in Operation Iraqi Freedom. This fact is deserving of effusive praise and explicit acknowledgment in H.R. 1591. My third amendment did this.

The brave servicemen and women of the United States toppled the repressive Baathist regime, deposed one of history's greatest tyrants and gave the Iraqi people the chance to draft their own constitution, hold their own free elections, establish their own government, and build a future of peace and prosperity for themselves and their posterity.

But the cost of America's magnificent gift to the people of Iraq has been high. It has been paid for with the lives of more than 3,000 service members and the limbs of countless thousands of other. It has been paid for with the hard-earned tax dollars of the families of America.

The cost to the United States has also been high regarding the new and neglected needs of the American people. Operation Iraqi Freedom has exacerbated the backlog in Veterans Administration health care facility maintenance; placed an undue strain on the delivery of medical treatment and rehabilitative services for current and new veterans; and exacted a heavy toll on the equipment, training and readiness requirements, and the families of the men and women of the United States Armed Forces. My amendment acknowledged the sacrifices made by, and the debt of gratitude, we and the Iraqi people owe to Armed Forces of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

Last, Jackson Lee Amendment No. 4, changed the troop reference date for redeployment set forth in section 1904 from March 1, 2008, to December 31, 2007. What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Iraq will have had more than three years since the United States turned over sovereignty to establish a sustainable government with secure borders that can protect its people. If the allied forces could win World War II

in less than four years, certainly that is enough time for the Government of Iraq to provide for the security of its people, with the substantial assistance of the United States.

But Mr. Speaker, we ought not let the perfect become the enemy of the good. The emergency supplemental may not be perfect but it is better—far better—than any legislation relating to the war in Iraq that has ever been brought to the floor for a vote.

For the first time, Mr. Speaker, the Congress can go on record against an open-ended war whose goal line is always moving. The vote today will put the House on record as squarely against the Bush Administration's policy of looking the other way while the Iraqi government fails to govern a country worthy of a free people and with as much commitment and dedication to the security and happiness of its citizens and has been shown by the heroic American servicemen and women who risked their lives and, in the case of over 3,000 fallen heroes, lost their lives to win for the Iraqi people the chance to draft their own constitution, hold their own free elections, establish their own government, and build a future of peace and prosperity for themselves and their posterity.

But the cost of America's magnificent gift to the people of Iraq has been high. It has been paid for with the lives of more than 3,000 service members and the limbs of countless thousands of others. It has been paid for with the hard-earned tax dollars of the families of America.

The cost to the United States has also been high regarding the new and neglected needs of the American people. Operation Iraqi Freedom has exacerbated the backlog in Veterans Administration health care facility maintenance; placed an undue strain on the delivery of medical treatment and rehabilitative services for current and new veterans; and exacted a heavy toll on the equipment, training and readiness requirements, and the families of the men and women of the United States Armed Forces.

The emergency supplemental acknowledges the sacrifices made by, and the debt of gratitude, we and the Iraqi people owe to Armed Forces of the United States. More than that, it makes a substantial down payment on that debt by providing substantial increases in funding for our troops. For example, the supplemental provides $2.8 billion for defense health care, which is $1.7 billion above the President's request. Additionally, another $1.7 billion is provided to address the maintenance backlog at VA health care facilities. We provide $2.5 billion to ensure that our troops are properly equipped and trained.

Because after all, when American troops are sent into harm's way, America has an obligation to do all it can to minimize the risk of harm to the troops. That is why I am pleased the bill directs the President to adhere to current military guidelines for unit readiness, time between deployments, and meeting benchmarks and ending our involvement in Iraq's civil war.

Although the bill may not be the best I might have hoped for, I have concluded that it is the best that can be achieved at this time, this moment in history. I support the rule and the bill because I believe it represents a change of course and a new direction in our policy on Iraq. This bill will place us on the road that will reunite our troops with their families and bring them home with honor and success. I urge all members to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 261 will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 545, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 201, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—201

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Radanovich
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1609

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. CARNEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIVE AMERICAN METHAMPHETAMINE ENFORCEMENT AND TREATMENT ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 545, as amended, 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 545, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—423

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
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
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
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Cantor
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Radanovich
Scott (GA)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1617

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 160, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

AYES—256

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe

Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—160

Akin
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachmann
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ellsworth
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Goode
Granger
Graves
Hastert
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Holt
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Gohmert
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—15

Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
Honda
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Lantos
Lowey
Murphy, Tim
Nadler
Radanovich
Rangel
Woolsey
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1626

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1591, U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2007

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 261, I call up the bill (H.R. 1591) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 261, the amendment printed in House Report 110–64 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1591

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II GRANTS

For an additional amount for ''Public Law 480 Title II Grants'', during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad under title II of said Act, $450,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities'', $1,648,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys'', $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $2,750,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $1,736,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $118,260,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $8,468,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $4,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is

designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $17,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $8,878,899,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $1,100,410,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $1,495,828,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $1,229,334,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $173,244,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $82,800,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps'', $15,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $14,100,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $552,725,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $24,600,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $20,897,672,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $5,115,397,000, of which up to $120,293,000 may be transferred to Coast Guard ''Operating Expenses'', for reimbursement for activities which support activities requested by the Navy: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $1,503,694,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $6,909,259,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $2,855,993,000, of which not to exceed $300,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be used for payments to reimburse Pakistan, Jordan, and other key cooperating nations, for logistical, military, and other support provided, or to be provided, to United States military operations, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That such payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $74,049,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $111,066,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as

making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $13,591,000: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $10,160,000: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $133,569,000: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $38,429,000: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

For an additional amount for ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $5,906,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND

For an additional amount for ''Iraq Security Forces Fund'', $3,842,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

IRAQ FREEDOM FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Iraq Freedom Fund'', $155,600,000, to remain available for transfer until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

For an additional amount for ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $2,432,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

STRATEGIC RESERVE READINESS FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts provided in this or any other Act, for training, operations, repair of equipment, purchases of equipment, and other expenses related to improving the readiness of non-deployed United States military forces, $2,500,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein only to appropriations for military personnel, operation and maintenance, procurement, and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purposes provided herein: *Provided further,* That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than five days prior to making transfers under this authority, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfers made pursuant to this authority: *Provided further,* That funds shall be transferred to the appropriation accounts not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act: *Provided further,* That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further,* That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $461,850,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Army'', $160,173,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $3,474,389,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', $681,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $10,197,399,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $995,797,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', $171,813,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine

Corps'', $159,833,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $937,407,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $1,885,383,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $2,474,916,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $140,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', $95,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $2,042,183,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $934,930,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $60,781,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $295,737,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $132,928,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $545,904,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $1,315,526,000: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For an additional amount for ''National Defense Sealift Fund'', $5,000,000: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $2,789,703,000; of which $2,289,703,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, which shall remain available until September 30, 2008; and of which $500,000,000 shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, which shall remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', $259,115,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RELATED AGENCIES

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for ''Intelligence Community Management Account'', $57,426,000: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 1301. Appropriations provided in this chapter are available for obligation until September 30, 2007, unless otherwise provided in this chapter.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1302. Upon his determination that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary of Defense may transfer between appropriations up to $3,500,000,000 of the funds made available to the Department of Defense in this chapter: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: *Provided further,* That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and

is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109–289; 120 Stat. 1257), except for the fourth proviso.

SEC. 1303. Funds appropriated in this chapter, or made available by the transfer of funds in or pursuant to this chapter, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 1304. None of the funds provided in this chapter may be used to finance programs or activities denied by Congress in fiscal years 2006 or 2007 appropriations to the Department of Defense or to initiate a procurement or research, development, test and evaluation new start program without prior written notification to the congressional defense committees.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1305. During fiscal year 2007, the Secretary of Defense may transfer amounts in or credited to the Defense Cooperation Account, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608, to such appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense as he shall determine for use consistent with the purposes for which such funds were contributed and accepted: *Provided,* That such amounts shall be available for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall report to the Congress all transfers made pursuant to this authority: *Provided further,* That funds made available pursuant to this section are designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

SEC. 1306. (a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE SUPPORT.—Of the amount appropriated by this chapter under the heading, ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', not to exceed $100,000,000 may be used for support for counter-drug activities of the Governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan: *Provided,* That such support shall be in addition to support provided for the counter-drug activities of such Governments under any other provision of the law.

(b) TYPES OF SUPPORT.—

(1) Except as specified in subsection (b)(2) of this section, the support that may be provided under the authority in this section shall be limited to the types of support specified in section 1033(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85, as amended by Public Laws 106–398, 108–136, and 109–364) and conditions on the provision of support as contained in section 1033 shall apply for fiscal year 2007.

(2) The Secretary of Defense may transfer vehicles, aircraft, and detection, interception, monitoring and testing equipment to said Governments for counter-drug activities.

SEC. 1307. (a) From funds made available for operation and maintenance in this chapter to the Department of Defense, not to exceed $456,000,000 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commander's Emergency Response Program, for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan to respond to urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility by carrying out programs that will immediately assist the Iraqi and Afghan people.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 15 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes of the programs under subsection (a).

SEC. 1308. Supervision and administration costs associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance, and executed in direct support of the Global War on Terrorism only in Iraq and Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 1309. Section 9010 of division A of Public Law 109–289 is amended by striking ''2007'' each place it appears and inserting ''2008''.

SEC. 1310. Section 1005(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act, FY 2007 (Public Law 109–364) is amended by striking ''$310,277,000'' and inserting ''$376,446,000''.

SEC. 1311. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1312. (a) Of the funds appropriated or made available in this chapter under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', up to $100,000,000 may be made available for transfer to the Department of State ''Economic Support Fund'' account to support provincial reconstruction teams in Iraq and Afghanistan: *Provided,* That these funds may be transferred by the Secretary of Defense only if he determines such amounts are required to assist in reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(b) The transfer authority in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense.

(c) The Secretary shall, not fewer than five days prior to making transfers under this authority, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of such transfer.

SEC. 1313. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code;

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations;

(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148); and

(4) The limitation included in this section also applies to renditions.

SEC. 1314. (a) Not more than 50 percent of the amount of the funds appropriated by this Act under each of the headings ''Iraq Security Forces Fund'' and ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' shall be available for obligation or expenditure until the Secretary of Defense submits the initial report required by subsection (b) and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget submits the initial report required by subsection (c).

(b) REPORT BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—

(1) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that contains individual transition readiness assessments by unit of Iraq and Afghan security forces. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees updates of the report required by this subsection on a monthly basis until October 1, 2008. The report and updates of the report required by this subsection shall be submitted in classified form.

(2) In this subsection, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate.

(c) REPORT BY OMB.—

(1) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense; the Commander, Multi-National Security Transition Command—Iraq; the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan; and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter a report on the proposed use of all funds under each of the headings ''Iraq Security Forces Fund'' and ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' on a project-by-project basis, for which the obligation of funds is anticipated during the three month period from such date, including estimates by the commanders referred to in this paragraph of the costs required to complete each such project.

(2) The report required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) The use of all funds on a project-by-project basis for which funds appropriated under the headings referred to in paragraph (1) were obligated prior to the submission of the report, including estimates by the commanders referred to in paragraph (1) of the costs to complete each project.

(B) The use of all funds on a project-by-project basis for which funds were appropriated under the headings referred to in paragraph (1) in prior appropriations Acts, or for which funds were made available by transfer, reprogramming, or allocation from other headings in prior appropriations Acts, including estimates by the commanders referred to in paragraph (1) of the costs to complete each project.

(C) An estimated total cost to train and equip the Iraq and Afghan security forces, disaggregated by major program and sub-elements by force, arrayed by fiscal year.

(d) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of any proposed new projects or transfers of funds between sub-activity groups in excess of $15,000,000 using funds appropriated by this Act under the headings ''Iraq Security Forces Fund'' and ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund''.

SEC. 1315. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this chapter may be obligated or expended to provide award fees to any defense contractor contrary to the provisions of section 814 of the National Defense Authorization Act, FY 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

SEC. 1316. (a) Not more than 90 percent of the funds appropriated in this chapter for operation and maintenance shall be available for obligation unless and until the Secretary

of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the use of contracted services in support of United States military and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall prepare the report in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of State: *Provided further*, That the report shall provide detailed information specifying the number of contracts, private contractors, and contractor personnel used to provide services in fiscal year 2006, with sub-allocations by major service categories: *Provided further*, That the report also shall include estimates of the number of contracts to be executed in fiscal year 2007 with the associated number of contractors and contractor personnel, and provide information regarding the Federal department(s) or agency(s) responsible for executing these contracts: *Provided further*, That the report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act.

(b) Amounts appropriated for operation and maintenance in this chapter are hereby reduced by $815,000,000 to reflect savings attributable to efficiencies and management improvements in the funding of contracts in the military departments: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall allocate this reduction proportionally to each operation and maintenance account contained in this chapter: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than five days prior to making such reductions, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of such reductions.

SEC. 1317. Section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''A death gratuity'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (d), a death gratuity'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and, in such subsection, by striking ''If an eligible survivor dies before he'' and inserting ''If a person entitled to all or a portion of a death gratuity under subsection (a) or (d) dies before the person'' ; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection and ending on September 30, 2007, a person covered by section 1475 or 1476 of this title may designate another person to receive not more than 50 percent of the amount payable under section 1478 of this title. The designation shall indicate the percentage of the amount, to be specified only in 10 percent increments up to the maximum of 50 percent, that the designated person may receive. The balance of the amount of the death gratuity shall be paid to or for the living survivors of the person concerned in accordance with paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (a).''.

SEC. 1318. Section 9007 of division A of Public Law 109–289 is amended by striking ''20'' and inserting ''170''.

SEC. 1319. Section 1403(a) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398), as amended by section 1052 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and section 1073 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), is amended by striking ''September 30, 2007'' and inserting ''June 30, 2008''.

SEC. 1320. There is appropriated to the Secretary of Defense such sums as may be necessary to implement the recommendations of the Army Inspector General with regard to trained military attorneys dedicated to representing soldiers who are pursuing claims before physical evaluation boards and earlier in the Army disability evaluation system process.

CHAPTER 4

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

For an additional amount for ''Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'', $150,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 5

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for ''Analysis and Operations'', $35,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, to be used for expansion of the State and Local Fusion Center program: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, to be used to increase the number of inspectors, intelligence analysts and support staff responsible for container security inspections, and for other efforts to improve supply chain security: *Provided*, That up to $1,000,000 shall be transferred to ''Salaries and Expenses, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center'' for basic training costs: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION, OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND PROCUREMENT

For an additional amount for ''Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement'', $150,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, to be used to complete and expand airwings on the Northern Border: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

AVIATION SECURITY

For an additional amount for ''Aviation Security'', $1,250,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $1,000,000,000 shall be for explosive detection procurement and installation, $90,000,000 shall be for expansion of checkpoint explosive detection pilot systems, and $160,000,000 shall be for screening of cargo carried on passenger aircraft: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

NATIONAL PROTECTION AND PROGRAMS

INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND INFORMATION SECURITY

For an additional amount for ''Infrastructure Protection and Information Security'', $25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, to be used for development of State and local interoperability plans in conjunction with the SAFECOM program office: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, $25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, for regional disaster communications capability and support for mutual aid agreements: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for ''State and Local Programs'', $415,000,000, of which $190,000,000 shall be for port security grants and $225,000,000 shall be for intercity rail passenger transportation, freight rail, and transit security grants: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

For an additional amount for ''Emergency Management Performance Grants'', $100,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

SYSTEMS ACQUISITION

For an additional amount for ''Systems Acquisition'', $400,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the

amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 1501. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available in this or any other Act shall be used by the Secretary of Homeland Security to approve a site security plan for a chemical facility, unless the facility meets or exceeds security standards or requirements established for such a facility by the State or local government for the area where the facility is located.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, each of the terms ''site security plan'' and ''chemical facility'' has the meaning that the term has in section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109–295; 120 Stat. 1388).

(b) AMENDMENTS.—Section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109–295; 120 Stat. 1388) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''the Secretary may not disapprove a site security plan submitted under this section based on the presence or absence of a particular security measure, but'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''consistent with similar'' and inserting ''identical to the protections given'';

(3) in subsection (c), by striking '', site security plans, and other information submitted to or obtained by the Secretary under this section, and related vulnerability or security information, shall be treated as if the information were classified material'' and inserting ''and site security plans shall be treated as sensitive security information (as that term is used in section 1520.5 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations)''; and

(4) in subsection (d), by striking '': *Provided*, That nothing in this section confers upon any person except the Secretary a right of action against an owner or operator of a chemical facility to enforce any provision of this section''.

CHAPTER 6

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $6,437,000, as follows:

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, $6,437,000 for business continuity and disaster recovery, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 7

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Army'', $1,329,240,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $168,200,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, $25,600,000 shall not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense submits an updated 1391 form that addresses the actual housing requirement for the Consolidated Compound in Kabul, Afghanistan, to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate and an approval is issued: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $369,690,000 shall not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense submits a detailed report explaining how military road construction is coordinated with NATO and coalition nations: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $401,700,000 shall not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense submits a detailed spending plan, including a 1391 form for each project, to support Army end-strength growth to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate and an approval is issued: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps'', $389,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $49,600,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $200,000,000 shall not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense submits a detailed spending plan, including a 1391 form, for each project to support Marine Corps end-strength growth to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate and an approval is issued: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Air Force'', $60,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $3,900,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, established by section 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $3,136,802,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That within 30 days of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a detailed spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for ''Compensation and Pensions'', $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, for a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5101 note).

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL SERVICES

For an additional amount for ''Medical Services'', $414,982,000, to remain available until expended, of which $30,000,000 shall be for a new Level I comprehensive polytrauma center; $56,000,000 shall be for prosthetics; $100,000,000 shall be for contract mental health care when appointment waiting times exceed 30 days; and $228,982,000 shall be for treatment of veterans of the global war on terror: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for ''Medical Administration'', $256,300,000, to remain available until expended, of which $6,300,000 shall be used for polytrauma support clinic teams for case management: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MEDICAL FACILITIES

For an additional amount for ''Medical Facilities'', $595,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $45,000,000 shall be used for upgrades to polytrauma care centers; and $550,000,000 shall be for non-recurring maintenance as identified in the Department of Veterans Affairs Facility Condition Assessment report: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to

section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For an additional amount for ''Medical and Prosthetic Research'', $35,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be used for research initiatives related to Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation Enduring Freedom survivors: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''General Operating Expenses'', $62,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,250,000 shall be for digitization of records and $60,750,000 shall be for expenses related to hiring and training new claims processing personnel: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

For an additional amount for ''Information Technology Systems'', $35,000,000, to remain available until expended, for system development upgrades to address global war on terror requirements: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For an additional amount for ''Construction, Major Projects'', $23,800,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be for the authorized completion of a spinal cord injury center: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For an additional amount for ''Construction, Minor Projects'', $260,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 8

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'', $966,954,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which $102,155,000 for World Wide Security Upgrades is available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount available under this heading, $258,000 shall be transferred to, and merged with, funds available in fiscal year 2007 for expenses for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom: *Provided further*, That $395,000,000 of the amount available for Iraq operations shall not be obligated until the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives receives and approves a detailed plan for expenditure, prepared by the Secretary of State, and submitted within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That up to $50,000,000 may be made available to establish and maintain a civilian reserve corps: *Provided further*, That none of the funds for a civilian reserve corps may be obligated without specific authorization in a subsequent Act of Congress: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Office of Inspector General'', $46,800,000, to remain available until December 31, 2008: *Provided*, That $45,500,000 shall be transferred to the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction for reconstruction oversight: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for ''Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs'', $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for ''Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities'', $288,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

RELATED AGENCY

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for ''International Broadcasting Operations'', for activities related to broadcasting to the Middle East, $10,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND

For an additional amount for ''Child Survival and Health Programs Fund'', $161,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER AND FAMINE ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''International Disaster and Famine Assistance'', $135,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development'', $10,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General'', $3,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For an additional amount for ''Economic Support Fund'', $2,953,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th

Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES

For an additional amount for ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', $239,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

For an additional amount for ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', $334,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'', $111,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND

For an additional amount for ''United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund'', $35,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

NONPROLIFERATION, ANTITERRORISM, DEMINING AND RELATED PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for ''Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs'', $87,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''International Affairs Technical Assistance'', $2,750,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', $260,000,000: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for ''Peacekeeping Operations'', $225,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 1801. Section 3001(o)(1)(B) of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (Public Law 108–106; 117 Stat. 1238; 5 U.S.C. App., note to section 8G of Public Law 95–452) is amended by striking ''fiscal year 2006'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2006, 2007, or 2008''.

SEC. 1802. (a) LIMITATION ON ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND ASSISTANCE FOR LEBANON.—None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'' for cash transfer assistance for the Government of Lebanon may be made available for obligation until the Secretary of State reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on Lebanon's economic reform plan and on the specific conditions and verifiable benchmarks that have been agreed upon by the United States and the Government of Lebanon pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding on cash transfer assistance for Lebanon.

(b) LIMITATION ON FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM AND INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE FOR LEBANON.— None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM'' or ''INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT'' for military or police assistance to Lebanon may be made available for obligation until the Secretary of State submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on procedures established to determine eligibility of members and units of the armed forces and police forces of Lebanon to participate in United States training and assistance programs and on the end use monitoring of all equipment provided under such programs to the Lebanese armed forces and police forces.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the Government of Lebanon's actions to implement section 14 of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701 (August 11, 2006).

CHAPTER 9

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 1901. (a) Congress finds that it is Defense Department policy that units should not be deployed for combat unless they are rated ''fully mission capable''.

(b) 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 the Committees on Armed Services at least 15 days in advance of the deployment that the unit is fully mission capable.

(c) For purposes of subsection (b), the term ''fully mission capable'' means capable of performing assigned mission essential tasks to prescribed standards under the conditions expected in the theater of operations, consistent with the guidelines set forth in the Department of Defense readiness reporting system.

(d) The President, by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services that the deployment to Iraq of a unit that is not assessed fully mission capable is required for reasons of national security and by submitting along with the certification a report in classified and unclassified form detailing the particular reason or reasons why the unit's deployment is necessary despite the chief of the military department's assessment that the unit is not fully mission capable, may waive the limitation prescribed in subsection (b) on a unit-by-unit basis.

SEC. 1902. (a) Congress finds that it is Defense Department policy that Army, Army Reserve, and National Guard units should not be deployed for combat beyond 365 days or that Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve units should not be deployed for combat beyond 210 days.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended to initiate the development of, continue the development of, or execute any order that has the effect of extending the deployment for Operation Iraqi Freedom of—

(1) any unit of the Army, Army Reserve, or Army National Guard beyond 365 days; or

(2) any unit of the Marine Corps or Marine Corps Reserve beyond 210 days.

(c) The limitation prescribed in subsection (b) shall not be construed to require force levels in Iraq to be decreased below the total United States force levels in Iraq prior to January 10, 2007.

(d) The President, by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services that the extension of a unit's deployment in Iraq beyond the periods specified in subsection (b) is required for reasons of national security and by submitting along with the certification a report in classified and unclassified form detailing the particular reason or reasons why the unit's extended deployment is necessary, may waive the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) on a unit-by-unit basis.

SEC. 1903. (a) Congress finds that it is Defense Department policy that Army, Army Reserve, and National Guard units should not be redeployed for combat if the unit has been deployed within the previous 365 consecutive days or that Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve units should not be redeployed for combat if the unit has been deployed within the previous 210 days.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended to initiate

the development of, continue the development of, or execute any order that has the effect of deploying for Operation Iraqi Freedom of—

(1) any unit of the Army, Army Reserve, or Army National Guard if such unit has been deployed within the previous 365 consecutive days; or

(2) any unit of the Marine Corps or Marine Corps Reserve if such unit has been deployed within the previous 210 consecutive days.

(c) The limitation prescribed in subsection (b) shall not be construed to require force levels in Iraq to be decreased below the total United States force levels in Iraq prior to January 10, 2007.

(d) The President, by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services that the redeployment of a unit to Iraq in advance of the periods specified in subsection (b) is required for reasons of national security and by submitting along with the certification a report in classified and unclassified form detailing the particular reason or reasons why the unit's redeployment is necessary, may waive the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) on a unit-by-unit basis.

SEC. 1904. (a) The President shall make and transmit to Congress the following determinations, along with reports in classified and unclassified form detailing the basis for each determination, on or before July 1, 2007:

(1) whether the Government of Iraq has given United States Armed Forces and Iraqi Security Forces the authority to pursue all extremists, including Sunni insurgents and Shiite militias, and is making substantial progress in delivering necessary Iraqi Security Forces for Baghdad and protecting such Forces from political interference; intensifying efforts to build balanced security forces throughout Iraq that provide evenhanded security for all Iraqis; ensuring that Iraq's political authorities are not undermining or making false accusations against members of the Iraqi Security Forces; eliminating militia control of local security; establishing a strong militia disarmament program; ensuring fair and just enforcement of laws; establishing political, media, economic, and service committees in support of the Baghdad Security Plan; and eradicating safe havens;

(2) whether the Government of Iraq is making substantial progress in meeting its commitment to pursue reconciliation initiatives, including enactment of a hydro-carbon law; adoption of legislation necessary for the conduct of provincial and local elections; reform of current laws governing the de-Baathification process; amendment of the Constitution of Iraq; and allocation of Iraqi revenues for reconstruction projects; and

(3) whether the Government of Iraq and United States Armed Forces are making substantial progress in reducing the level of sectarian violence in Iraq.

(b) On or before October 1, 2007, the President—

(1) shall certify to the Congress that the Government of Iraq has enacted a broadly accepted hydro-carbon law that equitably shares oil revenues among all Iraqis; adopted legislation necessary for the conduct of provincial and local elections, taken steps to implement such legislation, and set a schedule to conduct provincial and local elections; reformed current laws governing the de-Baathification process to allow for more equitable treatment of individuals affected by such laws; amended the Constitution of Iraq consistent with the principles contained in article 137 of such constitution; and allocated and begun expenditure of $10 billion in Iraqi revenues for reconstruction projects, including delivery of essential services, on an equitable basis; or

(2) shall report to the Congress that he is unable to make such certification.

(c) If in the transmissions to Congress required by subsection (a) the President determines that any of the conditions specified in such subsection have not been met, or if the President is unable to make the certification specified in subsection (b) by the required date, the Secretary of Defense shall commence the redeployment of the Armed Forces from Iraq and complete such redeployment within 180 days.

(d) If the President makes the certification specified in subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall commence the redeployment of the Armed Forces from Iraq not later than March 1, 2008, and complete such redeployment within 180 days.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act are immediately available for obligation and expenditure to plan and execute a safe and orderly redeployment of the Armed Forces from Iraq, as specified in subsections (c) and (d).

(f) After the conclusion of the 180-day period for redeployment specified in subsections (c) and (d), the Secretary of Defense may not deploy or maintain members of the Armed Forces in Iraq for any purpose other than the following:

(1) Protecting American diplomatic facilities and American citizens, including members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

(2) Serving in roles consistent with customary diplomatic positions.

(3) Engaging in targeted special actions limited in duration and scope to killing or capturing members of al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations with global reach.

(4) Training members of the Iraqi Security Forces.

(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 50 percent of the funds appropriated by title I of this Act for assistance to Iraq under each of the headings ''IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND'', ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'', and ''INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT'' shall be withheld from obligation until the President has made a certification to Congress regarding the matters specified in subsection (b)(1).

(h) The requirement to withhold funds from obligation pursuant to subsection (g) shall not apply with respect to funds made available under the heading ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'' for continued support for the Community Action Program and Community Stabilization Program in Iraq administered by the United States Agency for International Development or for programs and activities to promote democracy in Iraq.

SEC. 1905. (a) COORDINATOR FOR IRAQ ASSISTANCE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint a Coordinator for Iraq Assistance (hereinafter in this section referred to as the ''Coordinator''), by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall report directly to the President.

(b) DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall be responsible for—

(1) Developing and implementing an overall strategy for political, economic, and military assistance for Iraq;

(2) Coordinating and ensuring coherence of Iraq assistance programs and policy among all departments and agencies of the Government of the United States that are implementing assistance programs in Iraq, including the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Justice;

(3) Working with the Government of Iraq in meeting the benchmarks described in section 1904(b) of this Act in order to ensure Iraq continues to be eligible to receive United States assistance described in such section;

(4) Coordinating with other donors and international organizations that are providing assistance for Iraq;

(5) Ensuring adequate management and accountability of United States assistance programs for Iraq;

(6) Resolving policy and program disputes among departments and agencies of the United States Government that are implementing assistance programs in Iraq; and

(7) Coordinating United States assistance programs with the reconstruction programs funded and implemented by the Government of Iraq.

(c) RANK AND STATUS.—The Coordinator shall have the rank and status of ambassador.

SEC. 1906. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to close Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

SEC. 1907. CONGRESSIONAL PLEDGE TO FULLY SUPPORT MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN HARM'S WAY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On September 14, 2001, both the Senate and the House of Representatives passed S.J. Res. 23 of the 107th Congress, which became Public Law 107–40 and authorized the use of military force in Afghanistan.

(2) On October 10, 2002, the House of Representatives passed H.J. Res. 114 of the 107th Congress, which authorized the use of military force in Iraq.

(3) After passage by the Senate, H.J. Res. 114 became Public Law 107–243, the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002.

(4) Members of the United States Armed Forces have served honorably in their mission to fight terrorism and protect the greater security of the United States.

(5) These members of the Armed Forces and their families have made many sacrifices, in many cases the ultimate sacrifice, to protect the security of the United States and the freedom Americans hold dear.

(6) Congress and the American people are forever grateful to the members of the Armed Forces for the service they have provided to the United States.

(b) FAITHFUL SUPPORT OF CONGRESS.—Congress will fully support the needs of members of the Armed Forces who the Commander in Chief has deployed in harm's way in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, and their families.

SEC. 1908. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF AND CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO DECLARE WAR.

(a) It is the sense of Congress that Congress acknowledges the President as the Commander in Chief, and that role is granted solely to the President by article II, section 2, of the United States Constitution.

(b) It is further the sense of Congress that Congress has the power solely to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11, of the United States Constitution.

SEC. 1909. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CONDUCT OF IRAQ WAR BY COMMANDERS.

It is the sense of Congress that, because the commanders of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq have the training, experience, and first-hand knowledge of the situation on the ground—

(1) the commanders should be allowed to conduct the war and manage the movements of the troops; and

(2) Congress should remain focused on executing its oversight role.

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL HURRICANE DISASTER

RELIEF AND RECOVERY

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 2101. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, $25,000,000 is appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture, to remain available through September 30, 2008, to resume the 2005 Hurricanes Livestock Indemnity Program to provide additional compensation to livestock producers in the geographic area covered by the natural disaster declaration related to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita that suffered losses in excess of the maximum amount of assistance authorized under the 2005 Hurricanes Livestock Indemnity Program. The total amount of assistance that an eligible producer may receive for such additional livestock losses under this section, the 2005 Hurricanes Livestock Indemnity Program, or any other provision of law may not exceed twice the maximum amount of assistance authorized under the 2005 Hurricanes Livestock Indemnity Program. The amount provided under this section is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

SEC. 2102. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in the Act, $15,000,000 is appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture, to remain available through September 30, 2008, for the purpose of providing assistance, in connection with the provision of emergency financial assistance for losses for 2005 or 2006 crops due to damaging weather or any related condition, to producers with respect to irrigated crops in the geographic area covered by the natural disaster declaration related to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita that, due to contamination by saltwater intrusion resulting from Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, were planted in 2006 and suffered a loss or were prevented from being planted. However, the factors otherwise applicable under section 1480.12(g) of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not apply to the provision of such assistance. The amount provided under this section is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

SEC. 2103. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, $100,000,000 is appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture, to remain available through September 30, 2008, to resume the 2005 Hurricanes Citrus Program to provide additional compensation to citrus producers in the geographic area covered by the natural disaster declaration related to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita that suffered losses in excess of the maximum amount of assistance authorized under the 2005 Hurricanes Citrus Program. The total amount of assistance that an eligible producer may receive for such additional citrus losses under this section, the 2005 Hurricanes Citrus Program, or any other provision of law may not exceed twice the maximum amount of assistance authorized under the 2005 Hurricanes Citrus Program. The amount provided under this section is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for ''Operations, Research, and Facilities'' for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Katrina on the shrimp and menhaden fishing industries, $120,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

EXPLORATION CAPABILITIES

For an additional amount for ''Exploration Capabilities'' for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Katrina, $35,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 2201. Up to $48,000,000 of amounts made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in Public Law 109–148 and Public Law 109–234 for emergency hurricane and other natural disaster-related expenses may be used to reimburse hurricane-related costs incurred by NASA in fiscal year 2005: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for ''Construction'' to reduce the risk of hurricane and storm damage to the Mississippi coastal area, $37,080,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such sums shall be subject to authorization: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for ''Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'', as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Katrina, $1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this amount shall be used to restore the flood damage reduction and hurricane and storm damage reduction projects, and related works, to provide the level of protection for which they were designed, and to accelerate completion of unconstructed portions of authorized hurricane, storm damage reduction and flood control projects in the greater New Orleans and south Louisiana area at full Federal expense: *Provided further*, That the Chief of Engineers, acting through the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, shall provide, at a minimum, a monthly report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than July 30, 2007: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 2301. Up to $650,000,000 of the appropriations made available under the heading ''Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'' in title II, Chapter 3 of Public Law 109–234, for projects in the greater New Orleans metropolitan area that remain available as of the date of enactment of this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Army to improve protection at the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, as described under the heading ''Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'', in Chapter 3 of Public Law 109–234: *Provided*, That the obligation of these funds may be made without regard to individual amounts specified in title II, Chapter 3 of Public Law 109–234: *Provided further*, That the expenditure of such funds shall not be considered a transfer or reprogramming under any provision of law and shall be carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in an Act making appropriations for energy and water development or any other appropriations Act making additional funds available for energy and water development: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 4

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for ''Disaster Loans Program Account'' for administrative expenses to carry out the disaster loan program, $25,069,000, to remain available until expended, which may be transferred to and merged with ''Small Business Administration, Salaries and Expenses'': *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 5

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DISASTER RELIEF

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Disaster Relief'', $4,310,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $4,000,000 shall be transferred to ''Office of Inspector General'': *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 2501. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any agreement, the Federal share of assistance, including direct Federal assistance, provided for the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, and Texas in connection with Hurricanes Katrina, Wilma, Dennis, and Rita under sections 403, 406, 407, and 408 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster

Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b, 5172, 5173, and 5174) shall be 100 percent of the eligible costs under such sections.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Federal share provided by subsection (a) shall apply to disaster assistance provided before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LIMITATION.—In the case of disaster assistance provided under sections 403, 406, and 407 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, the Federal share provided by subsection (a) shall be limited to assistance provided for projects for which project worksheets have been approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2502. (a) COMMUNITY DISASTER LOAN ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(a) of the Community Disaster Loan Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–88) is amended by striking ''*Provided further,* That notwithstanding section 417(c)(1) of the Stafford Act, such loans may not be canceled:''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall be effective on the date of enactment of the Community Disaster Loan Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–88).

(b) EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title II of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234) is amended under the heading ''Federal Emergency Management Agency Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account'' by striking ''*Provided further,* That notwithstanding section 417(c)(1) of such Act, such loans may not be canceled:''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall be effective on the date of enactment of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234).

(c) The amounts provided in this section are designated as emergency requirements pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

SEC. 2503. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2401 of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234) is amended by striking ''12 months'' and inserting ''24 months''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall be effective on the date of enactment of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234).

CHAPTER 6

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

Notwithstanding section 2002(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397a(c)), funds made available under the heading ''Social Services Block Grant'' in division B of Public Law 109–148 shall be available for expenditure by the States through the end of fiscal year 2008: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

For carrying out activities authorized by subpart 1 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended, for use by the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama for the following costs: (1) recruiting and compensating teachers, principals, other school administrators, and other educators for positions in reopening public elementary and secondary schools impacted by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, including through such mechanisms as paying salary premiums, performance bonuses, housing subsidies and relocation costs; and (2) activities to build the capacity of reopening such public elementary and secondary schools to provide an effective education, including the design, adaptation, and implementation of high-quality formative assessments; the establishment of partnerships with nonprofit entities with a demonstrated track record in recruiting and retaining outstanding teachers and other school leaders; and paid release time for teachers and principals to identify and replicate successful practices from the fastest-improving and highest-performing schools: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Education shall allocate such funds among such States that submit applications; that such allocation shall be based on the number of public elementary and secondary schools in each State that were closed for 30 days or more during the period beginning on August 29, 2005, and ending on December 31, 2005, due to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; and that such States shall in turn allocate funds, on a competitive basis, to local education agencies, giving priority to such agencies with the highest percentages of public elementary and secondary schools that are closed as a result of such hurricanes as of the date of enactment of this Act and the highest percentages of public elementary and secondary schools with a student-teacher ratio of at least 25 to 1: *Provided further,* That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the State educational agency, in cooperation with local educational agencies, teachers' unions, local principals' organizations, local parents' organizations, local business organizations, and local charter schools organizations, shall develop a plan for a rating system for performance bonuses and if the State educational agency has failed to reach such an agreement that is satisfactory to all consulting entities by such deadline, the State educational agency shall immediately notify Congress of such failure and reasons for it and shall, not later than 30 days after such notification, establish and implement a rating system that shall be based on strong learning gains for students and growth in student achievement, based on classroom observation and feedback at least 4 times annually, conducted by multiple sources (including principals and master teachers), and evaluated against research-validated rubrics that use planning, instructional, and learning environment standards to measure teaching performance: *Provided further,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

HURRICANE EDUCATION RECOVERY

PROGRAMS TO RESTART SCHOOL OPERATIONS

Funds made available under section 102 of the Hurricane Education Recovery Act (title IV of division B of Public Law 109–148) may be used by the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas, in addition to the uses of funds described in section 102(e) for the following costs: (1) recruiting and compensating teachers, principals, other school administrators, and other educators for positions in reopening public elementary and secondary schools impacted by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, including through such mechanisms as paying salary premiums, performance bonuses, housing subsidies and relocation costs; and (2) activities to build the capacity of reopening such public elementary and secondary schools to provide an effective education, including the design, adaptation, and implementation of high-quality formative assessments; the establishment of partnerships with nonprofit entities with a demonstrated track record in recruiting and retaining outstanding teachers and other school leaders; and paid release time for teachers and principals to identify and replicate successful practices from the fastest-improving and highest-performing schools: *Provided,* That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the State educational agency, in cooperation with local educational agencies, teachers' unions, local principals' organizations, local parents' organizations, local business organizations, and local charter schools organizations, shall develop a plan for a rating system for performance bonuses and if the State educational agency has failed to reach such an agreement that is satisfactory to all consulting entities by such deadline, the State educational agency shall immediately notify Congress of such failure and reasons for it and shall, not later than 30 days after such notification, establish and implement a rating system that shall be based on strong learning gains for students and growth in student achievement, based on classroom observation and feedback at least 4 times annually, conducted by multiple sources (including principals and master teachers), and evaluated against research-validated rubrics that use planning, instructional, and learning environment standards to measure teaching performance: *Provided further,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

HIGHER EDUCATION

For an additional amount under part B of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (''HEA'') for institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102 of that Act) that are located in an area in which a major disaster was declared in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act related to hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico in calendar year 2005, $30,000,000: *Provided,* That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education only for payments to help defray the expenses (which may include lost revenue, reimbursement for expenses already incurred, and construction) incurred by such institutions of higher education that were forced to close for at least 30 consecutive calendar days between August 25, 2005, and January 1, 2006, as a result of damage directly caused by such hurricanes and for payments to enable such institutions to provide grants to students who attend such institutions for academic years beginning on or after July 1, 2006: *Provided further,* That such payments shall be made in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary and made publicly available without regard to section 437 of the General Education Provisions Act, section 553 of title 5, United States Code, or part B of title VII of the HEA: *Provided further,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an

emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 2601. Section 105(b) of title IV of division B of Public Law 109–148 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''With respect to the program authorized by section 102 of this Act, the waiver authority in subsection (a) of this section shall be available until the end of fiscal year 2008.''.

CHAPTER 7

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for the purposes specified under, and subject to the provisions of, this heading in chapter 9 of title I of division B of Public Law 109–148 (119 Stat. 2779), $80,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2007: *Provided*, That the third proviso under such heading in Public Law 109–148 shall be applied to amounts made available under this heading and under such heading in Public Law 109–148 by substituting ''until December 31, 2007'' for ''for up to 18 months'': *Provided further*, That $80,000,000 shall be rescinded from unobligated balances remaining from the amounts made available under such heading in Public Law 109–148: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for ''Office of Inspector General'' for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes of the 2005 season, $10,240,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

TITLE III—AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3101. CROP DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

(a) ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE.—There are hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended, to make emergency financial assistance available to producers on a farm that incurred qualifying quantity or quality losses for the 2005 or 2006 crop, or for the 2007 crop before the date of the enactment of this Act, due to damaging weather or any related condition (including losses due to crop diseases, insects, and delayed harvest), as determined by the Secretary. However, to be eligible for assistance, the crop subject to the loss must have been harvested before the date of the enactment of this Act or, in the case of prevented planting or other total loss, would have been harvested before the date of the enactment of this Act in the absence of the damaging weather or any related condition.

(b) ELECTION OF CROP YEAR.—If a producer incurred qualifying crop losses in more than one of the 2005, 2006, or 2007 crop years, the producer shall elect to receive assistance under this section for losses incurred in only one of such crop years. The producer may not receive assistance under this section for more than one crop year.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall make assistance available under this section in the same manner as provided under section 815 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–387; 114 Stat. 1549A–55), including using the same loss thresholds for quantity and economic losses as were used in administering that section, except that the payment rate shall be 50 percent of the established price, instead of 65 percent.

(2) LOSS THRESHOLDS FOR QUALITY LOSSES.—In the case of a payment for quality loss for a crop under subsection (a), the loss thresholds for quality loss for the crop shall be determined under subsection (d).

(d) QUALITY LOSSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the amount of a payment made to producers on a farm for a quality loss for a crop under subsection (a) shall be equal to the amount obtained by multiplying—

(A) 65 percent of the payment quantity determined under paragraph (2); by

(B) 50 percent of the payment rate determined under paragraph (3).

(2) PAYMENT QUANTITY.—For the purpose of paragraph (1)(A), the payment quantity for quality losses for a crop of a commodity on a farm shall equal the lesser of—

(A) the actual production of the crop affected by a quality loss of the commodity on the farm; or

(B) the quantity of expected production of the crop affected by a quality loss of the commodity on the farm, using the formula used by the Secretary of Agriculture to determine quantity losses for the crop of the commodity under subsection (a).

(3) PAYMENT RATE.—For the purpose of paragraph (1)(B) and in accordance with paragraphs (5) and (6), the payment rate for quality losses for a crop of a commodity on a farm shall be equal to the difference between—

(A) the per unit market value that the units of the crop affected by the quality loss would have had if the crop had not suffered a quality loss; and

(B) the per unit market value of the units of the crop affected by the quality loss.

(4) ELIGIBILITY.—For producers on a farm to be eligible to obtain a payment for a quality loss for a crop under subsection (a), the amount obtained by multiplying the per unit loss determined under paragraph (1) by the number of units affected by the quality loss shall be at least 25 percent of the value that all affected production of the crop would have had if the crop had not suffered a quality loss.

(5) MARKETING CONTRACTS.—In the case of any production of a commodity that is sold pursuant to 1 or more marketing contracts (regardless of whether the contract is entered into by the producers on the farm before or after harvest) and for which appropriate documentation exists, the quantity designated in the contracts shall be eligible for quality loss assistance based on the 1 or more prices specified in the contracts.

(6) OTHER PRODUCTION.—For any additional production of a commodity for which a marketing contract does not exist or for which production continues to be owned by the producer, quality losses shall be based on the average local market discounts for reduced quality, as determined by the appropriate State committee of the Farm Service Agency.

(7) QUALITY ADJUSTMENTS AND DISCOUNTS.—The appropriate State committee of the Farm Service Agency shall identify the appropriate quality adjustment and discount factors to be considered in carrying out this subsection, including—

(A) the average local discounts actually applied to a crop; and

(B) the discount schedules applied to loans made by the Farm Service Agency or crop insurance coverage under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(8) ELIGIBLE PRODUCTION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out this subsection in a fair and equitable manner for all eligible production, including the production of fruits and vegetables, other specialty crops, and field crops.

(e) PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.—

(1) LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under this section to a producer for losses to a crop, together with the amounts specified in paragraph (2) applicable to the same crop, may not exceed 95 percent of what the value of the crop would have been in the absence of the losses, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) OTHER PAYMENTS.—In applying the limitation in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include the following:

(A) Any crop insurance payment made under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) or payment under section 196 of the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333) that the producer receives for losses to the same crop.

(B) The value of the crop that was not lost (if any), as estimated by the Secretary.

(3) DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that no producer on a farm receives duplicative payments under this section and any other Federal program for the same loss.

(f) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—The producers on a farm shall not be eligible for assistance under this section with respect to losses to an insurable commodity or noninsurable commodity if the producers on the farm—

(1) in the case of an insurable commodity, did not obtain a policy or plan of insurance for the insurable commodity under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) for the crop incurring the losses;

(2) in the case of a noninsurable commodity, did not file the required paperwork, and pay the administrative fee by the applicable State filing deadline, for the noninsurable commodity under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333) for the crop incurring the losses; or

(3) were not in compliance with highly erodible land conservation and wetland conservation provisions.

(g) TIMING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall make payments to producers on a farm for a crop under this section not later than 60 days after the date the producers on the farm submit to the Secretary a completed application for the payments.

(2) INTEREST.—If the Secretary does not make payments to the producers on a farm by the date described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall pay to the producers on a farm interest on the payments at a rate equal to the current (as of the sign-up deadline established by the Secretary) market yield on outstanding, marketable obligations of the United States with maturities of 30 years.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INSURABLE COMMODITY.—The term ''insurable commodity'' means an agricultural commodity (excluding livestock) for which the producers on a farm are eligible to obtain a policy or plan of insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(2) NONINSURABLE COMMODITY.—The term ''noninsurable commodity'' means a crop for which the producers on a farm are eligible to

obtain assistance under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333).

SEC. 3102. LIVESTOCK ASSISTANCE.

(a) LIVESTOCK COMPENSATION PROGRAM.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE.—There are hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended, to carry out the livestock compensation program established under subpart B of part 1416 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, as announced by the Secretary on February 12, 2007 (72 Fed. Reg. 6443), to provide compensation for livestock losses during calendar years 2005 and 2006, and during calendar year 2007 before the date of the enactment of this Act, due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary, including wildfire in the State of Texas and other States and blizzards in the States of Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. However, the payment rate for compensation under this subsection shall be 75 percent of the payment rate otherwise applicable under such program.

(2) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—In carrying out the program described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide assistance to any applicant that—

(A) conducts a livestock operation that is located in a disaster county with eligible livestock specified in paragraph (1) of section 1416.102(a) of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (72 Fed. Reg. 6444), an animal described in section 10806(a)(1) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (21 U.S.C. 321d(a)(1)), or other animals designated by the Secretary as livestock for purposes of this subsection; and

(B) meets the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 1416.102(a) of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, and all other eligibility requirements established by the Secretary for the program.

(3) ELECTION OF LOSSES.—If a producer incurred eligible livestock losses in more than one of the 2005, 2006, or 2007 calendar years, the producer shall elect to receive payments under this subsection for losses incurred in only one of such calendar years, and such losses must have been incurred in a county declared or designated as a disaster county in that same calendar year.

(4) MITIGATION.—In determining the eligibility for or amount of payments for which a producer is eligible under the livestock compensation program, the Secretary shall not penalize a producer that takes actions (recognizing disaster conditions) that reduce the average number of livestock the producer owned for grazing during the production year for which assistance is being provided.

(5) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that no producer on a farm receives duplicative payments under this subsection and another Federal program with respect to any loss.

(6) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) DISASTER COUNTY.—The term ''disaster county'' means—

(i) a county included in the geographic area covered by a natural disaster declaration; and

(ii) each county contiguous to a county described in clause (i).

(B) NATURAL DISASTER DECLARATION.—The term ''natural disaster declaration'' means—

(i) a natural disaster declared by the Secretary during calendar year 2005 or 2006, or calendar year 2007 before the date of the enactment of this Act, under section 321(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(a)); or

(ii) a major disaster or emergency designated by the President during calendar year 2005 or 2006, or calendar year 2007 before the date of the enactment of this Act, under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

(b) LIVESTOCK INDEMNITY PAYMENTS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE.—There are hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended, to make livestock indemnity payments to producers on farms that have incurred livestock losses during calendar years 2005 and 2006, and during calendar year 2007 before the date of the enactment of this Act, due to a disaster, as determined by the Secretary, including hurricanes, floods, anthrax, wildfires in the State of Texas and other States, and blizzards in the States of Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Oklahoma.

(2) ELECTION OF LOSSES.—If a producer incurred eligible livestock losses in more than one of the 2005, 2006, or 2007 calendar years, the producer shall elect to receive payments under this subsection for losses incurred in only one of such calendar years. The producer may not receive payments under this subsection for more than one calendar year.

(3) PAYMENT RATES.—Indemnity payments to a producer on a farm under paragraph (1) shall be made at a rate of not less than 30 percent of the market value of the applicable livestock on the day before the date of death of the livestock, as determined by the Secretary.

(4) LIVESTOCK DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''livestock'' means an animal that—

(A) is specified in clause (i) of section 1416.203(a)(2) of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (72 Fed. Reg. 6445), or is designated by the Secretary as livestock for purposes of this subsection; and

(B) meets the requirements of clauses (iii) and (iv) of such section.

(c) LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that no producer on a farm receives duplicative payments under this section and any other Federal program for the same loss.

SEC. 3103. SPINACH.

There is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture $25,000,000, to remain available until expended, to make payments to growers and first handlers, as defined by the Secretary, of fresh spinach that were unable to market spinach crops as a result of the Food and Drug Administration Public Health Advisory issued on September 14, 2006. The payment made to a grower or first handler under this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the value of the unmarketed spinach crops.

SEC. 3104. EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM.

There is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide assistance under the Emergency Conservation Program under title IV of the Agriculture Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.) for the cleanup and restoration of farmland damaged by freezing temperatures at any time during the period beginning on January 1, 2007, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3105. PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.

(a) REDUCTION IN PAYMENTS TO REFLECT PAYMENTS FOR SAME OR SIMILAR LOSSES.—The amount of any payment for which a producer is eligible under sections 3101 and 3102 shall be reduced by any amount received by the producer for the same loss or any similar loss under—

(1) the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148; 119 Stat. 2680); or

(2) an agricultural disaster assistance provision contained in the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture on January 26, 2006.

(b) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITATION.—Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a) shall apply with respect to assistance provided under sections 3101, 3102, 3103, and 3104.

SEC. 3106. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture may promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement sections 3101 and 3102.

(b) PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of the implementing regulations and the administration of sections 3101 and 3102 shall be made without regard to—

(1) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking; and

(3) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act'').

(c) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use the authority provided under section 808 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) USE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION; LIMITATION.—In implementing sections 3101 and 3102, the Secretary of Agriculture may use the facilities, services, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation shall not make any expenditures to carry out sections 3101 and 3102 unless funds have been specifically appropriated for such purpose.

SEC. 3107. MILK INCOME LOSS CONTRACT PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding subsections (c)(3), (f), and (g) of section 1502 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7982), there is hereby appropriated $283,000,000, to remain available until expended, for payments under such section, using the payment rate specified in subsection (c)(3)(B) of such section, from September 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008. Of such amount, $252,000,000 shall be available only on or after September 30, 2007, and only so long as an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs for fiscal years after 2007, including such section 1502, is not enacted.

SEC. 3108. PEANUT STORAGE COSTS.

Notwithstanding subsection (a)(6) of section 1307 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7957), there is hereby appropriated $74,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the payment of storage, handling, and other associated costs for the 2007 crop of peanuts to ensure proper storage of peanuts for which a loan is made under such section. Of such amount, $74,000,000 shall be available only on or after September 30, 2007, and only so long as an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs for fiscal years after 2007, including such section 1307, is not enacted.

SEC. 3109. LOSSES DUE TO APHIS EMERGENCY ORDER.

There is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture $5,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide compensation to aquaculture operations and other persons in the United States engaged in the business of breeding, rearing, or transporting live fish to cover all or a portion of the economic losses incurred by the operation or person as a result of the emergency order issued by the Animal and Plant Health

Inspection Service on October 24, 2006, prohibiting the importation of specified species of live fish from Ontario and Quebec, Canada, and the interstate movement of these same species of fish from New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, or Wisconsin due to outbreaks of viral hemorrhagic septicemia. The operation or person seeking compensation shall be required to document to the satisfaction of the Secretary the economic losses so incurred as a result of the emergency order.

SEC. 3110. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.

The amounts provided in this title are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $48,000,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 4101. Of the funds made available through appropriations to the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2007, not less than $4,000,000 shall be for the Office of Women's Health of such Administration.

SEC. 4102. None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 2007 may be used for a risk-based inspection program for poultry or meat unless the Secretary of Agriculture considers such program to be a rule under chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for ''Operations, Research, and Facilities'', National Marine Fisheries Service, $60,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That the National Marine Fisheries Service shall cause such amounts to be distributed among fishing communities, Indian tribes, individuals, small businesses, including fishermen, fish processors, and related businesses, and other persons for assistance to mitigate the economic and other social effects caused by the commercial fishery failure as determined by the Secretary on August 10, 2006: *Provided further,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 3

SEC. 4301. (a) Section 102(a)(3)(B) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15302(a)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2006'' and inserting ''January 1, 2008''.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Help America Vote Act of 2002.

CHAPTER 4

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 4401. Of the unobligated balances made available pursuant to section 505 of Public Law 109–90, $89,800,000 are rescinded.

SEC. 4402. The last two provisos under the heading ''Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses'' in Public Law 109–90 shall remain in effect through September 30, 2007.

SEC. 4403. (a) IN GENERAL.—Any contract, subcontract, or task order described in subsection (b) shall contain the following:

(1) A requirement for a technical review of all designs, design changes, and engineering change proposals, and a requirement to specifically address all engineering concerns identified in the review before the obligation of further funds may occur.

(2) A requirement that the Coast Guard maintain technical warrant holder authority, or the equivalent, for major assets.

(3) A requirement for independent cost estimates of major changes.

(4) A requirement for measurement of contractor and subcontractor performance based on the status of all work performed.

(b) CONTRACTS, SUBCONTRACTS, AND TASK ORDERS COVERED.—Subsection (a) applies to—

(1) any major procurement contract entered into by the Coast Guard;

(2) any subcontract entered into under such a contract; and

(3) any task order issued pursuant to such a contract or subcontract.

(c) PLAN FOR EXPENDITURE OF DEEPWATER FUNDS.—The funds appropriated in Public Law 109–295 for the Integrated Deepwater Systems program may not be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives receive and approve a plan for expenditure that—

(1) defines activities, milestones, yearly costs, and lifecycle costs for each procurement of a major asset, including an independent cost estimate for each;

(2) identifies lifecycle staffing and training needs of Coast Guard project managers and of procurement and contract staff;

(3) identifies all Integrated Product Teams that are not chaired by Coast Guard personnel and explains why the Coast Guard does not chair;

(4) identifies competition to be conducted in each procurement;

(5) does not rely on a single industry entity or contract;

(6) contains very limited indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts and explains the need for any indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts;

(7) complies with all applicable acquisition rules, requirements, and guidelines, and incorporates the best systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government;

(8) complies with the capital planning and investment control requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, including circular A–11, part 7;

(9) includes a certification by the Chief Procurement Officer of the Department of Homeland Security that the Coast Guard has established sufficient controls and procedures to comply with all contracting requirements and that any apparent conflicts of interest have been sufficiently addressed;

(10) includes a description of the process used to act upon deviations from the contractually specified performance requirements and clearly explains the actions taken on such deviations; and

(11) is reviewed by the Government Accountability Office.

SEC. 4404. (a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to contracts entered into after May 1, 2007, and except as provided in subsection (b), no entity performing lead system integrator functions in the acquisition of a major system by the Department of Homeland Security may have any direct financial interest in the development or construction of any individual system or element of any system of systems.

(b) EXCEPTION.—An entity described in subsection (a) may have a direct financial interest in the development or construction of an individual system or element of a system of systems if—

(1) the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the House Committee on Homeland Security that—

(A) the entity was selected by the Department of Homeland Security as a contractor to develop or construct the system or element concerned through the use of competitive procedures; and

(B) the Department took appropriate steps to prevent any organizational conflict of interest in the selection process; or

(2) the entity was selected by a subcontractor to serve as a lower-tier subcontractor, through a process over which the entity exercised no control.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude an entity described in subsection (a) from performing work necessary to integrate two or more individual systems or elements of a system of systems with each other.

(d) REGULATIONS UPDATE.—Not later than May 1, 2007, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall update the acquisition regulations of the Department of Homeland Security in order to specify fully in such regulations the matters with respect to lead system integrators set forth in this section. Included in such regulations shall be (1) a precise and comprehensive definition of the term ''lead system integrator'', modeled after that used by the Department of Defense, and (2) a specification of various types of contracts and fee structures that are appropriate for use by lead system integrators in the production, fielding, and sustainment of complex systems.

CHAPTER 5

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Wildland Fire Management'', $100,000,000, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided,* That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further,* That such funds are also available for repayment to other appropriation accounts from which funds were transferred for wildfire suppression: *Provided further,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for ''Resource Management'' for the detection of highly pathogenic avian influenza in wild birds, including the investigation of morbidity and mortality events, targeted surveillance in live wild birds, and targeted surveillance in hunter-taken birds, $7,398,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For an additional amount for ''Operation of the National Park System'' for the detection of highly pathogenic avian influenza in wild birds, including the investigation of morbidity and mortality events, $525,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for ''Surveys, Investigations, and Research'' for the detection of highly pathogenic avian influenza in wild birds, including the investigation of morbidity and mortality events, targeted surveillance in live wild birds, and targeted surveillance in hunter-taken birds, $5,270,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Wildland Fire Management'', $400,000,000, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That such funds shall only become available if funds provided previously for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for repayment to other appropriation accounts from which funds were transferred for wildfire suppression: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 4501. There is appropriated not to exceed $400,000,000 to the Department of Agriculture, to be used for one-time payments to be allocated, to the maximum extent practicable, in the same amounts and in the same manner as were paid to States and others in 2006 under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393; 16 U.S.C. 500 note): *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

SEC. 4502. Section 20515 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended by inserting before the period: ''; and of which, not to exceed $9,019,000 shall be available, in addition to amounts otherwise available, for contract support costs''.

SEC. 4503. Section 20512 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended by inserting after the first dollar amount: '', of which, not to exceed $5,000,000 shall be available, in addition to amounts otherwise available, for contract support costs; and of which, not to exceed $7,300,000 may be transferred to the 'Indian Health Facilities' account,''.

SEC. 4504. Section 20501 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended by inserting after $55,663,000 ''of which $13,000,000 shall be for Save America's Treasures''.

CHAPTER 6

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Of the amount provided by the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) for ''National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases'', $49,500,000 shall be transferred to ''Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' to carry out activities relating to advanced research and development as provided by section 319L of the Public Health Service Act.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount to make payments under section 2604(a)–(d) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8623(a)–(d)), $200,000,000: *Provided*, That grantees may obligate the funds made available by this paragraph through September 30, 2008, to meet the home energy assistance needs arising from an emergency as defined in section 2603(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 8622(1)) or for energy crisis intervention under section 2604(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 8623(c)) except that, in carrying out this paragraph, the Governor of a State (or equivalent authority in the case of grantee other than a State) shall be treated as the Secretary for purposes of such section 2603(1): *Provided further*, That the amount provided by this paragraph is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

For an additional amount to make payments under section 2604(e) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8623(e)), $200,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount provided by this paragraph is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic, $969,650,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $870,000,000 shall be for activities including the development and purchase of vaccine, antivirals, necessary medical supplies, diagnostics, and other surveillance tools: *Provided further*, That products purchased with these funds may, at the discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, be deposited in the Strategic National Stockpile: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 496(b) of the Public Health Service Act, funds may be used for the construction or renovation of privately owned facilities for the production of pandemic vaccine and other biologicals, where the Secretary finds such a contract necessary to secure sufficient supplies of such vaccines or biologicals: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be transferred to other appropriation accounts of the Department of Health and Human Services, as determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, to be used for the purposes specified in this sentence: *Provided further*, That not less than $34,650,000 shall be for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for laboratory diagnostics and analytical capabilities: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

COVERED COUNTERMEASURE PROCESS FUND

For carrying out section 319F–4 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6e) to compensate individuals for injuries caused by H5N1 vaccine, in accordance with the declaration regarding avian influenza viruses issued by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on January 26, 2007, pursuant to section 319F–3(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6d(b)), $50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 4601. Section 20602 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended by striking ''of which no less than $5,000,000 shall be'' and inserting the following: ''of which $7,500,000 (together with an additional $7,000,000 which shall be transferred by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation as an authorized administrative cost) shall be available when needed through September 30, 2008,''.

SEC. 4602. Section 20608(a) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended by inserting ''and which shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 2007,'' after ''Public Law 103–353,''.

SEC. 4603. Section 20625(b)(1) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended by—

(1) striking ''$7,172,994,000'' and inserting ''$7,176,431,000'';

(2) amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows: ''(A) $5,454,824,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), of which up to $3,437,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Education on October 1, 2006, to obtain annually updated educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census;''; and

(3) amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows: ''(C) not to exceed $2,352,000 may be available for section 1608 of the ESEA and for a clearinghouse on comprehensive school reform under part D of title V of the ESEA;''.

SEC. 4604. The provision in the first proviso under the heading ''Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research'' in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2006, relating to alternative financing programs under section 4(b)(2)(D) of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 shall not apply to funds appropriated by the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007.

CHAPTER 7

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

PAYMENT TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to Gloria W. Norwood, widow of Charles W. Norwood, Jr., late a Representative from the State of Georgia, $165,200.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For an additional amount for ''Capitol Power Plant'', $50,000,000, for asbestos abatement and other improvements, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

CHAPTER 8

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for ''International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction'', $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 4801. (a) MIDDLE EAST FOUNDATION.—Section 534(k) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–102) is amended, in the second proviso, by inserting after ''subsection (b) of that section'' the following: ''and the requirement that a majority of the members of the board of directors be United States citizens provided in subsection (d)(3)(B) of that section''.

SEC. 4802. Notwithstanding any provision of title I of division B of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Laws 109–369, 109–383, and 110–5), the dollar amount limitation of the first proviso under the heading, ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic and Consular Programs'', in title IV of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–108; 119 Stat. 2319) shall not apply to funds appropriated under such heading for fiscal year 2007.

SEC. 4803. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2007 for ''Bilateral Economic Assistance—Department of the Treasury—Debt Restructuring'' may be used to assist Liberia in retiring its debt arrearages to the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the African Development Bank.

CHAPTER 9

SEC. 4901. Funds provided for the ''National Transportation Safety Board, Salaries and Expenses'' in section 21031 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) include amounts necessary to make lease payments due in fiscal year 2007 on an obligation incurred in 2001 under a capital lease.

SEC. 4902. Section 21033 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended by adding after the second proviso: '': *Provided further*, That paragraph (2) under such heading in Public Law 109–115 (119 Stat. 2441) shall be funded at $149,300,000, but additional section 8 tenant protection rental assistance costs may be funded in 2007 by using unobligated balances, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading 'Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing', the heading 'Housing Certificate Fund', and the heading 'Project-Based Rental Assistance' for fiscal year 2006 and prior fiscal years: *Provided further*, That paragraph (3) under such heading in Public Law 109–115 (119 Stat. 2441) shall be funded at $47,500,000: *Provided further*, That paragraph (4) under such heading in Public Law 109–115 (119 Stat. 2441) shall be funded at $5,900,000: *Provided further*, That paragraph (5) under such heading in Public Law 109–115 (119 Stat. 2441) shall be funded at $1,281,100,000, of which $1,251,100,000 shall be allocated for the calendar year 2007 funding cycle on a pro rata basis to public housing agencies based on the amount public housing agencies were eligible to receive in calendar year 2006, and of which up to $30,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to allocate to public housing agencies that need additional funds to administer their section 8 programs, with up to $20,000,000 to be for fees associated with section 8 tenant protection rental assistance''.

SEC. 4903. Section 21033 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended (prior to amendment by the preceding section of this chapter) by adding after the third proviso: '': *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the previous proviso, except for applying the 2007 Annual Adjustment Factor and making any other specified adjustments, public housing agencies in the following categories shall receive renewal funding for calendar year 2007 equal to the amounts, prior to prorations, such public housing agencies were eligible to receive in calendar year 2006, prorated at the calendar year 2006 rate: (1) public housing agencies that would receive less funding under the previous proviso than they would receive under this proviso and that are located in any area declared a major disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 1521 et seq.) with respect to hurricanes that occurred in calendar years 2004 and 2005; (2) public housing agencies participating in the Moving to Work Demonstration; (3) public housing agencies that, during calendar year 2007 but prior to June 1, 2007, are in receivership, or the Department of Housing and Urban Development has declared to be in breach of an Annual Contributions Contract; or (4) public housing agencies that overspent their allocation for calendar year 2006 and available housing assistance payments balance from calendar year 2005''.

SEC. 4904. Chapter 10 of title II of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended by inserting after section 21041 the following new section:

''SEC. 21041A. The provisions under the heading 'Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Salaries and Expenses' in title III of division A of Public Law 109–115 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting '$67,568,000' for '$60,000,000'.''.

SEC. 4905. Section 21033 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–289, as amended by Public Law 110–5) is amended (prior to amendment by the preceding sections of this chapter) by striking the sixth proviso.

SEC. 4906. Section 232(b) of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–377) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) APPLICABILITY.—In the case of any dwelling unit that, upon the date of the enactment of this Act, is assisted under a housing assistance payment contract under section 8(o)(13) as in effect before such enactment, or under section 8(d)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(d)(2)) as in effect before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (title V of Public Law 105–276), assistance may be renewed or extended under such section 8(o)(13), as amended by subsection (a), provided that the initial contract term and rent of such renewed or extended assistance shall be determined pursuant to subparagraphs (F) and (H), and subparagraphs (C) and (D) of such section shall not apply to such extensions or renewals.''.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS ACT

SEC. 4910. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

TITLE V—CONTRACTING REFORM

SEC. 5001. MINIMIZING SOLE-SOURCE CONTRACTS.

(a) PLANS REQUIRED.—Subject to subsection (c), the head of each executive agency covered by title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.) and the head of each agency covered by chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, shall develop and implement a plan to minimize the use of contracts entered into using procedures other than competitive procedures by the agency concerned. The plan shall contain measurable goals and shall be completed and submitted to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, with a copy provided to the Comptroller General, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review the plans provided under subsection (a) and submit a report to Congress on the plans not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REQUIREMENT LIMITED TO CERTAIN AGENCIES.—The requirement of subsection (a) shall apply only to those agencies that awarded contracts in a total amount of at least $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

SEC. 5002. MINIMIZING COST-REIMBURSEMENT TYPE CONTRACTS.

(a) PLANS REQUIRED.—Subject to subsection (c), the head of each executive agency covered by title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.) and the head of each agency covered by chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, shall develop and implement a plan to minimize the use of cost-reimbursement type contracts by the agency concerned. The plan shall contain measurable goals and shall be completed and submitted to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, with a copy provided to the Comptroller General, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review the plans provided under subsection (a) and submit a report to Congress on the plans not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REQUIREMENT LIMITED TO CERTAIN AGENCIES.—The requirement of subsection (a) shall apply only to those agencies that awarded contracts in a total amount of at least $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

SEC. 5003. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF JUSTIFICATION AND APPROVAL DOCUMENTS FOR NONCOMPETITIVE CONTRACTS.

(a) CIVILIAN AGENCY CONTRACTS.—Section 303 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j)(1) In the case of a procurement permitted by subsection (c), the head of an executive agency shall make publicly available,

within 14 days after the award of the contract, the documents containing the justification and approval required by subsection (f)(1) with respect to the procurement.

''(2) The documents shall be made available on the website of the agency and through the Federal Procurement Data System.

''(3) This subsection does not require the public availability of information that is exempt from public disclosure under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code.''.

(b) DEFENSE AGENCY CONTRACTS.—Section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(1)(1) In the case of a procurement permitted by subsection (c), the head of an agency shall make publicly available, within 14 days after the award of the contract, the documents containing the justification and approval required by subsection (f)(1) with respect to the procurement.

''(2) The documents shall be made available on the website of the agency and through the Federal Procurement Data System.

''(3) This subsection does not require the public availability of information that is exempt from public disclosure under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code.''.

SEC. 5004. DISCLOSURE OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR OVERCHARGES.

(a) QUARTERLY REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) The head of each Federal agency or department shall submit to the chairman and ranking member of each committee specified in paragraph (2) on a quarterly basis a report that includes the following:

(A) A list of audits or other reports issued during the applicable quarter that describe contractor costs in excess of $1,000,000 that have been identified as unjustified, unsupported, questioned, or unreasonable under any contract, task or delivery order, or subcontract.

(B) The specific amounts of costs identified as unjustified, unsupported, questioned, or unreasonable and the percentage of their total value of the contract, task or delivery order, or subcontract.

(C) A list of audits or other reports issued during the applicable quarter that identify significant or substantial deficiencies in the performance of any contractor or in any business system of any contractor under any contract, task or delivery order, or subcontract.

(2) The report described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and other committees of jurisdiction.

(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an agency or department with respect to a calendar quarter if no audits or other reports described in paragraph (1) were issued during that quarter.

(b) SUBMISSION OF INDIVIDUAL AUDITS.—The head of each Federal agency or department shall provide, within 14 days after a request in writing by the chairman or ranking member of any of the committees described in subsection (a)(2), a full and unredacted copy of any audit or other report described in subsection (a)(1).

TITLE VI—ELIMINATION OF SCHIP SHORTFALL

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE FUND

For an additional amount to provide additional allotments to remaining shortfall States under section 2104(h)(4) of the Social Security Act, as inserted by section 6001, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed $750,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376 (109th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by section 511(a)(4) of H. Res. 6 (110th Congress).

SEC. 6001. ELIMINATION OF REMAINDER OF SCHIP FUNDING SHORTFALLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007.

(a) ELIMINATION OF REMAINDER OF FUNDING SHORTFALLS, TIERED MATCH, AND OTHER LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES.—Section 2104(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(h)), as added by section 201(a) of the National Institutes of Health Reform Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–482), is amended—

(1) in the heading for paragraph (2), by striking ''REMAINDER OF REDUCTION'' and inserting ''PART''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS TO ELIMINATE REMAINDER OF FISCAL YEAR 2007 FUNDING SHORTFALLS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—From the amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts, the Secretary shall allot to each remaining shortfall State described in subparagraph (B) such amount as the Secretary determines will eliminate the estimated shortfall described in such subparagraph for the State for fiscal year 2007.

''(B) REMAINING SHORTFALL STATE DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a remaining shortfall State is a State with a State child health plan approved under this title for which the Secretary estimates, on the basis of the most recent data available to the Secretary as of the date of the enactment of this paragraph, that the projected Federal expenditures under such plan for the State for fiscal year 2007 will exceed the sum of—

''(i) the amount of the State's allotments for each of fiscal years 2005 and 2006 that will not be expended by the end of fiscal year 2006;

''(ii) the amount of the State's allotment for fiscal year 2007; and

''(iii) the amounts, if any, that are to be redistributed to the State during fiscal year 2007 in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2104(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(h)) (as so added), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''subject to paragraph (4)(B) and'';

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''subject to paragraph (4)(B) and'';

(3) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking ''and (3)'' and inserting ''(3), and (4)''; and

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and (3)'' and inserting ''(3), and (4)''.

TITLE VII—MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE AND SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF

CHAPTER 1

SEC. 7101. SHORT TITLE.

This chapter may be cited as the ''Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007''.

SEC. 7102. MINIMUM WAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) except as otherwise provided in this section, not less than—

''(A) $5.85 an hour, beginning on the 60th day after the date of enactment of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007;

''(B) $6.55 an hour, beginning 12 months after that 60th day; and

''(C) $7.25 an hour, beginning 24 months after that 60th day;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7103. APPLICABILITY OF MINIMUM WAGE TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206) shall apply to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) TRANSITION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the minimum wage applicable to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) shall be—

(1) $3.55 an hour, beginning on the 60th day after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) increased by $0.50 an hour (or such lesser amount as may be necessary to equal the minimum wage under section 6(a)(1) of such Act), beginning 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and every 6 months thereafter until the minimum wage applicable to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands under this subsection is equal to the minimum wage set forth in such section.

SEC. 7104. APPLICABILITY OF MINIMUM WAGE TO AMERICAN SAMOA.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206) shall apply to American Samoa.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(b) TRANSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) shall be—

(A) $3.55 an hour, beginning on the 60th day after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) increased by $0.50 an hour (or such lesser amount as may be necessary to equal the minimum wage under section 6(a)(1) of such Act), beginning 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and every 6 months thereafter until the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa under this paragraph is equal to the minimum wage set forth in such section.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), if an employee is employed in an industry in American Samoa that, on the date of enactment of this Act, is required to pay a minimum wage rate under section 697 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, that is higher than the minimum wage rate required under paragraph (1)(A), the minimum wage applicable to such employee shall be—

(A) the minimum wage rate required for such an industry under such section on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) increased by $0.50 an hour (or such lesser amount as may be necessary to equal the minimum wage under section 6(a)(1) of such Act), beginning 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and every 6 months

thereafter until the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa under this subsection is equal to the minimum wage set forth in such section.

CHAPTER 2

SEC. 7201. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This chapter may be cited as the ''Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this chapter an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this chapter is as follows:

Sec. 7201. Short title; amendment of 1986 Code; table of contents.
Sec. 7202. Extension and modification of work opportunity tax credit.
Sec. 7203. Extension and increase of expensing for small business.
Sec. 7204. Determination of credit for certain taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips.
Sec. 7205. Waiver of individual and corporate alternative minimum tax limits on work opportunity credit and credit for taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips.
Sec. 7206. Family business tax simplification.
Sec. 7207. Denial of lowest capital gains rate for certain dependents.
Sec. 7208. Suspension of certain penalties and interest.
Sec. 7209. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

SEC. 7202. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF WORK OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 51(c)(4)(B) (relating to termination) is amended by striking ''2007'' and inserting ''2008''.

(b) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM AGE FOR DESIGNATED COMMUNITY RESIDENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (5) of section 51(d) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) DESIGNATED COMMUNITY RESIDENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'designated community resident' means any individual who is certified by the designated local agency—

''(i) as having attained age 18 but not age 40 on the hiring date, and

''(ii) as having his principal place of abode within an empowerment zone, enterprise community, or renewal community.

''(B) INDIVIDUAL MUST CONTINUE TO RESIDE IN ZONE OR COMMUNITY.—In the case of a designated community resident, the term 'qualified wages' shall not include wages paid or incurred for services performed while the individual's principal place of abode is outside an empowerment zone, enterprise community, or renewal community.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (D) of section 51(d)(1) is amended to read as follows:

''(D) a designated community resident,''.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS UNDER INDIVIDUAL WORK PLANS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 51(d)(6) (relating to vocational rehabilitation referral) is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting '', or'', and by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) an individual work plan developed and implemented by an employment network pursuant to subsection (g) of section 1148 of the Social Security Act with respect to which the requirements of such subsection are met.''.

(d) TREATMENT OF DISABLED VETERANS UNDER THE WORK OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.—

(1) DISABLED VETERANS TREATED AS MEMBERS OF TARGETED GROUP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 51(d)(3) (relating to qualified veteran) is amended by striking ''agency as being a member of a family'' and all that follows and inserting ''agency as—

''(i) being a member of a family receiving assistance under a food stamp program under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 for at least a 3-month period ending during the 12-month period ending on the hiring date, or

''(ii) entitled to compensation for a service-connected disability, and—

''(I) having a hiring date which is not more that 1 year after having been discharged or released from active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, or

''(II) having aggregate periods of unemployment during the 1-year period ending on the hiring date which equal or exceed 6 months.''.

(B) DEFINITIONS.—Paragraph (3) of section 51(d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the terms 'compensation' and 'service-connected' have the meanings given such terms under section 101 of title 38, United States Code.''.

(2) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF WAGES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT FOR DISABLED VETERANS.—Paragraph (3) of section 51(b) is amended—

(A) by inserting ''($12,000 per year in the case of any individual who is a qualified veteran by reason of subsection (d)(3)(A)(ii))'' before the period at the end, and

(B) by striking ''ONLY FIRST $6,000 OF'' in the heading and inserting ''LIMITATION ON''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals who begin work for the employer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7203. EXTENSION AND INCREASE OF EXPENSING FOR SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsections (b)(1), (b)(2), (b)(5), (c)(2), and (d)(1)(A)(ii) of section 179 (relating to election to expense certain depreciable business assets) are each amended by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2011''.

(b) INCREASE IN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 179 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$100,000 in the case of taxable years beginning after 2002'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$125,000 in the case of taxable years beginning after 2006'', and

(2) by striking ''$400,000 in the case of taxable years beginning after 2002'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$500,000 in the case of taxable years beginning after 2006''.

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 179(b)(5) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2003'' and inserting ''2007'',

(2) by striking ''$100,000 and $400,000'' and inserting ''$125,000 and $500,000'', and

(3) by striking ''2002'' in clause (ii) and inserting ''2006''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 7204. DETERMINATION OF CREDIT FOR CERTAIN TAXES PAID WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYEE CASH TIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 45B(b)(1) is amended by inserting ''as in effect on January 1, 2007, and'' before ''determined without regard to''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to tips received for services performed after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 7205. WAIVER OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX LIMITS ON WORK OPPORTUNITY CREDIT AND CREDIT FOR TAXES PAID WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYEE CASH TIPS.

(a) ALLOWANCE AGAINST ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—Subparagraph (B) of section 38(c)(4) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by inserting a comma at the end of clause (ii), and by adding at the end the following new clauses:

''(iii) the credit determined under section 45B, and

''(iv) the credit determined under section 51.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to credits determined under sections 45B and 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006, and to carrybacks of such credits.

SEC. 7206. FAMILY BUSINESS TAX SIMPLIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 761 (defining terms for purposes of partnerships) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) QUALIFIED JOINT VENTURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified joint venture conducted by a husband and wife who file a joint return for the taxable year, for purposes of this title—

''(A) such joint venture shall not be treated as a partnership,

''(B) all items of income, gain, loss, deduction, and credit shall be divided between the spouses in accordance with their respective interests in the venture, and

''(C) each spouse shall take into account such spouse's respective share of such items as if they were attributable to a trade or business conducted by such spouse as a sole proprietor.

''(2) QUALIFIED JOINT VENTURE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'qualified joint venture' means any joint venture involving the conduct of a trade or business if—

''(A) the only members of such joint venture are a husband and wife,

''(B) both spouses materially participate (within the meaning of section 469(h) without regard to paragraph (5) thereof) in such trade or business, and

''(C) both spouses elect the application of this subsection.''.

(b) NET EARNINGS FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 1402 (defining net earnings from self-employment) is amended by striking '', and'' at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting a semicolon, by striking the period at the end of paragraph (16) and inserting ''; and'', and by inserting after paragraph (16) the following new paragraph:

''(17) notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, each spouse's share of income or loss from a qualified joint venture shall be taken into account as provided in section 761(f) in determining net earnings from self-employment of such spouse.''.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 211 of the Social Security Act (defining net earnings from self-employment) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting ''; and'', and by inserting after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

''(16) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, each spouse's share of income or loss from a qualified joint venture shall be taken into account as provided in section 761(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in determining net earnings from self-employment of such spouse.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 7207. DENIAL OF LOWEST CAPITAL GAINS RATE FOR CERTAIN DEPENDENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12) CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR LOWEST RATE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual described in subparagraph (B)—

''(i) the amount determined under paragraph (1)(A)(ii)(II) shall not be less than the amount of taxable income which would (without regard to this subsection) be taxed at a rate below 15 percent, and

''(ii) the sum of the amounts determined under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) shall be an amount equal to the rate of tax specified in paragraph (1)(C) multiplied by so much of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable income) as exceeds the excess (if any) of—

''(I) the amount of taxable income which would (without regard to this subsection) be taxed at a rate below 15 percent, over

''(II) the taxable income reduced by the adjusted net capital gain.

''(B) INDIVIDUALS TO WHOM PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this paragraph, an individual is described in this subparagraph if—

''(I) such individual meets the age requirements of section 152(c)(3) (determined without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof), and

''(II) such individual's earned income (as defined in section 911(d)(2)) for the taxable year does not exceed one-half of such individual's support (within the meaning of section 152) for such taxable year.

''(ii) SPECIAL RULES FOR JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return—

''(I) the taxpayer and the taxpayer's spouse shall be treated as a single individual for purposes of applying subclause (II) of clause (i), and

''(II) the taxpayer shall be treated as an individual described in this subparagraph only if the taxpayer and the taxpayer's spouse are described in clause (i) (determined after application of subclause (I)).''.

(b) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—Section 55 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR LOWEST RATE.—In the case of an individual described in section 1(h)(12)(B), no amount shall be determined under subsection (b)(3)(B).''.

(c) COORDINATION WITH SUNSET OF PROVISIONS OF THE JOBS AND GROWTH TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1(h)(12), as added by this section, is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) no amount of qualified 5-year gain shall be taken into account under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) (as in effect after the application of section 303 of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

(2) SUNSET OF JGTRRA.—The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date specified in section 303 of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

SEC. 7208. SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN PENALTIES AND INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1)(A) and (3)(A) of section 6404(g) are each amended by striking ''18-month period'' and inserting ''22-month period''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to notices provided by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his delegate, after the date which is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7209. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Subparagraph (B) of section 401(1) of the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 is amended by striking ''106.25 percent'' and inserting ''112.75 percent''.

This Act may be cited as the ''U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health, and Iraq Accountability Act, 2007''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, why are we here? We are here because 4 years ago the President plunged us into a preemptive war in Iraq, a country that had not attacked the United States, and we took that action on the basis of bad information, manipulated intelligence, with no visible plans for governing after the war was over.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, that attack diverted us from the hunt for bin Laden, the person who did attack us.

The war has now gone on for 4 years and, as a result, we have seen chaos and carnage. We have seen over 3,000 American service men and women die, many times more wounded and maimed. We have seen our influence decimated throughout the Middle East. We have seen our reputation as the democratic hope of the world tarnished by stories about torture and rendition.

I voted against that war. There were 215 Republicans who voted for it and 6 that voted against it. There were 81 Democrats who voted for it and 126 Democrats who voted against it. We had 132 votes, in total, against going to war. And ever since that time, we have been trying to get to 218 votes so we can turn this country and this war around.

Over the last 4 years, this war has been fought with virtually no sense of shared sacrifice. Military families have done double and triple duty, while the rest of America has had to accept the sacrifice of a tax cut. That is about all that has been asked of most Americans.

We have spent a huge amount of our national treasure, and now the President is asking for another almost $100 billion for this war and asking for an additional $3.5 billion for his own domestic priorities.

This bill is our response. It says to the President: ''Okay, you can have that money, but only under certain terms and conditions.'' And we try to do three things: number one, to redirect a greater effort to the right war in Afghanistan, rather than the wrong war in Iraq. Secondly, we try to protect our troops to the maximum extent possible and correct the neglect that they have suffered as they have returned from the battlefield. And, thirdly, we are trying to send a message to Iraq politicians that they need to change direction; that we will no longer tolerate an open-ended, interminable babysitting job; that they must get together and begin to resolve their own differences.

This bill sets a timetable for repositioning our troops out of Iraq. The exact timetable will be determined by the performance of the Iraqis and whether or not they meet important political and military benchmarks.

And this bill establishes a target for finishing our redeployment in any circumstance. It recognizes that our troops won the war, but it also recognizes that the President's plan calls upon troops to do something that they do not have the power to do, namely, to convince Iraqi factions to reach reasonable compromises on their own turf.

It sets reasonable conditions for moving our troops into a different posture. It holds Iraqis accountable to standards that the President himself has laid out. And it puts us on a new direction with respect to the war in Iraq.

And it does some other things, too. It completes action on a number of leftover pieces of business that the previous Congress left to this new incoming Congress.

The President himself asked for $3.4 billion to deal with the needs of FEMA. We are also finishing action on the BRAC action which requires $3.1 billion in additional funding. We are finishing action on the need to improve family military housing to the tune of $3.4 billion. We are finishing action on rebuilding the lives and providing other assistance to the Katrina victims after the most devastating natural disaster in the history of our country.

We are finishing the action on the agriculture disaster problem that Congress wrestled with for well over a year in the previous Congress without coming to resolution. And we are providing the final $1 billion in funds to combat a potential pandemic flu, funds which the President himself requested in an emergency appropriation in the year 2005.

And we are also finishing action on the action begun last year by the Congress in trying to deal with the fact that 14 States are going to run out of child health money; and we need, therefore, to provide $750 million to see to it that low-income families and children in low-income families are not pushed off those State health care rolls. This is a request that has come in from Republican and Democratic Governors alike.

And we have also provided some additional funding, above what the President asked for, items which are not

last year's business, but which we think are important in terms of this year's business.

We are increasing funding for veterans health and defense health by $3.4 billion. We are, on the homeland security front, increasing funding substantially. The President, since days after 9/11, has been resisting virtually every congressional effort to add funding for homeland security, for border security, for cargo security and the like.

We are continuing the effort to provide significantly more money than the President has asked for. If anybody wants to argue with that, I would suggest they take it up with the 9/11 Commission. I would suggest they take it up with the Hart-Rudman Commission. I would suggest they take it up with the 9/11 families. Everybody but Anne Coulter, I think, would be responsive to what those families think.

And then we are also providing $1.2 billion in additional funding for our war in Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, I sat at CIA headquarters and watched, right after 9/11, as our predator aircraft were searching Afghanistan for bin Laden. And I know what the people at that agency were saying when they expressed their frustration that the President was diverting a huge share of our resources in the hunt for bin Laden to prepare for the unilateral attack on Iraq.

What this bill is trying to do is to correct that by, again, refocusing additional attention on the war against Afghanistan. And I make absolutely no apology for the funds that we have in here.

Now, some will say this is not a perfect instrument. They will differ with the time line that we have for the repositioning of troops, and they will differ with the benchmarks. But what I would say to them is that what is important in this document today is not the exact wording. What is important is not the exact timetable. What is important is not the exact enumeration of benchmarks. What is important is that, for the first time, this Congress will be exercising its constitutional responsibilities to provide real oversight on the executive branch of government, and we will be trying to set this country on a new direction.

Someone in this House said last week that we are similar in our position to a board of directors for a corporation. He said the President is the CEO. The President's Cabinet represents his management team, and we are the board of directors. And when a board of directors of a corporation sees that the management of the corporation is leading it down a disastrous path, it has a fiduciary responsibility to its stockholders to step in and correct the problem. That is what we are trying to do in this legislation. In this case, we have a fiduciary responsibility and a representational responsibility to the taxpayers and to our constituents, and we are trying to meet that responsibility today.

Now, there are some who have criticized us for doing so, some in newspapers and some on this floor. Very frankly, I am getting a bit tired of those who were consistently wrong from the beginning on the issue of Iraq, I am getting tired of them lecturing those of us who were consistently right from the beginning in our opposition to this war.

And when people ask me why we don't have a better solution, I tell them of the old story about Eddie Stanky, who used to play second base for the New York Giants many years ago. And one day, Leo Durocher, the manager, was hitting ground balls to the infield, and Stanky dropped two in a row. And so Durocher grabbed a glove and said, ''Here, kid, I'm going to show you how it's done.'' And he went out to second base, and the very first ball Durocher dropped. And he turned to Stanky, and said, ''Kid, you got second base so screwed up, nobody can play it.''

The fact is, if you substitute George Bush for Eddie Stanky and Iraq for second base, you have got the picture of what the problem is today.

Now, this Congress cannot run foreign policy, but it has an obligation to try to influence the policy and influence the conduct of that policy when we see it headed down the wrong path. Mr. MURTHA has tried to lead the way in seeing to it that we face up to those responsibilities, and this legislation will give us an opportunity to do that.

I would hope it would be supported on a bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I rise today to express my opposition to this emergency supplemental. My colleagues know that I have the highest level of respect for my chairman, Mr. OBEY. Together we worked as partners in the 109th Congress, passing appropriations bills through the committee and through the House. Indeed, the Appropriations Committee is at its best when each of us works together across party lines and rises above purely partisan politics.

During the last Congress I was privileged to serve as chairman of this great committee, and Mr. OBEY was our distinguished ranking member. Today, our roles are reversed, and Mr. OBEY is now our chairman.

There is no question that if my friend from Wisconsin were permitted to write this bill on his own, this would be a much better product. Instead, the House is being asked to consider a spending bill that reflects the priorities of Speaker PELOSI and a deeply divided Democratic Caucus. It attempts to bridge these widening divisions over the war in Iraq by delivering billions of dollars in unrelated and unauthorized spending under an emergency designation.

This legislation ought to focus on our troops. It ought to focus on providing those in harm's way with the resources they need to complete their mission successfully. It ought to respect, not micromanage, our combatant commanders in whom we place the ultimate responsibility of prosecuting military actions.

Instead, this legislation ties the hands of our Commander in Chief during a time of war, places military decisions in the hands of politicians, and attempts to buy votes for its passage on the left and on the right by literally promising something to everyone.

If the majority's goal is to end the war or withdraw our troops, then that should be addressed in a separate piece of legislation. The majority cannot have it both ways, pretending, on the one hand, to support our troops, while on the other undercutting their ability to prosecute their mission.

Men and women of good conscience can disagree about the war in Iraq. But on one thing we must all agree, our men and women in uniform must continue to receive our unqualified support and the resources they need to complete their mission successfully.

My colleagues, consider carefully the consequences of our actions here today. Passage of this measure in its present form will signal to insurgents and terrorists that the United States doesn't have the political will to continue supporting this fledgling Iraqi democracy.

□ 1645

Al Qaeda and other enemies of freedom will simply lay in wait until our troops are withdrawn. And with the collapse of this fragile democracy, our efforts, and the sacrifices of our troops, will have been for nothing.

The fight in Iraq is also critical to the future of Israel. A failure in Iraq will further destabilize the region, posing a direct threat to Israel. We must not let that occur to our friend and ally.

There should be no carrot big enough to force Members into choosing between their principled support for our troops in the field and funding for the many unrelated and parochial items sprinkled throughout this bill.

Republican Members in the House are simply not going to abandon our principles, and troops in the field, for the promise of pork back in our districts. To their credit, many Democrats also continue to express grave reservations about this approach and about this legislation.

Last year Congress sent the President a clean supplemental bill for our troops. This Congress, and our country, would be better served by producing a clean bill free of extraneous spending and unrelated legislative provisions.

There is no question that the President will veto this bill. In the meantime our troops will face the uncertainty resulting from the majority's mixed signals and lack of a clear commitment.

I am also deeply concerned that the Democrat leadership has brought this emergency supplemental to the House floor under a closed rule without opportunity for Members on both sides of the aisle to offer amendments.

During my tenure as chairman, the House considered six emergency supplemental appropriations bills. Of these six bills, the two largest bills, H.R. 1268, was $81.2 billion; the other was a $91.8 billion supplemental. Those two bills primarily focused on the global war on terror. In both instances I worked closely with my leadership and the Rules Committee in seeking rules that permitted open debate, including amendments, on the House floor. And in both instances, these supplemental bills were considered under an open rule. The remaining four bills were noncontroversial and bipartisan in nature and were considered by unanimous consent on the Suspension Calendar.

I assumed that Chairman OBEY would continue in the longstanding tradition and practice of the committee to advocate open rules on all appropriations bills. Members on both sides of the aisle benefit by a process that supports a fair, honest, open, and transparent debate on the House floor. I was disappointed that Mr. OBEY's first bill as chairman, the fiscal year 2007 continuing resolution, was considered under a closed rule, with only 1 hour of debate and no opportunity for amendments.

Consideration of this supplemental under a closed rule is unprecedented and leaves the minority little choice but to walk away from the tradition of comity that has marked our longstanding work on this committee.

By denying Members, both Democrats and Republicans, their right to offer amendments to this legislation, I can assure you that all bets are off on getting our committee work done this year. It simply will not happen. There will be no unanimous consent agreements on the fiscal year 2008 bills. I spoke personally with Mr. OBEY about this and asked him to carry that message directly to the Speaker.

This legislation is simply too important to have it rushed through the House with no debate and no opportunity for the body to consider amendments. Consideration of this legislation under a closed rule signals to the House, and to the public, that the Speaker has imposed martial law on the people's House.

Lastly, I would be remiss not to highlight my reservations about the budgetary aspects of this bill that proposes more than $22 billion in emergency spending items that are completely unrelated to the global war on terror or legitimate emergencies in the Gulf Coast region.

I ask my colleagues what does a $25 million bailout for spinach producers, $60 million for the salmon fishing industry, or $5 million for fish breeding have to do with the global war on terror?

This legislation also includes authorization language to increase the minimum wage. Again, I ask my friends why can't the committees of jurisdiction in the House and the Senate meet in open conference to resolve the differences between these bills? What place has this provision in a wartime supplemental?

In short, much of what is included in this bill is completely unrelated to the global war on terror and has no place in the bill. Sadly, many items are being designated as emergencies for no other reason than to make more room for additional spending on the part of the Democrats under the fiscal 2008 caps.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider thoughtfully the precedent set by this legislation. Weigh in your conscience the effects of undermining the authority of the President, and future Presidents, and putting at further risk our men and women in uniform.

Our Congress, and our country, would be better served by sending the President a clean supplemental free of extraneous spending and unrelated legislative provisions.

While I respect Chairman OBEY, I cannot support this legislation as it is presently written. I strongly urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me explain what is in this bill for the Members.

We have $4 billion over the amount requested by the President. The President requested a total of $12.1 billion for military personnel pay and benefits. The committee recommends increasing the funds for those programs by $1.4 billion. The committee adds $1.4 billion to cover the full cost of housing allowance for military members in fiscal year 2007; $2.3 billion to cover the full cost of fielding an additional 36,000 Army troops.

If everybody here remembers, we added 30,000 troops in the supplemental, which the White House did not ask for, argued about, and which the Defense Department did not want. And yet now we are short of troops, and they are trying to blame the Congress for being short of troops.

We also added money for 9,000 additional marines. The committee recommends $52.5 billion for military operations, $2.2 billion over the President's request.

In addition to fully funding the request for military operations, the committee proposes an additional $2.5 billion to address training and equipping shortfalls in forces not deployed. We will set up a Reserve Readiness fund.

The committee recommends adding funds for the war in Afghanistan, $1 billion. That is where the original war started, and that is what you vote against if you vote against this bill.

$5.9 billion for the Afghanistan Security Forces fund, $3.8 billion for the Iraq Security Forces fund, and a total of $2.4 billion is recommended for the joint IED task force.

The recommendations propose an increase of $17 million for DOD's Family Advocacy program. In other words, all of us hear, when we go talk with the families, the problems that they have. We add $17 million for that particular fund.

We have three significant reductions. We reduce some of the buys of hardware which we think ought to be in the base bill.

The committee bill recommends a total of $24.8 billion for equipment purchases, a slight decrease to the President's request of $86 million. The committees proposed an allocation of $1.4 billion to purchase what they call MRAP vehicles, that is, the vehicles with the V shape, which we need so badly. And that is what you are voting against if you vote against this bill: $311 million above the request of the White House.

For Army procurement accounts the committee approves a total of $15 billion: $994 million for tactical radios, $2.2 billion for tactical trucks, $867 million for up-armored Humvees, $636 million for Bradley fighting vehicle upgrades. And that is what you are voting against if you vote against this bill.

The committee bill includes $192 million not requested for three additional F/A–18s. We take care of the SEABEEs, something they have talked about that have been decimated by this war, and we put equipment in for the SEABEEs.

The committee is recommending reductions to several high-profile programs requested by the President. We deny funding for two Joint Strike Fighter airplanes because they ought to be in the base bill, and we will talk about that depending on what they authorize.

The President requested a total of $1.4 billion for research and development. The committee recommends a total of $1 billion.

Working capital funds: the committee bill provides a total of $1.3 billion for working capital.

Now let me talk about defense health programs. We just saw what we went through with Walter Reed. BILL YOUNG, who was chairman of the committee, and I went out to Walter Reed all the time. I had no idea, as most Members didn't, about what was going on at Walter Reed. And it really gets to me that every time we went out there, we asked them if you needed any help and they always told us everything is all right. We put more money in any way because we knew there would be some problems come about because of the fact that they were under BRAC. The committee decided unanimously to eliminate the closing of Walter Reed, especially during the time of war. We put $1.7 billion above the budget request.

The additional funding is for $450 million for post-traumatic stress. And that is not near enough, folks. That is not near enough. We figure there are going to be 65,000 military people who come back that are going to have post-traumatic stress. And that is what you are voting against if you vote against this bill.

We put $450 million in for traumatic brain injury care and research; $730 million to cover the funding shortfall created by Congress' having disapproved the Department's proposal to increase the health insurance premiums. And I am for that, but we didn't fund it. But we fund it in this bill, and that is what you vote against if you vote against this bill.

We put $62 million in for amputee care. Let me tell you something about amputee care. I went out to the amputee center in Brooks. Private industry put up a place in 18 months; $58 million they raised to put an amputee center up. We have been working on an amputee center at Walter Reed. It took us 3 years and it is still not built. JERRY LEWIS, BILL YOUNG, and myself, and it is still not done yet.

We are putting in $12 million for caregivers. The nurses called. They said, We have got a real problem here. We see these wounded. We see the people coming home all the time. It affects us mentally. It affects us emotionally. It affects us psychologically. We need help. So we put $12 million in; $6 million for Landstuhl, where they get the worst casualties; $2 million for Walter Reed; $2 million for Brooks; and $2 million for the hospital in California.

We put in $14.8 million for burn care. I want to tell you something, Members. You can go to all the hospitals. When you go to the burn care centers, you see the results of this war. We go to the hospitals. All of us go to the hospitals quite often. And let me tell you the burn centers are the worst when you go.

Now, we also took out 5 percent on contracting. Now, why did we do that? We did that because contractors are falling all over themselves and we asked the GAO and we asked the Inspector General of Iraq, How many contractors do you have? They couldn't tell us. They said, Help us find out how many contractors we have.

So we asked the Under Secretary of Defense. He couldn't tell us. He said, I will let you know in a week.

He still hasn't told us. So we took 5 percent out. They will tell us now how many contractors they have.

And we fenced 10 percent. So that is $800 million for the 5 percent and then $1.6 billion for the contractors to come out. So that is $2.1 billion we have taken out for the contractors.

We put in for CERP, which is a program in which there is $456 million provided under operations and maintenance for the commanders.

No permanent bases we said over and over again. We put in no torture, which has caused us so much problem when they didn't have the people trained when they were in Abu Ghraib.

Contracting oversight. We have a death gratuity amendment. Military attorneys, we put some money in for military attorneys.

Meeting readiness guidelines: let me tell you what we do to meet readiness guidelines. When you talk to these families, they need a year at home before they are redeployed. Is there anybody that thinks we should send these folks back before they have a year at home? Is there anybody that thinks we should extend them when they have 13 months in country? Is there anybody who thinks we should send troops into combat who aren't trained and ready? Is there anybody here?

□ 1700

We put benchmarks in for the Iraqi Government, as the chairman of the committee explained, because we need to give them the incentive. We need them to have some benchmarks so they understand that they have to get this done.

Every time something happens, and this is a problem we have, every time something happens, we step in. They started out, they said, with 80 percent of the people in the Iraqi units deployed in Iraq. Now it is 50 percent. Where are they? They are on leave. They deserted. They are not there. So who makes up the difference? Our troops are the ones making up the difference. We have to force the Iraqis to make up the difference.

Why are we even thinking about forcing the military to break their own guidelines because of this surge? Because of the fact they can't sustain the deployment. So the administration has decided, we are going to have to send people back with less than a year at home.

We are going to send people back that aren't trained and ready? That is unacceptable. That is unacceptable to every single Member of Congress. We have an obligation to the taxpayer under the Constitution to take care of defense.

We have an obligation to have oversight and auditing and accountability. We have had 14 hearings so far. We will have at least 40 more hearings before we have the base bill. I am going to put you on notice right now, the supplemental, the 2008 supplemental, is not going to come up with the base bill. The 2008 supplemental is going to be held, because we are going to see if there is going to be progress in this country before we bring up the 2008 supplemental. We are going to see if what they say is true. We are going to find out if this administration is giving us the facts.

We have said to them under the Moran amendment, you have to tell us how much oil production there is. Oil production is below prewar level. Electricity production is below prewar level. Unemployment is 60 percent.

Incidents have doubled since I spoke out here a year-and-a-half ago. Doubled. There are now 1,200 a week. And when I say ''incidents,'' I am talking about 140,000 troops deployed to Iraq, individually. I heard Elizabeth Edwards the other day talk about breast cancer, before she knew it had come back, and she said to me, there is 40,000 people that have breast cancer every year, but it is one at a time.

What we are talking about are troops, 140,000 troops, one at a time; 140,000 troops with families; 140,000 troops that have wives and husbands and mothers and fathers that have to suffer during these deployments.

When you go to the hospital, you see figures. Don't think when you say you see 2,500 people who have been killed, 3,000 have been killed or 25,000 have been wounded. It is individuals that have been wounded, individuals that have been killed, and those families are suffering.

We have to put some benchmarks so the Iraqis, they have civil war, we have to put benchmarks in this bill so the Iraqis start to do it themselves, and the Americans aren't forced to make up the difference, but they do it themselves.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), our leader on the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding time.

The supplemental before us today is a case study of what happens when one branch of the government tries to do the job assigned to another. It is hard to say what this will be known for, unconstitutional legislation that would allow Congress to micromanage a war, or a crude political compromise designed to win votes.

One thing though is perfectly clear: The bill is a sham. Don't be fooled by the rhetoric you will hear today. The managers on the other side of the aisle will try to convince you that we are addressing pressing needs, providing critical resources for our troops in the field and other so-called disasters here at home. But make no mistake, the bill will only hamstring our troops, provide fodder for our enemies abroad, cause a disastrous and precipitous cut and run, and indescribable damage to America's reputation in the vital Mideast and worldwide.

It also breaks the bank here at home by providing funds for pork-laden Democrat wish-lists. What does dollars for a spinach producer have to do with providing help for our troops in Iraq? What does money to a salmon farmer have to do with providing support for our troops in Iraq? What about aquaculture money? What has that got to do with troops in Iraq?

And for those Members who have surrendered their better judgment for pork for their districts, the majority adds $2.5 billion in so-called emergency

homeland security items to sweeten the pot.

Don't get me wrong, many of the majority's homeland security adds are worthy and important items, such as nuclear and explosive detection systems and additional aircraft for the northern border, things I have supported in the past and continue to support, but they are in no way a 2007 emergency. They can be handled regularly in the 2008 bills. In every instance these bills could and should be addressed through the 2008 process.

By including them as 2007 emergencies, the majority is simply trying to look strong on security and buy down requirements to free up funds in fiscal 2008 for additional spending. While I support homeland security spending, I support it in a fiscally responsible way.

Let me turn to the real issue under debate today now. To the defense provisions that will cause the precipitous withdrawal of our forces from Iraq and take from a President his constitutional powers of Commander in Chief, there is a very good reason why our Founding Fathers gave the executive branch the responsibility to conduct war.

The House of Representatives is made up of 435 individuals; lawyers, doctors, teachers, farmers, some with military experience, some without. It is not made up of 435 military commanders who possess the ability to manage a war. We have military professionals to do that. Why are we attempting to insert our military judgment, which can cause the death or injury of our troops, when we are neither trained nor skilled to do so? Leave the management of the war to the trained professionals who know what they are doing.

If your aim is to end the war, and it is, this is the absolute wrong way to do it. The right way, bring forth a resolution or a bill to reverse the original authorization for the war. But as long as you have authorized the war, please don't tie the hands of our great soldiers and their commanders behind their backs in carrying out your authorization, still on the books, to fight this war against terror.

Mr. Speaker, this committee has lost its way on this one. It is a shameful turn of events. Handcuffing the authorities of the President, undermining our troops in harm's way and exploiting worthy government programs for political gain is beyond the pale. Our troops and our Nation deserve better. They deserve our undying support.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today in support of this bill, probably the most difficult decision I have made in my 33 year political career. But I do it because I want this war to end. I did not support this war. I did not vote for it. I still believe that we were lied to, that we were given at the minimum bad information, but I believe we were lied to, the link to al Qaeda, the weapons of mass destruction. We have been over that, but it can't be forgotten. We were not told the truth.

But here we are now, and most of us want the war to end now. What does ''now'' mean? There is no real now. Even if there was a vote ''called out now,'' it would mean for 6, 7, 9, 10 months the military would, in a properly and orderly way, get the troops out. But there would be no end date, so ''now'' could be extended.

This bill, however, does speak to ''now,'' because it sets a timetable so that ''now'' becomes the desire to end the war and ''now'' becomes the mechanism in process to end the war.

In the next few minutes, the e-mails will start to come in from some friends on my left, who think they are on my left, who tell me that I sold out. Well, you know something? Not to end the war is to sell out. To get dramatic and emotional about something without the reality of ending the war might be to sell out.

I will take this vote tomorrow fully understanding that my vote was a vote to end the war; fully understanding that I didn't pull the rug from under the troops, but I told them that I didn't want them there any longer; fully understanding that when there was a vote that spoke about immediate withdrawal, we all remember how the Republicans took Mr. MURTHA's desire to end the war and turned it into a resolution that said get out immediately. Interestingly enough, a lot of people who want to end the war now didn't vote for that. I was one of only three that voted to get out immediately.

So I have been there, and I have done that. This is the best vehicle for ending the war. That is why I support it. That is why we have to vote for it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), a member of our committee.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there are legitimate and important emergency funding needs for the troops and our Federal civilian corps on the ground in Iraq and elsewhere. The President requested $93.4 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations to continue the fight against terrorism, and that is what we should be doing.

Unfortunately, this bill offers, I think, a way of not doing that in an appropriate way. It is bloated with $124.3 billion in spending, $21 billion over what was requested. It is true we have provided funding for emergency supplementals before, but it would be hard pressed to convince the American people that $25 million for spinach producers, which may be important to do, but in the regular order; $74 million for peanut storage may be appropriate, but in regular order. It should not be done here. At the same time it does that, it restricts the civilian spending for the provincial reconstruction teams, which helps us do some of the civilian things that we should be doing in Iraq.

The larger issue, however, is this legislation before us has become a vehicle, unfortunately, for polarization on the fight to stabilize Iraq. I have been there three times. I believe tying the hands of our military commanders to adapt to the changing circumstances can only hurt our mission and our troops.

I don't believe it is a good policy to criticize the administration's strategy as failing, while at the same time cutting the very funding necessary for the administration and the troops to succeed, and then putting conditions on releasing the funding provided. They just don't all fit together.

We have to look no further than the report of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group to find ''the way forward, a new approach for Iraq.'' Just last months when we debated the Iraq war resolution, 106 Members from both sides of the aisle mentioned the importance of the Iraq Study Group and how they supported it.

Last night Mr. SHAYS asked the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment that I was cosponsoring to do exactly that, and it was turned down, and just at the very time the diplomatic engagement that most of us wanted to see take place begins to take place. The meeting 2 weeks ago had us engaging with the Syrians and the Iranians. We accepted Mr. MORAN's amendment in the full committee, which was good, to really put the Congress on record in support of that diplomatic effort. But Mr. SHAYS was turned down again, as I was turned down several weeks ago.

The Iraq Study Group's Cochairmen Baker and Hamilton said in the group report, ''The U.S. foreign policy is doomed to failure, as is any course in action in Iraq, if not supported by a broad, sustained consensus.''

This bill is not a broad, sustained consensus. The recommendation of the Iraq Study Group could have brought us, and still may very well bring us, to a consensus that unites the Congress and the nation on Iraq. That is the policy both the Congress and the administration should embrace. This bill does not do it, and I urge a ''no'' vote on it.

There are some legitimate and important emergency funding needs for our troops and our Federal civilian corps on the ground in Iraq and elsewhere. The President requested some $93.4 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations to continue the fight against terrorism. That's what this bill should be addressing.

Unfortunately, this bill fails to offer a reasonable way forward in supporting our troops, and I cannot vote for it.

This is a bloated $124.3 billion spending bill—over $21 billion than what was requested.

It's true we've provided funding for emergencies in other supplementals, for example hurricane relief and planning for a flu pandemic. But I think we would be hard pressed to convince the people we represent that $25 million for spinach producers or $74 million for peanut storage costs qualify as emergency spending needed today. The debate on that kind of spending should be part of the fiscal year 2008 appropriations process where it belongs.

The larger issue, however, is that this legislation before us has become the vehicle for polarization on the fight to stabilize Iraq. It does not offer an alternative. Instead, it would ultimately mandate a retreat.

I have been to Iraq three times, and my concern for our troops has never been stronger. If I thought that this bill was in their best interests, I would support it.

Tying the hands of our military commanders to adapt to changing circumstances can only hurt our mission and our troops.

Within the State-Foreign Operations portion, it cuts funding necessary to support projects such as the Provincial Reconstruction Teams. PRTs are joint civilian-military teams living in the provinces among the Iraqi people. They work side-by-side with the Iraqis to identify development and governance programs and offer our best bet for improving stability and governance.

Cutting funding for these teams is cutting them off at their knees before they get a chance to stand up. These funds are essential for improving safety and stability—the very safety and stability which will enable our troops to withdraw more quickly.

I just don't believe it is good policy to criticize the administration's strategy as failing while at the same time cutting the very funding necessary for it to succeed and then putting conditions on releasing funds provided.

We have to look no further than the report of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group to find "the way forward—a new approach" for Iraq. They worked for more than 8 months, supported by expert working groups and senior military advisers in the areas of economy and reconstruction, military and security, political development, and strategic environment.

The study group's report released last December 6 was hailed as an important opportunity to chart a new course for Iraq. That is what we should be considering today.

Just last month when we debated the Iraq war resolution, 106 Members from both sides of the aisle mentioned the importance of the Iraq Study Group's recommendations as the way forward in Iraq.

Last night, Mr. SHAYS asked the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment, offered in partnership with me, to support the findings of the Iraq Study Group. By doing so, we believed the House would be working to meet our responsibility as political leaders to build bipartisan consensus on the issues of war and peace.

But his request was turned down. That was the second time in a month that the Rules Committee has not allowed an amendment on the Iraq Study Group's report. Instead, we have before us a political statement that pulls us farther apart.

The ramifications of this polarization reach far beyond Washington; all the way to Baghdad and the Iraqi provinces. I want to read from the letter Secretary Baker and Congressman Hamilton wrote as the prelude to the Iraq Study Group's recommendations:

> Many Americans are dissatisfied, not just with the situation in Iraq but with the state of our political debate regarding Iraq. Our political leaders must build a bipartisan approach to bring a responsible conclusion to what is now a lengthy and costly war. Our country deserves a debate that prizes substance over rhetoric, and a policy that is adequately funded and sustainable. The President and Congress must work together. Our leaders must be candid and forthright with the American people in order to win their support.

And it goes on to say:

> . . . U.S. foreign policy is doomed to failure—as is any course of action in Iraq—if it is not supported by a broad, sustained consensus. The aim of our report is to move our country toward such a consensus.

The bill before us does not move the country toward a consensus. The country must come back together. We must be united. That is the only way we will be successful.

The recommendations of this distinguished group could have brought us to consensus and united the Congress and the Nation on Iraq. That is the policy both the Congress and the President should embrace.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

□ 1715

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank the chairman and thank the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee who has put this together.

My colleagues, a short while ago when President Bush was asked how long will this war last, he said: "We will be in Iraq as long as the Iraqi people want us there."

Well, this bill says that we will be in Iraq as long as the American people want us there. And the American people realize this is a war that is not worthy of the sacrifice of those men and women in uniform who are bearing the whole cost of this war.

This bill is about that young son who was told by his daddy one day that he has to leave him to go off and fight for our country. And day after day he asks his mommy: When is daddy coming back? And finally one day his mommy, with tear-filled eyes, has to say: Daddy is not coming back.

Well, we have to ask ourselves: Is this war worthy of that sacrifice? This bill says it is not because there has never been a strategy for success. This bill will bring our troops home as soon and as safely as possible.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. LEWIS, for his hard work in providing this response, this very, I think, respectful response.

I would submit to you that any sacrifice any American has made in Iraq is a worthy, worthy sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Thus far in the 110th Congress, the House has considered two pieces of appropriations legislation. Thus far, we have twice done so under rules that stifle debate and amendment.

First, we operated under a closed rule on the 2007 continuing resolution, limited debate, no amendments, a bill that spend hundreds of billions of dollars. Now we are doing the same thing with a war supplemental. Let me be clear about what is happening here tonight.

The majority does not want a vote to remove the egregious and unconstitutional provisions restricting the Commander in Chief's authority over our Armed Forces. They do not want to allow us the opportunity to strike the unprecedented deadline for withdrawing our troops. Never before has a Congress in our history written into law a date for the withdrawal of American troops in a war.

They won't allow us that opportunity because Republicans and Democrats would vote bipartisanly to strike that deadline. They have proposed a rule that will prohibit Members from offering amendments that could modify the bill in such a way that the President could sign it.

Let's be clear: by proposing a closed rule, the Democratic leadership signals it wants this bill vetoed. In short, the majority would rather play politics than find a solution to the problem. And who will lose this game of political chicken? The troops who stand in harm's way as we talk; the troops, who are relying on this Congress to provide the necessary funds before the end of May so they can complete their mission successfully and as safely as possible.

This bill should be rejected out of hand and the majority should immediately bring back a clean supplemental so we can ensure that our troops will have the resources they need. Let's stop the posturing and pass a clean bill. That's the bottom line.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my support for the supplemental, not because I agree with everything that is in it, but because I agree with one thing that is in it, and that is a binding deadline to end the war in Iraq and redeploy our troops to where they are truly needed, and that is to fight the real war on terror where the terrorists started to bomb our country and planned to bomb us on 9/11 and that is in the mountains of Afghanistan.

Why are we fighting a civil war in Iraq? Why are we fighting a civil war in Iraq when it is in Afghanistan where the war should be fought? Why are our Republican friends talking about protecting our national security in Iraq when in fact it is al Qaeda in Afghanistan that is posing the greatest threat to our national security?

It is this supplemental that talks about fighting the real national security threat to our Nation, and that is

why I support this important supplemental, because it truly supports our troops and it supports our veterans as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my support for this supplemental, not because I agree with everything in it, but because I agree with the most important thing in it: a binding deadline to end the war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we need to redeploy our troops from Iraq first and foremost because it is in our national security interest.

As someone who voted for the original resolution, I am particularly pained by the hardships and suffering our troops and their families endure. I want them to come home.

But I also know that the men and women in uniform, and the families behind them, are willing to make the sacrifices they do if that is what it takes to make America more secure.

The truth is policing a civil war in Iraq does not bring us closer to defeating the global network of extremists who wish to harm us.

But redeployment from Iraq will enhance our security by allowing us to properly address other challenges around the world, most importantly the fight in Afghanistan and Pakistan against a resurgent al Qaeda and Taliban, the enemies who actually did engineer 9/11.

The moral authority we've lost in the eyes of the world compromises our ability to lead multinational efforts against national security threats ranging from terrorism and nuclear proliferation to global warming and drug trafficking.

The sooner we begin redeployment, the sooner we begin unraveling the tremendous damage that this war and its mismanagement have wrought on our national security.

We need to restore America's leadership. We need to strengthen America's security. We need to pass this supplemental and begin the redeployment from Iraq.

I believe in a strong U.S. engagement around the world, including using military force when necessary. I also believe, as did Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, and Reagan, that America's greatest strength comes from its values and its ability to lead.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of the committee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member profusely for granting me this time.

It is with regret that I rise today in opposition to the defense supplemental bill. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I wanted to be able to support a bill that would provide our soldiers with the funding they need to carry out their mission in Iraq. But I must oppose it because it presupposes our defeat in Iraq by tying the hands of the military leaders.

Further, it adds nonemergency spending, lots of spending, and sets new precedents. And of particular concern to me, fails to fix some major problems that were created in the continuing resolution with respect to rental assistance for our neediest families.

The continuing resolution changed the formula for distributing $16 billion in rental assistance under the section 8 program. The result is less funding, more uncertainty, a ''use it or lose it'' mentality, and a loss of any incentive to plan over the long run. It rewards excessive spending and punishes cost-effectiveness and will set public housing authorities against one another by creating new winners and losers every year.

The impacts on the program are staggering. Over 1,220 PHAs in 30 States will lose $460 million permanently. That means forever. I have here a list that I include for the RECORD of all the PHAs that are going to lose funds and how much they are going to lose. It also includes the name of the Member of this body who represents each of those PHAs.

So the supplemental bill before us today tries to fix some of the problems in the CR, but it fails to do that, and it distracts from the true purpose of this bill which is to support our troops in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to admit that mistakes have been made in the execution of the war. No one is disputing that. Even Secretary of State Rice has admitted there are mistakes. But there is no sense in looking backward. Not now. We should give the administration's new policy a chance to work before presupposing its failure and our ultimate defeat in Iraq.

Let me be clear: I want our troops to come home as soon as possible, but I want them to return in victory, not defeat. It is time for the Iraqis to assume responsibility for the security of their nation. I am hopeful that the administration's new policy will bring to an end the sectarian violence in Baghdad and provide an opening for the Iraqi Government to step up to the plate.

It was a bipartisan vote of Congress that authorized this war 4 years ago. It is going to take bipartisan cooperation to bring about its successful conclusion. This bill, unfortunately, is anything but bipartisan. It is nothing more than a crafty way for the Democrat majority to set a hard-and-fast deadline for troop withdrawals before we have even given the new Iraq strategy a chance to succeed.

Let's give our troops a chance to stabilize Iraq and come home in victory. Let's pass a clean supplemental which gives the troops the resources they need to protect themselves. I strongly urge a ''no'' vote.

Member	Housing Authority	Net Loss
Ackerman, Gary	HA OF NORTH HEMPSTEAD	-$104,235
Aderholt, Robert	HA BOAZ	-$90,740
Aderholt, Robert	HA CULLMAN	-$7,882
Aderholt, Robert	HA HAMILTON	-$11,179
Akin, Todd	ST CHARLES HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,397
Alexander, Rodney	ALEXANDRIA HSG AUTHORITY	-$534,731
Alexander, Rodney	CALDWELL PARISH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$8,561
Alexander, Rodney	CONCORDIA PARISH POLICE JURY	-$11,336
Alexander, Rodney	DELHI HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$14,894
Alexander, Rodney	EAST CARROLL PH. POLICE JURY,SEC.8	-$4,302
Alexander, Rodney	FRANKLIN PARISH POLICE JURY	-$5,524
Alexander, Rodney	IBERVILLE PARISH COUNCIL	-$7,219
Alexander, Rodney	JACKSON PARISH POLICE JURY	-$8,961
Alexander, Rodney	LINCOLN PARISH POLICE JURY	-$29,327
Alexander, Rodney	NEW ROADS (TOWN OF)	-$10,693
Alexander, Rodney	OBERLIN (TOWN OF)	-$39,514
Alexander, Rodney	RUSTON (CITY) SEC.8 HSG.AGENCY	-$105,526
Alexander, Rodney	TALLULAH (CITY OF) PHA	-$10,059
Alexander, Rodney	UNION PARISH POLICE JURY	-$9,225
Alexander, Rodney	WEST CARROLL PH. POLICE JURY HSG ASSIST.OFFICE	-$660
Alexander, Rodney	WEST MONROE HSG AUTH	-$304,933
Alexander, Rodney	WINN PARISH POLICE JURY	-$53,837
Allen, Thomas	AUGUSTA HSG AUTHORITY	-$344,312
Allen, Thomas	WESTBROOK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$6,015
Altmire, Jason	HOUSING AUTH CO OF LAWRENCE	-$98,809
Andrew, Robert	CAMDEN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$701,623
Andrews, Robert	CLEMENTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$20,151
Andrews, Robert	GLASSBORO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$22,788
Andrews, Robert	GLOUCESTER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$208,716
Arcuri, Michael	DOLGEVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$384
Arcuri, Michael	HA OF CORTLAND	-$121,945
Arcuri, Michael	HA OF GENEVA	-$82,862
Arcuri, Michael	HA OF ILION VILLAGE	-$20,095
Arcuri, Michael	HA OF ROME	-$79,933
Arcuri, Michael	TOWN OF CAMDEN	-$283
Arcuri, Michael	TOWN OF FORESTPORT	-$28,674
Arcuri, Michael	TOWN OF NEW HARTFORD	-$24,212
Arcuri, Michael	TOWN OF VERNON	-$12,119
Arcuri, Michael	TOWN OF WHITESTOWN	-$3,313
Arcuri, Michael	VILLAGE OF CLINTON	-$5,038
Arcuri, Michael	VILLAGE OF NEW HARTFORD	-$29,473

Member	Housing Authority	Net Loss
Arcuri, Michael	VILLAGE OF WATERVILLE	-$8,711
Bachmann, Michele	STEARNS COUNTY HRA	-$37,325
Bachus, Spencer	HA COLUMBIANA	-$11,887
Bachus, Spencer	HA LEEDS	-$120
Bachus, Spencer	HA WALKER COUNTY	-$53,177
Baird, Brian	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF KALAMA	-$19,519
Baird, Brian	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THURSTON COUNTY	-$219,444
Baird, Brian	KELSO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$22,566
Baker, Richard	BATON ROUGE (CITY OF) COMMUNITY	-$287,588
Baker, Richard	PORT ALLEN (CITY OF)	-$49,541
Baker, Richard	WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH COUNCIL, SEC.8	-$36,866
Baldwin, Tammy	MADISON CDA	-$418,911
Baldwin, Tammy	MIDDLETON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$27,747
Barrett, Gresham	HA AIKEN	-$369,645
Barrett, Gresham	HA ANDERSON	-$45,323
Barrett, Gresham	HA SOUTH CAROLINA REG NO 1	-$15,249
Barrow, John	HA SAVANNAH	-$4,132,472
Bartlett, Roscoe	CITY OF WESTMINSTER	-$57,438
Bartlett, Roscoe	HAGERSTOWN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$334,558
Bartlett, Roscoe	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF FREDERICK	-$394,422
Barton, Joe	ARLINGTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,007,236
Barton, Joe	CORSICANA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$315,663
Bean, Melissa	MCHENRY COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$63,280
Becerra, Xavier	CITY OF LOS ANGELES HSG AUTH	-$22,635,747
Berkley, Shelley	CITY OF LAS VEGAS HSG AUTH	-$4,163,561
Berkley, Shelley	NORTH LAS VEGAS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,369,839
Berry, Marion	PHILLIPS COUNTY PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$41,404
Berry, Marion	BLYTHEVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$78,404
Berry, Marion	BRINKLEY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$114,558
Berry, Marion	CABOT PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$12,781
Berry, Marion	EARLE SECTION 8 HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$23,754
Berry, Marion	LEE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$67,981
Berry, Marion	MALVERN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$60,653
Berry, Marion	MISSISSIPPI COUNTY PUBLIC FACILITIES	-$159,488
Berry, Marion	POCAHONTAS PUBLIC HSG AGENCY	-$1,614
Berry, Marion	WHITE RIVER REGIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$108,838
Berry, Marion	WYNNE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$33,837
Bilbray, Brian	CITY OF CARLSBAD HOUSING &	-$313,608
Bilbray, Brian	CITY OF ENCINITAS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$21,246
Bilirakis, Gus	CLEARWATER H/A	-$598,945
Bishop, Rob	HA OF CITY OF OGDEN	-$388,204

Bishop, Rob	DAVIS COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$833,838
Bishop, Rob	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF SALT LAKE CITY	-$435,570
Bishop, Rob	LOGAN CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$52,603
Bishop, Rob	WEBER COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$33,825
Bishop, Sanford	ALBANY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$6,154
Bishop, Sanford	HA COLUMBUS GA GEN FUND ACCT CONSL	-$605,724
Bishop, Timothy	NORTH FORK HSG ALLIANCE INC	-$522,590
Bishop, Timothy	TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON	-$299,066
Bishop, Timothy	TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON	-$628,019
Bishop, Timothy	VILLAGE OF PATCHOGUE CDA	-$45,738
Blunt, Roy	DALLAS COUNTY PHA	-$78,072
Blunt, Roy	JASPER COUNTY PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$11,596
Blunt, Roy	JOPLIN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$98,510
Boehner, John	BUTLER MET.HA	-$61,791
Boehner, John	MIDDLETOWN PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$1,321,001
Boehner, John	PREBLE METROPOLITAN HOUSING AUTH	-$13,937
Bonner, Jo	HA FOLEY	-$105,942
Bonner, Jo	HA MONROEVILLE	-$15,918
Bonner, Jo	HA PRICHARD	-$2,098,731
Bonner, Jo	MOBILE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$57,785
Bonner, Jo	MOBILE HOUSING BOARD	-$1,757,175
Boozman, John	CRAWFORD COUNTY PUBLIC FACILITIES BOARD NO 1	-$159,327
Boozman, John	FORT SMITH	-$271,371
Boozman, John	HARRISON HOUSING AGENCY	-$37,467
Boozman, John	HSG AUTH OF THE CITY OF SILOAM SPRINGS	-$226,495
Boozman, John	RUSSELLVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$41,799
Bordallo, Madeleine	GUAM HSG AND URBAN RENEWAL AUTH	-$3,753,269
Boren, Dan	BROKEN BOW HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$99,154
Boren, Dan	COALGATE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$6,344
Boren, Dan	HENRYETTA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$16,725
Boren, Dan	HUGO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$59,576
Boren, Dan	MC ALESTER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$20,354
Boswell, Leonard	ALBIA LOW RENT HOUSING AGENCY	-$19,914
Boswell, Leonard	CENTRAL IOWA REGIONAL HOUSING AUTH	-$37,875
Boswell, Leonard	CITY OF DES MOINES MUNICIPAL HOUSING AGENCY	-$488,619
Boswell, Leonard	MUNICIPAL HOUSING AGENCY	-$10,902
Boswell, Leonard	OSKALOOSA MUNICIPAL PHA	-$9,997
Boucher, Rick	BRISTOL REDEVELOPMENT HA	-$966
Boucher, Rick	NORTON REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$24,275
Boucher, Rick	PEOPLE INCORPORATED OF SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA	-$41,043
Boucher, Rick	SCOTT COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$84,949
Boucher, Rick	WISE COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$143,566
Boustany, Charles	CALCASIEU PARISH POLICE JURY	-$504,547
Boustany, Charles	EVANGELINE PH. POLICE JURY, SEC.8	-$47,858
Boustany, Charles	RAYNE (CITY OF) SEC.8 HOUSING AGENCY	-$4,366
Boustany, Charles	WASHINGTON PARISH HSG AUTHORITY, SEC.8	-$10,071
Boyd, Allen	HA MARIANNA	-$13,733
Boyd, Allen	HA TALLAHASSEE	-$141,930
Boyda, Nancy	ATCHISON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,000
Boyda, Nancy	CHANUTE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$10,298
Boyda, Nancy	ECKAN	-$159,969
Boyda, Nancy	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF	-$53,013
Boyda, Nancy	RILEY COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$164,437
Boyda, Nancy	SEK-CAP, INC	-$75,263
Boyda, Nancy	TOPEKA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$154,405
Brady, Kevin	DEEP EAST TX COUNCIL OF GOVTS	-$141,149
Brady, Kevin	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF LIVINGSTON	-$7,105
Brady, Kevin	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF ORANGE	-$313,658
Brady, Kevin	WALKER COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,794
Brady, Robert	CHESTER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$618,126
Braley, Bruce	BETTENDORF HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$62,401
Braley, Bruce	CITY OF CEDAR FALLS, IOWA	-$254,090
Braley, Bruce	CITY OF DAVENPORT, IOWA	-$8,101
Braley, Bruce	DUBUQUE DEPT OF HUMAN RIGHTS	-$360,672
Braley, Bruce	EVANSDALE MUNICIPAL HOUSING AUTH	-$59,914
Braley, Bruce	WATERLOO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$163,938
Brown, Corrine	HA ALACHUA COUNTY	-$121,596
Brown, Corrine	HA PALATKA	-$89,426
Brown, Corrine	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF JACKSONVILLE	-$2,299,671
Brown, Henry	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF MYRTLE BEACH	-$112,344
Brown-Waite, Ginny	HA LEVY COUNTY	-$21,970
Brown-Waite, Ginny	PASCO COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,034,666
Brown-Waite, Ginny	SUMTER COUNTY HOUSING SERVICES	-$51,620
Buchanan, Vern	HA MANATEE COUNTY	-$213,464
Buchanan, Vern	HA SARASOTA	-$121,196
Burgess, Michael	GAINESVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$126,032
Burgess, Michael	TARRANT COUNTY HOUSING ASSISTANCE	-$751,114
Butterfield, G.K.	CHOANOKE AREA DEV ASSN	-$57,338
Butterfield, G.K.	HA GOLDSBORO	-$16,948
Butterfield, G.K.	HA ROANOKE CHOWAN REG HSG AUTHORITY	-$69,930
Butterfield, G.K.	HA ROCKY MOUNT	-$7,747
Butterfield, G.K.	HA WASHINGTON	-$186,970

Butterfield, G.K.	HA WILLIAMSTON	-$23,099
Butterfield, G.K.	HA WILSON	-$89,872
Butterfield, G.K.	KINSTON H/A	-$76,083
Butterfield, G.K.	TWIN RIVERS OPPORTUNITIES INC	-$40,344
Buyer, Steve	HA FOR THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE	-$105,892
Camp, Dave	EVART HOUSING COMMISSION	-$1,621
Camp, Dave	GREENVILLE HSG. COMM.	-$63,066
Camp, Dave	MONTCALM COUNTY HSG. COMM.	-$94,900
Camp, Dave	SAINT LOUIS HOUSING COMMISSION	-$13,865
Camp, Dave	TRAVERSE CITY HSG. COMM.	-$104,922
Cannon, Chris	BEAVER CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$6
Cannon, Chris	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF PROVO	-$80,974
Cannon, Chris	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF UTAH COUNTY	-$279,685
Capito, Shelley Moore	BUCKHANNON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$10,095
Capito, Shelley Moore	JACKSON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$213,959
Capito, Shelley Moore	MARTINSBURG HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$72,930
Capps, Lois	AREA HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF VENTURA	-$173,041
Capps, Lois	CITY OF PORT HUENEME HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$110,361
Capuano, Michael	CHELSEA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$124,371
Capuano, Michael	SOMERVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$469,804
Caraway, Michael	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF BRADY	-$86,858
Caraway, Michael	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF BROWNWOOD	-$329,718
Cardoza, Dennis	COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN HOUSING AUTH.	-$2,987,378
Cardoza, Dennis	COUNTY OF STANISLAUS HOUSING AUTH	-$2,520,796
Carnahan, Russ	FRANKLIN COUNTY PUBLIC HSG AGENCY	-$397,841
Carney, Christopher	LYCOMING COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$47,431
Carney, Christopher	MONTOUR COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$74,361
Carney, Christopher	SHAMOKIN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$16,164
Carney, Christopher	SNYDER COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$111,573
Carney, Christopher	WYOMING COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$12,108
Carson, Julia	DIVISION OF FAMILY AND CHILDREN	-$568,134
Carson, Julia	INDIANAPOLIS HOUSING AGENCY	-$4,289,723
Carter, John	CENTRAL TEXAS COUNCIL OF GOVTS	-$1,677,948
Carter, John	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CAMERON	-$24,640
Carter, John	ROUND ROCK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$74,326
Carter, John	TAYLOR HSG AUTHORITY	-$70,733
Castle, Michael	DOVER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$74,434
Castle, Michael	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	-$408,372
Castle, Michael	NEWARK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$66,172
Castle, Michael	WILMINGTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$389,640
Castor, Kathy	BRADENTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$218,630
Castor, Kathy	HA TAMPA	-$2,965,082
Castor, Kathy	ST. PETERSBURG H/A	-$2,927,882
Chandler, Ben	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY	-$37,864
Chandler, Ben	FRANKFORT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$151,640
Chandler, Ben	GEORGETOWN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$20,561
Chandler, Ben	KENTUCKY HOUSING CORPORATION	-$1,760,894
Chandler, Ben	LEXINGTON-FAYETTE COUNTY HOUSING	-$653,188
Christensen, Donna	VIRGIN ISLANDS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,781,536
Cleaver, Emanuel	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF KANSAS CITY,	-$4,169,792
Cleaver, Emanuel	INDEPENDENCE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,815,022
Clyburn, James	CHARLESTON COUNTY HOUS REDVEL AUTH	-$584,151
Clyburn, James	HA GEORGETOWN	-$2,836
Clyburn, James	HA MARION	-$45,159
Clyburn, James	HA SUMTER	-$174,642
Cohen, Steve	HA MEMPHIS	-$2,243,591
Cole, Tom	NORMAN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$248,162
Conoway, Michael	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF ABILENE	-$1,423,758
Conoway, Michael	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF MONAHANS	-$17,328
Conoway, Michael	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF ODESSA	-$106,828
Conoway, Michael	HSG AUTH CITY OF MARBLE FALLS	-$98,396
Conoway, Michael	KERMIT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$30,396
Conyers, John	MELVINDALE HOUSING COMMISSION	-$127,752
Cooper, Jim	METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMNT & HSG AGNCY	-$1,976,164
Costa, James	KINGS COUNTY HOUSING AUTH	-$292,114
Costello, Jerry	FRANKLIN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,035
Costello, Jerry	JACKSON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$188,065
Costello, Jerry	WILLIAMSON COUNTY HSG AUTHORITY	-$109,869
Courtney, Joe	ENFIELD HSG AUTHORITY	-$66,598
Courtney, Joe	NEW LONDON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$130,818
Courtney, Joe	PLAINFIELD H A	-$25,859
Courtney, Joe	ROCKVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$81,348
Cramer, Bud	HA DECATUR	-$115,085
Cramer, Bud	HA SO CENTRAL ALABAMA REGIONAL	-$267,202
Cubin, Barbara	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF CASPER	-$162,964
Cubler son, John Abney	HOUSTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,252,416
Cuellar, Henry	DILLEY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$9,581
Cuellar, Henry	FLORESVILLE HSG AUTHORITY	-$11,915
Cuellar, Henry	HIDALGO COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$175,333
Cuellar, Henry	HIDALGO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$11,168
Cuellar, Henry	JIM HOGG COUNTY HA	-$11,463
Cuellar, Henry	LAREDO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$59,371
Cuellar, Henry	MC ALLEN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$122,880
Cuellar, Henry	PEARSALL HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$28,790
Cuellar, Henry	POTEET HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,036
Davis, Arthur	FAIRFIELD ALABAMA H/A	-$122,158

Davis, Arthur	HA BESSEMER	-$7,009
Davis, Arthur	HA NORTHPORT	-$7,498
Davis, Arthur	HA TARRANT	-$68,803
Davis, Arthur	HA TUSCALOOSA	-$33,007
Davis, Danny	CITY OF N CHICAGO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$51,638
Davis, Danny	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF COOK COUNTY	-$7,693,156
Davis, Danny	STATE OF ILL. DEPT OF COMMERCE & COMM AFFAIRS	-$177,606
Davis, David	BRISTOL, TN HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY	-$2,805
Davis, David	HA MORRISTOWN	-$12,901
Davis, David	KINGSPORT HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY	-$365,373
Davis, Geoff	APPALACHIAN FOOTHILLS HA	-$143,955
Davis, Geoff	ASHLAND HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$75,578
Davis, Geoff	CAMPBELL COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$51,079
Davis, Geoff	COVINGTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$197,321
Davis, Geoff	MAYSVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$71,274
Davis, Lincoln	HA PULASKI	-$10,259
DeFazio, Peter	COOS-CURRY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$237,163
DeFazio, Peter	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF DOUGLAS COUNTY	-$38,481
DeFazio, Peter	LINN-BENTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$309,140
DeGette, Diana	CITY OF ENGLEWOOD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$543,179
DeGette, Diana	COLORADO DIVISION OF HOUSING	-$29,130
DeGette, Diana	SHERIDAN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$193,453
Delahunt, William	ABINGTON HSG AUTHORITY	-$98,396
Delahunt, William	BARNSTABLE HSG AUTHORITY	-$143,716
Delahunt, William	BOURNE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$26,094
Delahunt, William	DENNIS HSG AUTHORITY	-$16,822
Delahunt, William	DUXBURY HSG AUTHORITY	-$4,500
Delahunt, William	FALMOUTH HSG AUTHORITY	-$122,864
Delahunt, William	HINGHAM HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$12,448
Delahunt, William	PEMBROKE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$116,604
Delahunt, William	PLYMOUTH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$160,114
Delahunt, William	SANDWICH HSG AUTHORITY	-$16,762
Delahunt, William	WEYMOUTH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$292,134
Delahunt, William	YARMOUTH HSG AUTHORITY	-$144,797
DeLauro, Rosa	DERBY H A	-$182,050
DeLauro, Rosa	EAST HAVEN HSG AUTHORITY	-$4,239
DeLauro, Rosa	MILFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$120,198
DeLauro, Rosa	NAUGATUCK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$164,554
Dent, Charles	ALLENTOWN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$943,335
Dent, Charles	LEHIGH COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$226,690
Diaz-Balart, Mario	COLLIER COUNTY HA	-$76,272
Diaz-Balart, Mario	H/A CITY OF HOMESTEAD	-$1,223,651
Diaz-Balart, Mario	HA LEE COUNTY	-$39,834
Diaz-Balart, Mario	HIALEAH H/A	-$1,667,106
Dicks, Norm	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF	-$173,241
Dicks, Norm	MASON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$183,077
Dingell, John	INKSTER HOUSING COMMISSION	-$611,538
Doggett, Lloyd	HALLETTSVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$11,634
Doggett, Lloyd	KYLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$11,147
Doggett, Lloyd	LA GRANGE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$11,857
Doggett, Lloyd	TEXAS DEPT HOUSING & COMMUNITY AFFAIRS	-$1,538,531
Donnelly, Joe	LOGANSPORT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$297
Donnelly, Joe	MARSHALL CO. HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$22,956
Donnelly, Joe	MICHIGAN CITY HA	-$54,314
Doolittle, John	CITY OF ROSEVILLE	-$56,022
Doolittle, John	PLACER COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$34,054
Doyle, Michael	ALLEGHENY COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$512,071
Doyle, Michael	MCKEESPORT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$94,548
Drake, Thelma	ACCOMACK-NORTHHAMPTON REGIONAL H A	-$191,161
Drake, Thelma	CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH	-$1,029,230
Duncan, John	EAST TN HUMAN RESOURCE AGENCY	-$161,653
Duncan, John	HA ETOWAH	-$5,574
Duncan, John	HA KNOX COUNTY	-$185,573
Duncan, John	HA MARYVILLE	-$126,890
Duncan, John	KNOXVILLE COMMUNITY DEVEL CORP	-$903,393
Duncan, John	SE TN HUMAN RESOURCE AGENCY	-$65,622
Edwards, Chet	BRAZOS VALLEY DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL	-$986,058
Edwards, Chet	CLEBURNE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$37,760
Ehlers, Vernon	GRAND RAPIDS HSG. COMM.	-$986,186
Ehlers, Vernon	KENT COUNTY HOUSING COMMISSION	-$108,133
Ehlers, Vernon	ROCKFORD HOUSING COMMISSION	-$2,443
Ehlers, Vernon	WYOMING HOUSING COMMISSION	-$319
Ehteridge, Bob	COUNTY OF HARNETT	-$71,352
Eliison, Keith	RICHFIELD HRA	-$6,884
Ellison, Keith	MINNEAPOLIS PHA	-$3,690,568
Ellison, Keith	ST LOUIS PARK HRA	-$26,129
Ellsworth, Brad	BLOOMFIELD HA	-$20,260
Emerson, Jo Ann	CABOOL HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,975
Emerson, Jo Ann	HOWELL COUNTY PHA	-$85,373
Emerson, Jo Ann	NEW MADRID COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,130
Emerson, Jo Ann	ORAN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$25,819
Emerson, Jo Ann	PHELPS COUNTY PHA	-$130,282
Emerson, Jo Ann	RIPLEY COUNTY PHA	-$1,306
Emerson, Jo Ann	ROLLA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$10,698

Emerson, Jo Ann	SIKESTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$62,002
Engel, Eliot	TOWN OF RAMAPO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$74,405
Engel, Eliot	VILLAGE OF NYACK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$76,242
English, Phil	CORRY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$103,933
English, Phil	ERIE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$247,478
English, Phil	HSG AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF WARREN	-$48,945
Ethridge, Bob	HA SANFORD	-$37,692
Everett, Terry	DOTHAN H/A	-$85,044
Everett, Terry	H/A CITY OF MONTGOMERY	-$2,806,999
Everett, Terry	HA ELBA	-$21,557
Everett, Terry	HA ENTERPRISE	-$169,113
Everett, Terry	HA EVERGREEN	-$17,262
Everett, Terry	HA GREENVILLE	-$55,706
Everett, Terry	HA MIDLAND CITY	-$18,310
Everett, Terry	HA OPP	-$51,574
Everett, Terry	HA OZARK	-$13,844
Everett, Terry	HA SAMSON	-$53,500
Everett, Terry	HA TROY	-$59,212
Everett, Terry	PRATTVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$5,345
Fallin, Mary	DEL CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$32,574
Fallin, Mary	OKLAHOMA CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$679,188
Fallin, Mary	OKLAHOMA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY	-$1,746,840
Fallin, Mary	SEMINOLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$13,248
Fallin, Mary	SHAWNEE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$58,897
Fallin, Mary	TECUMSEH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$9,479
Fallin, Mary	WEWOKA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$20,917
Farr, Sam	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	-$61,265
Feeney, Tom	HA OF THE CITY OF TITUSVILLE	-$81,331
Ferguson, Mike	EDISON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$118,473
Ferguson, Mike	HUNTERDON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$28,738
Ferguson, Mike	MANVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$4,384
Ferguson, Mike	WOODBRIDGE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$168,757
Filner, Bob	IMPERIAL VALLEY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$433,008
Flake, Jeff	CITY OF MESA	-$235,530
Forbes, Randy	CHESAPEAKE REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$253,820
Forbes, Randy	FRANKLIN REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$46,018
Forbes, Randy	HOPEWELL REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$187,781
Forbes, Randy	PETERSBURG REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$940,839
Forbes, Randy	SUFFOLK REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$164,551
Fortenberry, Jeff	NORFOLK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$16,312
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF VIEQUES	-$33,462
Fortuno, Luis	MUN OF GUAYANILLA	-$52,330
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF BARCELONETA	-$25,548
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY HUMACAO	-$271,550
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY LUQUILLO	-$432
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF ADJUNTAS	-$1,510
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF AGUAS BUENAS	-$125,161
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF AIBONITO	-$25,501
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF ARECIBO	-$546,645
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF BAYAMON	-$975,273
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF CAGUAS	-$302,508
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF CANOVANAS	-$7,083
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF CAROLINA	-$330,154
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF CIALES	-$18,190
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF COAMO	-$6,715
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF COMERIO	-$10,416
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF DORADO	-$78,525
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF FAJARDO	-$42,667
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF GUANICA	-$4,307
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF GURABO	-$25,137
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF ISABELA	-$34,293
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF JUANA DIAZ	-$27,694
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF LARES	-$46,891
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF MARICAO	-$17,266
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF MOCA	-$10,100
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF NARANJITO	-$70,146
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF PATILLAS	-$6,053
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF PENUELAS	-$242,475
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF QUEBRADILLAS	-$84,386
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF RIO GRANDE	-$90,252
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF SABANA GRANDE	-$9,616
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF SALINAS	-$11,412
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF SAN LORENZO	-$46,005
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF TOA ALTA	-$21,027
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF VEGA BAJA	-$44,735
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF YABUCOA	-$21,577
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALITY OF YAUCO	-$250
Fortuno, Luis	MUNICIPALLITY OF VEGA ALTA	-$40,064
Fortuno, Luis	PUERTO RICO HOUSING FINANCE CORP	-$356,396
Foxx, Virginia	STATESVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$468,931
Frank, Barney	DARTMOUTH HA	-$53,467
Frank, Barney	HALIFAX HSG AUTHORITY	-$3,311
Frank, Barney	MANSFIELD HSG AUTHORITY	-$23,476
Frank, Barney	MIDDLEBOROUGH HSG AUTHORITY	-$160,707
Frank, Barney	TAUNTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$8,191
Frank, Barney	WELLESLEY HSG AUTHORITY	-$8,514
Franks, Trent	CITY OF PEORIA	-$41,382
Franks, Trent	MOHAVE COUNTY HSG AUTH	-$8,743
Frelinghuysen, Rodney	MADISON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$47,007
Frelinghuysen, Rodney	MORRIS COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$350,066

Frelinghuysen, Rodney	MORRISTOWN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$125,839
Garrett, Scott	WARREN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$181,367
Gerlach, Jim	BERKS COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$217,498
Gerlach, Jim	MONTGOMERY COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,344,529
Giffords, Gabrielle	CITY OF DOUGLAS HSG AUTH	-$34,164
Giffords, Gabrielle	COUNTY OF COCHISE PHA	-$74,772
Gilchrest, Wayne	HARFORD COUNTY HOUSING AGENCY	-$173,288
Gilchrest, Wayne	QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY HSG AUTHORITY	-$48,475
Gilchrest, Wayne	ST. MICHAELS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,648
Gilchrest, Wayne	WICOMICO COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$178,658
Gillibrand, Kirsten	CITY OF HUDSON	-$12,728
Gillibrand, Kirsten	HA OF HOOSICK FALLS	-$43,844
Gillibrand, Kirsten	HA OF MECHANICVILLE	-$35,325
Gillibrand, Kirsten	HA OF SARATOGA SPRINGS	-$15,025
Gillibrand, Kirsten	TOWN OF DAVENPORT	-$263
Gillibrand, Kirsten	TOWN OF KORTRIGHT	-$15,209
Gillibrand, Kirsten	VILLAGE OF DELHI	-$11,877
Gillibrand, Kirsten	VILLAGE OF DEPOSIT	-$4,595
Gillibrand, Kirsten	VILLAGE OF HANCOCK	-$70
Gillmor, Paul	SANDUSKY MHA	-$208,260
Gingrey, Phil	CITY OF MARIETTA	-$488,978
Gingrey, Phil	HA MARIETTA	-$1,716,197
Gohmert, Louie	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF TATUM	-$3,708
Gohmert, Louie	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF BECKVILLE	-$147,359
Gohmert, Louie	MARSHALL HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$262,932
Gohmert, Louie	TYLER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$148,435
Gonzales, Charles	BEXAR COUNTY HSG AUTHORITY	-$517,643
Goode, Virgil	COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE/DEPT.OF FINANCE	-$223,401
Goode, Virgil	MARTINSVILLE REDEV. & HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$145,130
Goodlatte, Bob	COVINGTON REDEV & HSG AUTHORITY	-$8,236
Goodlatte, Bob	HARRISONBURG REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$312,013
Goodlatte, Bob	ROANOKE REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$89,623
Goodlatte, Bob	STAUNTON REDEVELOPEMENT & HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$30,720
Gordon, Bart	HA MURFREESBORO	-$74,020
Graves, Sam	ABCD HOUSING AGENCY	-$54,882
Graves, Sam	CARROLLTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,697
Graves, Sam	EXCELSIOR SPRINGS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$61,734
Graves, Sam	GRUNDY COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$27,097
Graves, Sam	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF SAINT JOSEPH	-$280,384
Graves, Sam	NODAWAY COUNTY PHA	-$55,195
Graves, Sam	WESTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$59,935
Green, Al	HARRIS COUNTY HSG AND COMMUNITY DEV.	-$61,403
Green, Gene	BAYTOWN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$945,289
Grijalva, Raul	CITY OF TUCSON	-$1,451,001
Grijalva, Raul	PIMA COUNTY	-$840,483
Grijalva, Raul	SOUTH TUCSON CITY HOUSING AUTH	-$33,377
Hall, John	CITY OF PEEKSKILL	-$372,815
Hall, John	HA OF BEACON	-$213,596
Hall, John	PORT JERVIS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	-$68,449
Hall, John	TOWN OF POUGHKEEPSIE	-$107,993
Hall, John	TOWN OF YORKTOWN	-$6,680
Hall, Ralph	ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVTS	-$1,012,266
Hall, Ralph	COMMERCE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$270,068
Hall, Ralph	CRYSTAL CITY HSG AUTHORITY	-$57,004
Hall, Ralph	GREENVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$188,049
Hall, Ralph	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF ROCKWALL	-$41,056
Hall, Ralph	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF TEXARKANA	-$191,205
Hall, Ralph	HOUSINGG AUTHORITY OF PARIS	-$47,760
Hall, Ralph	TEXOMA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS	-$72,461
Hare, Phil	CHRISTIAN CTY HA	-$43,792
Hare, Phil	DECATUR HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$104,608
Hare, Phil	GREATER METROPOLITAN AREA HSG OF ROCK	-$98,198
Hare, Phil	HENDERSON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$37,162
Hare, Phil	HOUSING AUTH.CITY OF ROCK ISLAND	-$323,750
Hare, Phil	KNOX COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$143,338
Hare, Phil	MCDONOUGH COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$58,690
Hare, Phil	MERCER COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$15,588
Hare, Phil	MONTGOMERY COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$9,383
Hare, Phil	QUINCY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$289,401
Hare, Phil	SPRINGFIELD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,283,772
Hare, Phil	WARREN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,240
Harman, Jane	CITY OF LOMITA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$23,625
Harman, Jane	CITY OF TORRANCE	-$276,966
Harman, Jane	REDONDO BEACH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$95,413
Hastert, Dennis	AURORA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$208,837
Hastert, Dennis	ELGIN HA	-$735,241
Hastert, Dennis	KENDALL COUNTY HSG AUTH	-$46,825
Hastings, Alcee	HA FORT LAUDERDALE CITY	-$1,725,387
Hastings, Alcee	HA PALM BEACH COUNTY	-$1,148,960
Hastings, Doc	HA OF CHELAN COUNTY/CITY OF WENATCHEE	-$80,874
Hastings, Doc	HOUSING AUTHORITY CITY OF KENNEWICK	-$1,010,390
Hastings, Doc	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF GRANT COUNTY	-$4,931
Hastings, Doc	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF	-$269,551

Hastings, Doc	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF YAKIMA	-$129,668
Hastings, Doc	HSG AUTH OF THE CITY OF PASCO & FRANKLIN COUNTY	-$187,339
Hayes, Robin	HA MONROE	-$164,091
Hayes, Robin	HA OF THE TOWN OF LAURINBURG	-$84,509
Hayes, Robin	HA ROCKINGHAM	-$13,014
Hayes, Robin	HA WADESBORO	-$9,258
Hensarling, Jeb	ANDERSON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$523,816
Hensarling, Jeb	ATHENS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$43,169
Hensarling, Jeb	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF ALTO	-$9,370
Hensarling, Jeb	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF EDGEWOOD	-$32,658
Hensarling, Jeb	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF WILLS POINT	-$13,828
Hensarling, Jeb	MESQUITE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$256,339
Hensarling, Jeb	RUSK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$52,585
Herger, Wally	COUNTY OF BUTTE HSG AUTH	-$601,376
Herger, Wally	COUNTY OF SHASTA HSG AUTH	-$228,074
Herger, Wally	COUNTY OF SUTTER HSG AUTHORITY	-$454,293
Herger, Wally	YUBA COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$320,343
Herseth, Stephanie	BROOKINGS HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	-$78,875
Herseth, Stephanie	CANTON HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	-$15,787
Herseth, Stephanie	CITY OF LENNOX HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT COM.	-$3,065
Herseth, Stephanie	CITY OF MITCHELL HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT COMM	-$10,225
Herseth, Stephanie	CLARK HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	-$15,072
Herseth, Stephanie	HURON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$38,939
Herseth, Stephanie	LAWRENCE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$84,291
Herseth, Stephanie	MADISON HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	-$16,265
Herseth, Stephanie	MILLER HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	-$9,840
Herseth, Stephanie	REDFIELD HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	-$25,601
Herseth, Stephanie	VERMILLION HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	-$64,593
Herseth, Stephanie	WATERTOWN HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT COM.	-$113,668
Herseth, Stephanie	WESSINGTON SPGS HSG & REDEV COMM	-$3,481
Higgins, Brian	BUFFALO MUNICIPAL HOUSING AUTH	-$55,351
Higgins, Brian	CITY OF BUFFALO	-$759,973
Hill, Baron	CANNELTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,869
Hill, Baron	HOUSING AUTH. CITY OF JEFFERSONVILL	-$82,976
Hill, Baron	SELLERSBURG HA	-$18,200
Hill, Baron	TELL CITY HA	-$3,627
Hinchey, Maurice	CITY OF BINGHAMTON	-$24,255
Hinchey, Maurice	CITY OF POUGHKEEPSIE MUNICIPAL BLDG	-$10,965
Hinchey, Maurice	HA OF ITHACA	-$239,730
Hinchey, Maurice	HA OF MONTICELLO	-$357,482
Hinchey, Maurice	KINGSTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	-$242,869
Hinchey, Maurice	POUGHKEEPSIE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,028
Hinchey, Maurice	TOWN OF UNION	-$182,122
Hinjosa, Ruben	ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNME	-$12,209
Hinjosa, Ruben	BEEVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$123,413
Hinjosa, Ruben	CUERO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,681
Hinjosa, Ruben	DUVAL COUNTY HSG AUTHORITY	-$230
Hinjosa, Ruben	EDCOUCH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$32,506
Hinjosa, Ruben	EDINBURG HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$6,412
Hinjosa, Ruben	ELSA HOUSING AUTHORITY/LA HACIENDA	-$1,208
Hinjosa, Ruben	FALFURRIAS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$71,822
Hinjosa, Ruben	HSG AUTH CITY OF DONNA	-$40,337
Hinjosa, Ruben	MATHIS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$5,624
Hinjosa, Ruben	MERCEDES HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$30,223
Hinjosa, Ruben	ODEM HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$55,620
Hinjosa, Ruben	YOAKUM HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,942
Hirono, Mazie	COUNTY OF HAWAII	-$174,217
Hodes, Paul	LANCASTER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$9,811
Hodes, Paul	LEBANON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$39,815
Hodes, Paul	NORTHUMBERLAND HSG AUTHORITY	-$4,081
Hoekstra, Peter	MUSKEGON HEIGHTS HSG. COMM.	-$70,127
Hoekstra, Peter	MUSKEGON HOUSING COMMISSION	-$24,909
Holden, Tim	HARRISBURG HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$55,620
Holden, Tim	LEBANON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$334,294
Holden, Tim	POTTSVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$84,725
Holt, Rush	MIDDLETOWN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$17,029
Holt, Rush	OLD BRIDGE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$19,322
Hooley, Darlene	HOUSING & URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF	-$52,056

Hooley, Darlene	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF LINCOLN COUNTY	-$106,446
Hooley, Darlene	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF SALEM	-$410,201
Hooley, Darlene	MARION COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,010,129
Hoyer, Steny	COUNTY COMMISSIONERS CHARLES COUNTY	-$125,750
Hoyer, Steny	HSG AUTHORITY OF CALVERT COUNTY	-$30,439
Hulshof, Kenny	FULTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,990
Hulshof, Kenny	LINCOLN COUNTY PUB HSG AGENCY	-$1,312,015
Hulshof, Kenny	MACON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$8,020
Hulshof, Kenny	MEXICO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$162,809
Hulshof, Kenny	VANDALIA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$26,402
Hunter, Duncan	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO	-$4,765,305
Inglis, Bob	CITY OF SPARTANBURG H/A	-$1,212,511
Inglis, Bob	HA GREENVILLE	-$671,768
Israel, Steve	HA OF HUNTINGTON	-$748,364
Israel, Steve	HA OF OYSTER BAY	-$48,210
Israel, Steve	WILLIAMSPORT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$86,708
Issa, Darrell	CITY OF OCEANSIDE COMM DEV COMMISSION	-$855,653
Jackson, Jesse	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PARK FOREST	-$197,450
Jindal, Bobbie	KENTWOOD (TOWN 0F) SEC.8 HOUSING AGENCY	-$16,215
Jindal, Bobbie	PEARL RIVER (TOWN OF) HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$201,541
Johnson, Eddie	DALLAS COUNTY HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	-$260,106
Johnson, Eddie	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF DALLAS	-$1,348,276
Johnson, Henry	H/A DEKALB COUNTY	-$307,777
Johnson, Henry	HA DECATUR	-$77,695
Johnson, Henry	HA LITHONIA	-$10,545
Johnson, Timothy	CHAMPAIGN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,131,802
Johnson, Timothy	CITY OF DANVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$139,691
Johnson, Timothy	CLARK COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$16,939
Johnson, Timothy	FORD CTY HA	-$36,109
Johnson, Timothy	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF CUMBERLAND	-$1,230
Johnson, Timothy	LIVINGSTON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$8,185
Johnson, Timothy	VERMILION COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$34,536
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs	CUYAHOGA MHA	-$2,466,061
Jordan, Jim	ALLEN MHA 160001003 A/C #	-$238,524
Jordan, Jim	DELAWARE METRO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$30,664
Jordan, Jim	HANCOCK MHA	-$808,499
Jordan, Jim	HURON MHA	-$51,732
Kagen, Steve	BROWN COUNTY HA	-$1,350,060
Kagen, Steve	KAUKAUNA HA	-$4,771
Kaptur, Marcy	ERIE MHA	-$108,504
Kaptur, Marcy	LUCAS MHA	-$151,145
Keller, Ric	ORANGE CO SECTION 8	-$624,641
Kennedy, Patrick	BURRILLVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$32,451
Kennedy, Patrick	EAST PROVIDENCE H A	-$56,271
Kennedy, Patrick	LINCOLN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$14,004
Kennedy, Patrick	NEWPORT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$932,363
Kennedy, Patrick	PORTSMOUTH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$126,806
Kennedy, Patrick	SMITHFIELD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$54,971
Kennedy, Patrick	TIVERTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$28,755
Kildee, Dale	FLINT HOUSING COMMISSION	-$396,696
Kildee, Dale	SAGINAW HOUSING COMMISSION	-$224,223
Kilpatrick, Carolyn	DETROIT HOUSING COMMISSION	-$2,150,154
Kilpatrick, Carolyn	LINCOLN PARK HSG. COMM.	-$142,152
Kind, Ron	CRAWFORD COUNTY HSG AUTH	-$22
Kind, Ron	DUNN COUNTY HA	-$45,942
Kind, Ron	EAU CLAIRE COUNTY HA	-$81,481
Kind, Ron	EAU CLAIRE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$10,393
Kind, Ron	LAFAYETTE CO. HSG AUTH	-$17,114
Kind, Ron	MAUSTON HA	-$17,356
King, Peter	GLEN COVE CDA	-$264,429
King, Peter	HA OF LONG BEACH	-$329,926
King, Peter	TOWN OF BABYLON HOUSING ASSISTANCE	-$1,750,956
King, Peter	VILLAGE OF SEA CLIFF	-$4,095
King, Steve	COUNCIL BLUFFS MUNICIPAL HOUSING	-$128,691
King, Steve	SOUTHERN IOWA REG HSG AUTHORITY	-$10,400
Kingston, Jack	HA OF THE CITY OF BRUNSWICK	-$651,163
Kirk, Mark	WAUKEGAN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$330,903
Klein, Ron	HA DEERFIELD BEACH	-$166,120
Knollenberg, Joe	PONTIAC HOUSING COMMISSION	-$904,190
Knollenberg, Joe	ROYAL OAK HOUSING COMMISSION	-$1,872
Kuhl, John	VILLAGE OF HORSEHEADS	-$12,003
LaHood, Ray	EAST PEORIA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$15,846
LaHood, Ray	MASON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$85,403
LaHood, Ray	MENARD COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$51,467
LaHood, Ray	PEORIA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,339,551
LaHood, Ray	WOODFORD COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$15,772
Lamborn, Doug	EL PASO COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$31,527
Lampson, Nick	ROSENBERG HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$79,850
Langevin, James	EAST GREENWICH H A	-$335,038
Langevin, James	PROVIDENCE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$161,707
Langevin, James	RHODE ISLAND HSG MORT FIN CORP	-$1,227,258
Langevin, James	SOUTH KINGSTON HOUSIN AUTHORITY	-$10,165
Langevin, James	TOWN OF WESTERLY H A	-$111,368
Langevin, James	WARWICK H A	-$250,659

Larsen, Rick	HOUSING AUTHORITY CITY OF EVERETT	-$822,343
Larsen, Rick	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF SKAGIT COUNTY	-$73,768
Larson, John	BRISTOL HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,046,191
Larson, John	EAST HARTFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$21,776
Larson, John	GLASTONBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$22,097
Larson, John	NEWINGTON H A	-$16,485
Larson, John	WETHERSFIELD H A	-$6,800
Larson, John	WINDSOR H A	-$21,734
Latham, Tom	CHARLES CITY HOUSING AND REDEV. AUTHORITY	-$9,326
Latham, Tom	CITY OF AMES DEPT. OF PLANNING & HS	-$39,932
Latham, Tom	FORT DODGE HOUSING AGENCY	-$11,204
Latham, Tom	LRHA OF DECORAH IOWA	-$1,908
Latham, Tom	MID IOWA REGIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$5,407
Latham, Tom	NEW HAMPTON MUNICIPAL HOUSING AGCY	-$48,939
Latham, Tom	NORTH IOWA REGIONAL HOUSING AUTH	-$237,475
Latham, Tom	UPPER EXPLORERLAND REGIONAL	-$91,845
LaTourette, Steven	ASHTABULA MHA	-$115,189
LaTourette, Steven	LAKE MHA	-$425,587
Levin, Sander	EASTPOINTE HOUSING COMMISSION	-$158,911
Levin, Sander	FERNDALE HOUSING COMMISSION	-$1,243,389
Levin, Sander	MADISON HEIGHTS HSG COMMISSION	-$84,382
Lewis, Jerry	CITY OF NEEDLES HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,499
Lewis, John	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS	-$6,286,018
Lewis, John	HA EAST POINT	-$207,264
Lewis, Ron	BARDSTOWN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$39,783
Lewis, Ron	CAMPBELLSVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$38,262
Lewis, Ron	GREENSBURG HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$34,167
Lewis, Ron	OWENSBORO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$6,729
Lewis, Ron	SPRINGFIELD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$4,432
LoBiondo, Frank	ATLANTIC CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$469,836
LoBiondo, Frank	MILLVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$12,084
LoBiondo, Frank	SALEM HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$37,254
LoBiondo, Frank	VINELAND HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$68,582
Loebsack, David	AREA XV MULTI-COUNTY HOUSING AGENCY	-$69,748
Loebsack, David	CITY OF CEDAR RAPIDS	-$733,060
Loebsack, David	CITY OF IOWA CITY	-$559,526
Loebsack, David	CITY OF MUSCATINE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$209,900
Loebsack, David	FT MADISON HSG AUTH	-$17,936
Loebsack, David	KEOKUK LOW RENT HOUSING AGENCY	-$55,810
Loebsack, David	OTTUMWA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$39,202
Lowey, Nita	HA OF GREENBURGH	-$176,088
Lowey, Nita	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF TUCKAHOE	-$29,448
Lowey, Nita	THE CITY OF WHITE PLAINS	-$83,190
Lowey, Nita	TOWN OF MAMARONECK PHA	-$232,660
Lowey, Nita	VILLAGE OF OSSINING	-$392,325
Lowey, Nita	VILLAGE OF PELHAM HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$70,951
Lowey, Nita	VILLAGE OF PORT CHESTER COMMUNITY DEVELOP. DEPT	-$209,056
Lucas, Frank	PONCA CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,151
Lynch, Stephen	BRAINTREE HSG AUTHORITY	-$10,961
Lynch, Stephen	EASTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$11,322
Lynch, Stephen	HANSON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$29,404
Lynch, Stephen	MILTON HSG AUTHORITY	-$40,135
Lynch, Stephen	NORWOOD HSG AUTHORITY	-$18,345
Lynch, Stephen	STOUGHTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$76,686
Lynch, Stephen	WALPOLE HSG AUTHORITY	-$36,033
Mahoney, Tim	HA AVON PARK	-$104,828
Mahoney, Tim	HENDRY CO PUBLIC H/A	-$25,868
Manzullo, Donald	BOONE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$211,477
Manzullo, Donald	FREEPORT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$8,255
Manzullo, Donald	ROCKFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,142,206
Manzullo, Donald	WINNEBAGO COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$185,691
Marchant, Kenny	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF GRAPEVINE	-$7,529
Markey, Edward	ARLINGTON HSG AUTHORITY	-$183,312
Markey, Edward	BELMONT HSG AUTHORITY	-$13,131
Markey, Edward	FRAMINGHAM HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$119,659
Markey, Edward	LEXINGTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$46,290
Markey, Edward	MALDEN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$298,393
Markey, Edward	MEDFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$909,187
Markey, Edward	MELROSE HSG AUTHORITY	-$137,224
Markey, Edward	NATICK HSG AUTHORITY	-$13,235
Markey, Edward	REVERE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$72,036
Markey, Edward	WALTHAM HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$409,216
Markey, Edward	WATERTOWN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$29,695
Markey, Edward	WINCHESTER HSG AUTHORITY	-$46,248
Marshall, Jim	HA MACON	-$922,688
Matheson, Jim	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CARBON COUNTY	-$25,135
Matheson, Jim	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF	-$52,047
Matheson, Jim	ROOSEVELT CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,908
Matsui, Doris	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO HOUSING	-$7,789,722
McCarthy, Carolyn	HA OF FREEPORT	-$43,697
McCarthy, Carolyn	HEMPSTEAD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$174,112
McCarthy, Carolyn	TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD DEPT OF URBAN	-$40,120
McCarthy, Kevin	HOUSING AUTHORITY COUNTY OF KERN	-$159,052
McCaul, Michael	ELGIN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$21,748

McCollum, Betty	SOUTH CENTRAL MULTI COUNTY HRA	-$106,872
McCollum, Betty	WASHINGTON COUNTY HRA	-$119,385
McCotter, Thaddeus	DEARBORN HEIGHTS HSG. COMM.	-$180,436
McCotter, Thaddeus	LIVONIA HOUSING COMMISSION	-$68,913
McCotter, Thaddeus	PLYMOUTH HOUSING COMMISSION	-$28,909
McCotter, Thaddeus	WESTLAND HOUSING COMMISSION	-$85,638
McCrery, Jim	BIENVILLE PARISH POLICE JURY	-$3,627
McCrery, Jim	BOSSIER PARISH POLICE JURY	-$3,444
McCrery, Jim	CADDO PARISH COMMISSION	-$14,475
McCrery, Jim	GRANT PARISH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$26,081
McCrery, Jim	KINDER (TOWN OF) SEC.8 HOUSING AGENCY	-$27,959
McCrery, Jim	MINDEN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,649
McCrery, Jim	NATCHITOCHES (CITY OF) HSG. AUTHORITY	-$41,473
McCrery, Jim	NATCHITOCHES PARISH HSG AUTH	-$86,762
McCrery, Jim	SHREVEPORT HSG AUTHORITY	-$1,389,239
McCrery, Jim	WEBSTER PARISH POLICE JURY	-$68,887
McGovern, James	ATTLEBORO HSG AUTHORITY	-$58,656
McGovern, James	HOLLISTON HSG AUTHORITY	-$32,282
McGovern, James	MARLBOROUGH COMM DEV AUTHORITY	-$9,680
McGovern, James	SHREWSBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$6,147
McGovern, James	WORCESTER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$108,885
McHenry, Patrick	HA LINCOLNTON	-$79,045
McHenry, Patrick	WESTERN PIEDMONT COUNCIL OF GOVT	-$156,791
McHugh, John	BOONVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$10,946
McHugh, John	CANASTOTA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$13,894
McHugh, John	HA OF HARRIETSTOWN	-$11,762
McHugh, John	HA OF OGDENSBURG	-$1,217
McHugh, John	VILLAGE OF PHOENIX	-$63,717
McIntyre, Mike	BRUNSWICK COUNTY PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$154,691
McIntyre, Mike	HA BLADENBORO	-$18,015
McIntyre, Mike	PENDER COUNTY HOUSING AUTH.	-$126,489
McNulty, Michael	HA OF COHOES	-$79,433
McNulty, Michael	HA OF RENSSELAER	-$14,348
McNulty, Michael	HA OF SCHENECTADY	-$201,583
McNulty, Michael	HA OF TROY	-$459,793
McNulty, Michael	HA OF WATERVLIET	-$32,207
McNulty, Michael	TOWN OF BETHLEHEM	-$616
McNulty, Michael	TOWN OF COEYMANS	-$72,637
McNulty, Michael	TOWN OF COLONIE	-$141,998
McNulty, Michael	TOWN OF CORINTH	-$889
McNulty, Michael	TOWN OF DUANESBURG	-$10,075
McNulty, Michael	TOWN OF GLENVILLE	-$7,628
McNulty, Michael	TOWN OF HADLEY	-$11,617
McNulty, Michael	TOWN OF KNOX	-$6,547
McNulty, Michael	TOWN OF STILLWATER	-$30,075
McNulty, Michael	VILLAGE OF CANAJOHARIE	-$18,015
McNulty, Michael	VILLAGE OF COBLESKILL	-$18,627
McNulty, Michael	VILLAGE OF FORT PLAIN	-$8,455
McNulty, Michael	VILLAGE OF GREEN ISLAND	-$3,261
Meehan, Martin	ACTON HSG AUTHORITY	-$39,100
Meehan, Martin	ANDOVER HSG AUTHORITY	-$38,959
Meehan, Martin	CONCORD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$39,692
Meehan, Martin	TEWKSBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$14,865
Meehan, Martin	WAYLAND HOUUSING AUTHORITY	-$179,953
Melancon, Charlie	IBERIA PH. GOVERNMENT,SEC. 8 PROGRAM	-$41,899
Melancon, Charlie	JEANERETTE SECTION 8 HOUSING AGENCY	-$743
Melancon, Charlie	LAFOURCHE PH. HOUSING COUNCIL, SEC.8	-$94,598
Melancon, Charlie	MORGAN CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$36,726
Melancon, Charlie	NEW IBERIA (CITY OF)	-$25,020
Melancon, Charlie	ST. MARTIN PARISH GOVERNMENT HOUSING	-$149,985
Melancon, Charlie	ST. MARY PARISH SECTION 8 HOUSING	-$37,313
Melancon, Charlie	THIBODAUX (CITY) COMM. DEVELOPMENT,	-$52,797
Merchant, Kenny	GRAND PRAIRIE HSNG & COMM DEV.	-$495,814
Mica, John	ORMOND BEACH HSG AUTH	-$62,229
Mica, John	VOLUSIA COUNTY SECTION 8	-$30,146
Michaud, Michael	AUBURN HSG AUTHORITY	-$4,440
Michaud, Michael	ELLSWORTH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$14,745
Michaud, Michael	TREMONT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,055
Michaud, Michael	VAN BUREN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$14,748
Millender-McDonald, Juanita	CITY OF COMPTON	-$1,014,320
Millender-McDonald, Juanita	CITY OF LONG BEACH HSG AUTH	-$2,701,640
Miller, Brad	GREENSBORO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,018,687
Miller, Candice	LAPEER HOUSING COMMISSION	-$68,964
Miller, George	CITY OF BENICIA HSG AUTH	-$3,871
Miller, George	CITY OF PITTSBURG HSG AUTH	-$1,099,661
Miller, George	CITY OF RICHMOND HSG AUTH	-$1,441,752
Miller, George	CITY OF VACAVILLE	-$182,700
Miller, George	CITY OF VALLEJO	-$2,822,374
Miller, George	COUNTY OF SOLANO HSG AUTH	-$71,210
Miller, Jeff	CITY OF PENSACOLA SECTION 8	-$3,655,682
Miller, Jeff	CRESTVIEW HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$41,778
Miller, Jeff	HOLMES COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$90,893
Miller, Jeff	WALTON COUNTY HOUSING	-$71,134
Mitchell, Harry	CITY OF SCOTTSDALE	-$73,080
Mitchell, Harry	CITY OF TEMPE	-$497,845
Mollohan, Alan	HARRISON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$50,059
Mollohan, Alan	HOUSING AUTHORITY CITY OF KEYSER	-$64,946
Mollohan, Alan	THE CITY OF FAIRMONT HSG AUTH	-$170,107

Mollohan, Alan	WEIRTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$197,465
Moore, Dennis	JOHNSON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$259,702
Moore, Dennis	KANSAS CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,076,311
Moore, Gwen	HA OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE	-$1,363,546
Moran, James	ALEXANDRIA REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$621,339
Moran, James	ARLINGTON CO DEPT OF HUMAN SERVICES	-$1,574,753
Moran, Jerry	ELLIS COUNTY C/O DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES OF NW KS	-$43,702
Moran, Jerry	GREAT BEND HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$21,310
Moran, Jerry	HSG AUTH CITY OF HUTCHINSON KS	-$39,698
Moran, Jerry	JUNCTION CITY PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$26,871
Moran, Jerry	SALINA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$63,726
Murphy, Chirstopher	CANTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$13,893
Murphy, Chirstopher	DANBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$621,071
Murphy, Chirstopher	FARMINGTON H A	-$16,271
Murphy, Chirstopher	TORRINGTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$90,533
Murphy, Chirstopher	WATERBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$767,962
Murtha, John	ARMSTRONG COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$108,946
Murtha, John	FAYETTE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$212,440
Murtha, John	JOHNSTOWN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$176,538
Murtha, John	SOMERSET COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$33,487
Myrick, Sue Wilkins	HA OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE	-$1,252,729
Nadler, Jerrold	NEW YORK CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$54,489,034
Napolitano, Grace	CITY OF PICO RIVERA	-$252,468
Napolitano, Grace	NORWALK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$23,061
Neal, Richard	BELLINGHAM HSG AUTHORITY	-$1,916
Neal, Richard	MILFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$33,889
Neal, Richard	OXFORD H A	-$67,923
Neal, Richard	WARREN HSG AUTHORITY	-$32,750
Neal, Richard	WEBSTER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$17,825
Neugebauer, Randy	CISCO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$17,554
Neugebauer, Randy	HALE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$24,487
Neugebauer, Randy	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF BRECKENRIDGE	-$38,884
Neugebauer, Randy	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF FLOYDADA	-$58,489
Neugebauer, Randy	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF LUBBOCK	-$247,145
Neugebauer, Randy	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF MERKEL	-$9,407
Neugebauer, Randy	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF SLATON	-$12,737
Neugebauer, Randy	SOUTH PLAINS REGIONAL HSG AUTH	-$307,343
Oberstar, James	AITKIN COUNTY HRA	-$24,263
Oberstar, James	CASS COUNTY HRA	-$20,090
Oberstar, James	MORA HRA	-$32,231
Obey, David	BURNETT CTY HA	-$9,394
Obey, David	PORTAGE COUNTY HA	-$24,120
Obey, David	STEVENS POINT HA	-$6,885
Obey, David	WISCONSIN RAPIDS HA	-$17,181
Obey, David	WITTENBERG HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,674
Olver, John	ATHOL HSG AUTHORITY	-$28,544
Olver, John	FITCHBURG HSG AUTHORITY	-$65,797
Olver, John	GREENFIELD HSG AUTHORITY	-$188,446
Olver, John	LEOMINSTER HSG AUTHORITY	-$120,164
Olver, John	PITTSFIELD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$239,608
Olver, John	STOCKBRIDGE HSG AUTHORITY	-$727
Olver, John	WARE HSG AUTHORITY	-$122,184
Olver, John	WINCHENDON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,851
Ortiz, Solomon	CORPUS CHRISTI HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$477,019
Ortiz, Solomon	GREGORY HSG AUTHORITY	-$56,166
Ortiz, Solomon	LOS FRESNOS HSG AUTHORITY	-$25,302
Ortiz, Solomon	WILLACY COUNTY HSG AUTHORITY	-$20,255
Pallone, Frank	ASBURY PARK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$73,675
Pallone, Frank	FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$10,256
Pallone, Frank	HIGHLAND PARK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$25,975
Pallone, Frank	NEPTUNE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$20,368
Pallone, Frank	NEW BRUNSWICK HA	-$581,869
Pascrell, Bill	BLOOMFIELD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$81,434
Pascrell, Bill	CLIFTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$305,028
Pascrell, Bill	PATERSON DCD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,486,493
Pascrell, Bill	PATERSON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$480,033
Pastor, Ed	MARICOPA COUNTY HSG AUTH	-$299,765
Paul, Ron	BAY CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$97,675
Paul, Ron	BRAZORIA COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$276,515
Paul, Ron	EDNA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$16,259
Paul, Ron	LA MARQUE, CITY OF	-$91,286
Paul, Ron	PORT LAVACA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$9,289
Paul, Ron	TEXAS CITY HSG AUTHORITY	-$175,136
Paul, Ron	VICTORIA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$57,252
Payne, Donald	ORANGE CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$26,143
Payne, Donald	UNION TOWNSHIP HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$65,993
Pearce, Stevan	DONA ANA HSG AUTHORITY	-$158,355
Pearce, Stevan	LAS CRUCES HSG AUTHORITY	-$272,428
Pearce, Stevan	LOS LUNAS (VILLAGE OF) HSG AUTH	-$43,596
Pearce, Stevan	REGION V HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$415,836
Pearce, Stevan	TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES HSG AUTHORITY	-$40,717
Pelosi, Nancy	SAN FRANCISCO HSG AUTH	-$1,361,959
Pence, Mike	ANDERSON HA	-$349,086
Pence, Mike	FAYETTE COUNTY HA	-$180,094
Perlmutter, Ed	ADAMS COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$336,400
Perlmutter, Ed	ARVADA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$41,481
Peterson, Collin	BECKER COUNTY HRA	-$67,391
Peterson, Collin	BIG STONE COUNTY HRA	-$6,706

Peterson, Collin	CLEARWATER COUNTY HRA	-$21,801
Peterson, Collin	FERGUS FALLS HRA	-$10,826
Peterson, Collin	GRANT COUNTY HRA	-$2,883
Peterson, Collin	KANDIYOHI COUNTY HRA	-$172
Peterson, Collin	MCLEOD COUNTY HRA	-$31,067
Peterson, Collin	MEEKER COUNTY HRA	-$14,056
Peterson, Collin	MOORHEAD PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$31,474
Peterson, Collin	NW MN MULTI-COUNTY HRA	-$137,585
Peterson, Collin	OTTER TAIL COUNTY HRA	-$22,583
Peterson, Collin	STEVENS COUNTY HRA	-$22,325
Peterson, Collin	YELLOW MEDICINE COUNTY HRA	-$23,663
Peterson, John	BRADFORD COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$19,777
Peterson, John	CLARION COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,355
Peterson, John	ELK COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$78,227
Peterson, John	MCKEAN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$6,482
Peterson, John	OIL CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,238
Peterson, John	TIOGA COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$10,431
Peterson, John	TITUSVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,521
Peterson, John	VENANGO COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$262,872
Petri, Thomas	OSHKOSH HA	-$47,968
Petri, Thomas	OSHKOSH/WINNEBAGO COUNTY HA	-$67,038
Pickering, Charles	HA MISSISSIPPI REGIONAL NO 7	-$242,795
Pitts, Joseph	LANCASTER COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$141,093
Platts, Todd Russell	ADAMS COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$153,645
Platts, Todd Russell	YORK CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$228,681
Poe, Ted	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF BEAUMONT	-$916,421
Poe, Ted	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PORT ARTHUR	-$2,355,267
Poe, Ted	SAN BENITO HSG AUTHORITY	-$334,555
Pomeroy, Earl	BENSON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$25,232
Pomeroy, Earl	CAVALIER COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$19,939
Pomeroy, Earl	DICKEY/SARGENT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,737
Pomeroy, Earl	DUNN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$21,923
Pomeroy, Earl	EDDY COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,694
Pomeroy, Earl	EMMONS COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,033
Pomeroy, Earl	FARGO HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY	-$135,240
Pomeroy, Earl	GRAND FORKS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$632,272
Pomeroy, Earl	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CASS COUNTY	-$95,061
Pomeroy, Earl	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF COOPERSTOWN	-$11,862
Pomeroy, Earl	MCKENZIE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$17,801
Pomeroy, Earl	MERCER COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$8,820
Pomeroy, Earl	RICHLAND COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$17,853
Pomeroy, Earl	ROLETTE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$12,138
Pomeroy, Earl	STARK COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$204,010
Pomeroy, Earl	STUTSMAN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$59,114
Pomeroy, Earl	TOWNER COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,878
Price, David	ORANGE COUNTY	-$36,776
Pryce, Deborah	COLUMBUS METRO. HA	-$2,216,654
Putnam, Adam	CITY OF HAINES CITY	-$5,744
Putnam, Adam	CITY OF LAKELAND H/A	-$247,975
Putnam, Adam	HA BARTOW	-$16,354
Putnam, Adam	HA LAKE WALES	-$168,786
Putnam, Adam	HA PLANT CITY	-$82,602
Putnam, Adam	HA PUNTA GORDA	-$954,785
Putnam, Adam	HA WINTER HAVEN	-$37,354
Rahall, Nick	HOUSING AUTHORITY CITY OF BLUEFIELD	-$149,049
Rahall, Nick	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF MINGO COUNTY	-$178,441
Rahall, Nick	HUNTINGTON WV HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$317,670
Regula, Ralph	WAYNE MHA	-$267,992
Rehberg, Dennis	BUTTE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$18,851
Rehberg, Dennis	GREAT FALLS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$138,541
Rehberg, Dennis	HELENA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$182,021
Rehberg, Dennis	MT DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	-$976,460
Rehberg, Dennis	RICHLAND COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,560
Rehberg, Dennis	WHITEFISH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$11,880
Reichert, David	HA OF THE CITY OF RENTON	-$93,150
Renzi, Rick	CITY OF ELOY	-$59,772
Renzi, Rick	CITY OF FLAGSTAFF HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$21,221
Renzi, Rick	PINAL COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$459,056
Renzi, Rick	WILLIAMS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$34,682
Renzi, Rick	WINSLOW HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$11,916
Reyes, Silvestre	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF ANTHONY	-$237,704
Reyes, Silvestre	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF EL PASO	-$2,050,610
Reynolds, Thomas	HA OF LOCKPORT	-$576,816
Rodgers, Cathy McMorris	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF ASOTIN COUNTY	-$14,946
Rodgers, Cathy McMorris	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF WALLA	-$65,051
Rodgers, Cathy McMorris	SPOKANE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$38,664
Rodriguez, Ciro	DEVINE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$515
Rodriguez, Ciro	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF ALPINE	-$176,309
Rodriguez, Ciro	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF MARFA	-$11,287
Rodriguez, Ciro	UVALDE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$6,623
Rogers, Harold	CUMBERLAND VALLEY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$422,780
Rogers, Harold	LAUREL COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,305
Rogers, Harold	LAWRENCE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$7,148
Rogers, Harold	PIKE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$66,887
Rogers, Harold	PIKEVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$60,506
Rogers, Mike	HA AUBURN	-$169,752

Rogers, Mike	HA JACKSONVILLE	-$7,060
Rogers, Mike	HA LINEVILLE	-$26,141
Rogers, Mike	HA OPELIKA	-$26,485
Rogers, Mike	HA PHENIX CITY	-$127,721
Roskam, Peter	DUPAGE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$957,334
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana	CITY OF MIAMI, DEPT. OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	-$924,530
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana	HA MIAMI BEACH	-$1,663,105
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana	KEY WEST H/A	-$286,637
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana	MIAMI DADE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$9,678,408
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana	MONROE CO HA	-$242,619
Ross, Mike	ASHLEY COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$18,790
Ross, Mike	CALHOUN COUNTY PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$15,131
Ross, Mike	DALLAS COUNTY PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$253
Ross, Mike	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF STAR CITY	-$5,004
Ross, Mike	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF TEXARKANA	-$8,463
Ross, Mike	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF PINE BLUFF	-$451,408
Ross, Mike	HOWARD COUNTY PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$4,641
Ross, Mike	HSG AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF HOT SPRINGS	-$164,782
Ross, Mike	MCGEHEE PUBLIC RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES BOARD	-$34,034
Ross, Mike	POLK COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$74,495
Ross, Mike	SEVIER COUNTY PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$12,589
Ross, Mike	UNION CO.	-$60,184
Rothman, Steven	EDGEWATER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$57,289
Rothman, Steven	ENGLEWOOD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$440,943
Rothman, Steven	FORT LEE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$383,841
Rothman, Steven	SECAUCUS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$157,961
Ryan, Paul	RACINE COUNTY HA	-$148,526
Ryan, Paul	WALWORTH COUNTY HA	-$75,846
Ryan, Tim	TRUMBULL MHA	-$557,145
Ryan, Tim	YOUNGSTOWN MHA	-$1,398,962
Salazar, John	ARCHULETA COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$86,430
Salazar, John	CENTER HSG AUTH	-$13,692
Salazar, John	GARFIELD COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$126,717
Salazar, John	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MONTEZUMA	-$16,912
Salazar, John	HSG AUTH OF TRINIDAD	-$16,737
Salazar, John	ROCKY FORD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$26,316
Sanchez, Linda	CITY OF HAWAIIAN GARDENS HSG AUTH	-$138,111
Sanchez, Linda	CITY OF PARAMOUNT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$130,763
Sanchez, Linda	CITY OF SOUTH GATE	-$236,286
Sanchez, Loretta	CITY OF SANTA ANA HSG AUTH	-$844,190
Sarbanes, John	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF	-$222,793
Saxton, Jim	BERKELEY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$13,681
Schiff, Adam	CITY OF BURBANK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$111,448
Schiff, Adam	CITY OF PASADENA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	-$157,998
Schmidt, Jean	ADAMS MET.HA	-$50,236
Schultz, Debbie Wasserman	BROWARD COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$259,995
Schultz, Debbie Wasserman	DANIA HA	-$124,052
Scott, Robert	HAMPTON REDEVELOPEMENT & HSG AUTH	-$972,943
Scott, Robert	NEWPORT NEWS REDEVELOPMENT & HA	-$595,813
Scott, Robert	NORFOLK REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$3,168,068
Scott, Robert	PORTSMOUTH REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$3,585,497
Scott, Robert	RICHMOND REDEVELOPMENT & H/A	-$1,343,365
Scott, Robert	VIRGINIA HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY	-$3,108,957
Sensenbrenner, James	HARTFORD CDA	-$20,469
Sestak, Joe	DELAWARE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,208,267
Shays, Christopher	BRIDGEPORT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$856,741
Shays, Christopher	FAIRFIELD HSG AUTHORITY	-$150,778
Shays, Christopher	GREENWICH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$265,360
Shays, Christopher	NORWALK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$128,866
Shays, Christopher	STAMFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,567,891
Shea-Porter, Carol	PORTSMOUTH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,056
Shimkus, John	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF	-$20,497
Shimkus, John	HSG AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF SHELBY	-$9,372
Shimkus, John	RICHLAND HA	-$23,792
Shuler, Heath	MACON PROGRAM FOR PROGRESS	-$2,954
Shuler, Heath	WESTERN CAROLINA COMM ACTION	-$82,385
Shuster, Bill	FRANKLIN CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$22,432
Shuster, Bill	FULTON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$5,732
Shuster, Bill	HUNTINGDON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$20,798
Shuster, Bill	LUZERNE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$143,427
Simpson, Michael	ADA COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$279,014
Simpson, Michael	BOISE CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$76,980
Simpson, Michael	IDAHO HOUSING AND FINANCE ASSOCIATION	-$40,896
Simpson, Michael	SOUTHWESTERN IDAHO COOPERATIVE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$107,882
Sires, Albio	BAYONNE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$98,143
Sires, Albio	GUTTENBERG HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$19,618
Sires, Albio	HOBOKEN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$151,184

Sires, Albio	JERSEY CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,730,612
Sires, Albio	NEWARK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,452,191
Sires, Albio	NORTH BERGEN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$223,520
Sires, Albio	PERTH AMBOY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$728,029
Sires, Albio	WEEHAWKEN HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$124,250
Skelton, Ike	JEFFERSON CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$51,369
Skelton, Ike	MARSHALL HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$8,843
Skelton, Ike	NEVADA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$4,576
Skelton, Ike	PHA OF THE COUNTY OF RAY	-$130,741
Skelton, Ike	RICHMOND HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$114,695
Slaughter, Louise	CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS	-$19,084
Slaughter, Louise	CITY OF NORTH TONAWANDA	-$119,788
Slaughter, Louise	HA OF ROCHESTER	-$1,026,717
Smith, Adrian	CENTRAL NEBRASKA JOINT HSG AUTH	-$2,846
Smith, Adrian	CHADRON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$5,083
Smith, Adrian	GOTHENBURG HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,273
Smith, Adrian	HA SOUTH DELTA	-$854,303
Smith, Adrian	HALL COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$73,667
Smith, Adrian	HASTINGS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$364,802
Smith, Adrian	MCCOOK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,427
Smith, Adrian	WEST CENTRAL HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$10,713
Smith, Adrian	YORK HSG AUTHORITY	-$29,518
Smith, Christopher	LAKEWOOD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$185,237
Snyder, Vic	CONWAY COUNTY HOUSING AUTH	-$82,890
Snyder, Vic	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF LITTLE ROCK	-$98,434
Snyder, Vic	HSG AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF LONOKE	-$86,932
Snyder, Vic	PULASKI COUNTY HOUSING AGENCY	-$259,926
Solis, Hilda	CITY OF BALDWIN PARK HOUSING AUTH	-$618,786
Solis, Hilda	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES HOUSING AUTH.	-$24,640,103
Souder, Mark	FORT WAYNE HA-CITY OF FORT WAYNE	-$2,583,322
Souder, Mark	WARSAW HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$52,800
Space, Zachary	CHILLICOTHE MET HA	-$52,597
Space, Zachary	COSHOCTON MET.HSG AUTH	-$18,915
Space, Zachary	HARRISON MHA	-$16,032
Space, Zachary	NOBLE METROPOLITAN HA	-$28,238
Space, Zachary	ZANESVILLE MET HA	-$78,939
Spratt, John	HA CHESTER	-$58,033
Spratt, John	HA DARLINGTON	-$6,144
Spratt, John	HA FORT MILL	-$9,153
Spratt, John	HA HARTSVILLE	-$84,394
Spratt, John	HA NEWBERRY	-$74,769
Stark, Fortney Pete	CITY OF ALAMEDA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,795,123
Stupak, Bart	BARAGA HOUSING COMMISSION	-$9,569
Stupak, Bart	MANISTIQUE HSG. COMM.	-$16,680
Stupak, Bart	MARQUETTE HOUSING COMMISSION	-$13,171
Stupak, Bart	MENOMINEE HOUSING COMMISSION	-$7,467
Stupak, Bart	SAULT STE MARIE HSG. COMM.	-$27,229
Sullivan, John	TULSA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$220,424
Sutton, Betty	AKRON MHA	-$1,369,847
Tauscher, Ellen	CITY OF FAIRFIELD	-$584,346
Tauscher, Ellen	SUISUN CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$98,638
Terry, Lee	OMAHA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$1,006,438
Thompson, Bennie	HSG AUTH CITY OF GREENWOOD MS	-$53,775
Thompson, Bennie	NORTH DELTA REG HSS AUTH	-$414,871
Thompson, Mike	MENDOCINO COUNTY	-$51,852
Thompson, Mike	YOLO COUNTY HSG AUTHORITY	-$192,356
Thornberry, Mac	ELECTRA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$3,314
Thornberry, Mac	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF HASKELL	-$1,167
Thornberry, Mac	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF MINERAL WELLS	-$21,428
Thornberry, Mac	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF QUANAH	-$13,558
Thornberry, Mac	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF STAMFORD	-$28,968
Thornberry, Mac	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF TULIA	-$13,552
Thornberry, Mac	WICHITA FALLS HOUSING ASSISTANCE	-$872,497
Tiahrt, Todd	COWLEY COUNTY PUBLIC HOUSING	-$43,965
Tiahrt, Todd	NEWTON HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$25,205
Tiahrt, Todd	WICHITA HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$162,377
Tierney, John	AMESBURY HSG AUTHORITY	-$19,902
Tierney, John	BURLINGTON HSG AUTHORITY	-$64,244
Tierney, John	IPSWICH HSG AUTHORITY	-$15,639
Tierney, John	MERRIMAC HSG AUTHORITY	-$10,728
Tierney, John	NEWBURYPORT HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$65,924
Tierney, John	NORTH READING HSG AUTHORITY	-$20,622
Tierney, John	READING HSG AUTHORITY	-$78,514
Tierney, John	SAUGUS HSG AUTHORITY	-$98,010
Tierney, John	WILMINGTON HSG AUTHORITY	-$12,575
Turner, Michael	CLINTON METROPOLITAN HOUSING AUTH.	-$173,845
Udall, Mark	COLORADO SPRINGS HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$244,574
Udall, Tom	CUBA (VILLAGE OF) HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$4,011
Udall, Tom	GALLUP HSG AUTHORITY	-$30,461
Udall, Tom	HSG AUTH CITY OF ESPANOLA	-$111,478
Udall, Tom	MORA COUNTY HSG AUTHORITY	-$17,531
Udall, Tom	REGION II HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$2,337
Udall, Tom	SAN JUAN COUNTY HSG AUTHORITY	-$138,579
Udall, Tom	SANTA FE CIVIC HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$51,927
Udall, Tom	TUCUMCARI HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$18,684
Upton, Fred	BENTON HARBOR HSG. COMM.	-$103,572
Upton, Fred	BENTON TWNSHP. HSG. COMM.	-$64,581
Upton, Fred	DOWAGIAC HOUSING COMMISSION	-$46,618

Vacant	HA AUGUSTA	-$1,203,679
Vacant	MARIANA ISLANDS HOUSING CORP.	-$494,088
Visclosky, Peter	EAST CHICAGO HA	-$155,573
Visclosky, Peter	GARY HA	-$511,618
Walberg, Timothy	BATTLE CREEK HSG. COMM.	-$168,358
Walberg, Timothy	POTTERVILLE HOUSING COMMISSION	-$31,499
Walden, Greg	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF UMATILLA	-$6,003
Walden, Greg	JOSEPHINE HOUSING COMMUNITY DEV. COUNCIL	-$405,631
Walden, Greg	KLAMATH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$77,345
Walsh, James	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF NORTH SYRACUSE	-$137,710
Walsh, James	NEWARK HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$49,492
Walz, Timothy	ALBERT LEA HRA	-$109,764
Walz, Timothy	AUSTIN HRA	-$35,540
Walz, Timothy	FARIBAULT COUNTY HRA	-$11,164
Walz, Timothy	LE SUEUR COUNTY HRA	-$72,636
Walz, Timothy	MOWER COUNTY HRA	-$27,519
Walz, Timothy	NEW ULM EDA	-$11,850
Walz, Timothy	OLMSTED COUNTY HRA	-$40,815
Walz, Timothy	OWATONNA HRA	-$74,851
Walz, Timothy	PIPESTONE HRA	-$3,921
Walz, Timothy	WORTHINGTON HRA	-$116,679
Wamp, Zach	CHATTANOOGA H/A	-$2,512,956
Wamp, Zach	HA DAYTON	-$77,797
Wamp, Zach	HA OAK RIDGE	-$39,711
Waters, Maxine	CITY OF INGLEWOOD	-$778,548
Watson, Diane	CULVER CITY PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY	-$475,256
Watt, Melvin	TOWN OF EAST SPENCER HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$13,070
Watt, Melvin	HA THOMASVILLE	-$20,656
Watt, Melvin	HA WINSTON-SALEM	-$240,415
Watt, Melvin	NORTHWEST PIEDMONT CO OF GOV	-$144,518
Waxman, Henry	CITY OF SANTA MONICA	-$392,943
Welch, Peter	BRATTLEBORO HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$57,605
Welch, Peter	HARTFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$10,087
Welch, Peter	SPRINGFIELD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$4,065
Weldon, Dave	HOUSING & NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOP	-$39,176
Weldon, Dave	NW FLORIDA REGIONAL HA	-$403,073
Weller, Jerry	HA BLOOMINGTON	-$1,314
Weller, Jerry	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF JOLIET	-$1,111,858
Weller, Jerry	HSG AUTHORITY FOR LASALLE COUNTY	-$56,319
Weller, Jerry	KANKAKEE COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$404,193
Westmoreland, Lynn	H A CARROLLTON	-$17,498
Westmoreland, Lynn	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF NEWNAN	-$7,329
Whitfield, Ed	LAKE CUMBERLAND HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$140,728
Whitfield, Ed	MADISONVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$69,996
Whitfield, Ed	MAYFIELD HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$109,990
Whitfield, Ed	PADUCAH HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$241,818
Wilson, Charles	BELMONT METRO HSG AUTHORITY	-$12,229
Wilson, Charles	CITY OF MARIETTA	-$14,331
Wilson, Charles	GALLIA METRO HA	-$41,336
Wilson, Charles	JEFFERSON MHA	-$84,996
Wilson, Heather	BERNALILLO (TOWN OF) HSG AUTH	-$15,076
Wilson, Heather	MOUNTAINAIR HOUSING AUTHORITY	-$124,321
Wolf, Frank	LOUDOUN COUNTY HOUSING SERVICES	-$244,269
Wu, David	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF WASHINGTON	-$507,871
Wu, David	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF YAMHILL COUNTY	-$260,478
Wu, David	NORTHWEST OREGON HOUSING AGENCY	-$277,975
Young, Don	AK HSG FINANCE CORP	-$881,598

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. OBEY for yielding.

I have been against this war since day one, and I am outraged by the President's attempts to escalate it. I want this war to end now, and I want to bring our troops home immediately.

I mourn the loss of 3,228 Americans dead, and countless Iraqi civilians, and extend my deepest sympathies to the families. I repeat, I want this war to end, and I want to bring the troops home now.

Whether we like it or not, this bill before us is the first serious binding legislation to come before the House since the war began 4 years ago. This bill contains benchmarks and time lines for withdrawing our troops.

Even so, in my opinion, this bill does not go far enough. I think it should prohibit U.S. military action in Iran without explicit congressional authorization. But without this bill, the alternative is not acceptable. A supplemental without benchmarks is stay the course.

I have received thousands of letters from my district in support and opposition to this bill. The only way to bring the troops home is to vote ''yes.'' I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago, we gathered in this Chamber to debate what was called a symbolic resolution on the war in Iraq. I never subscribed to the notion it was symbolic because I believe any official act of this body has consequences. When Members speak, the world listens, friends and enemies alike.

Two weeks ago after that vote, I traveled again to Iraq and Afghanistan to observe conditions in these two fronts on the global war on terror and to meet again with our soldiers. I was the only Republican on the trip, but I view opportunities like these to travel to war zones with colleagues from the other side of the aisle as invaluable.

We all saw that the plans to stabilize Baghdad by reinforcing U.S. troops and integrating them with larger Iraqi units around the city are already under way. Our military commanders in Iraq are already executing their plans to clear, hold, and build; and early reports point towards some progress.

And yet tomorrow, in fact, we vote on a bill, portions of which could potentially affect the safety of our brave young soldiers in Iraq, the lives of millions of Iraqis, and damage our national interest in the Middle East and elsewhere. That is why I oppose this bill in its current form.

Every Member of this House, Republican and Democrat alike, should be working together to achieve some level of success in Iraq and to give our soldiers the dollars they need. We should not be tying the hands of our battlefield commanders, nor undercutting our brave soldiers and marines as they work to secure the peace as we debate here this afternoon and tomorrow.

Make no mistake about it, withdrawal from Iraq before that peace is better secured will have wide and important ramifications. We could potentially have an explosion of sectarian violence in Iraq, killing and bloodshed on a larger, more barbaric scale. Al Qaeda and other jihadists could get a new and more dangerous base of operations. The influence of Iran would grow. The Saudis and moderate Arab states themselves could be threatened. Turkey, a strong NATO ally, could be drawn into the war. And Iraq's neighbors could see even more waves of refugees.

Mr. Speaker, we are a Nation at war, and the stakes are extremely high for America. Our troops need this money now. They deserved it yesterday. But the Congress has decided to make them compete with nonmilitary, nonemergency, politically motivated spending.

We must give our commanders on the battlefield, and our brave young war fighters, the resources they need to protect themselves and fight the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join together to honor the service of these young men and women and to find a way forward in Iraq that protects our Nation and results in a stable Iraq that can govern and protect itself.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, by refusing to take responsibility for their failed policy in Iraq, the Bush administration has effectively forced Congress to intervene to bring it to a responsible end.

Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, Majority Whip CLYBURN, Chairman MURTHA and the Democratic leadership do deserve credit for recognizing this and for doing something that the Republican Congress refused to do over the last 4 years, namely, that is to confront the Bush administration over their failed policy and to commit to bring that policy to an end in Iraq.

But that is a very important step. However, for some of us the question of voting for funds to continue this war with strings attached and no real enforcement really does keep our troops in harm's way. I am disappointed we will not have the opportunity to vote on the Lee-Woolsey-Waters-Watson amendment which would fully fund the safe withdrawal of U.S. troops and contractors by December 31, 2007.

□ 1730

The American people want this, and I will continue to push to fully fund the safe withdrawal of our troops from Iraq and for timelines for withdrawal that are backed up, mind you, backed up by the appropriations power, and that is the power of the purse which the Constitution grants to the Congress. Too many lives have been lost, too many lives have been shattered.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), a member of our committee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, we should be standing together today in bipartisan support for our troops and for the resources they need to be successful in Iraq and the global war on terror. Instead, we have a proposal before us today that micromanages the war from Capitol Hill with ill-advised timelines for withdrawal that jeopardize our chances for success.

This plan is an unruly mess, bad public policy, bad precedent and bad politics. Those are not my words. They come from a Los Angeles Times editorial. The Times is right on target. The editorial goes on to say that by interfering with the discretion of the Commander in Chief and military leaders, ''Congress undermines whatever prospects remain of a successful outcome.''

The L.A. Times is a lot like most American people. They are unhappy with the war. They are unhappy with the way it has been waged, but they still want to give our generals and our troops the best chance for success. That is in stark contrast to the defeatism we see in this proposal today.

Some of our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle have quoted approvingly from the bipartisan Iraq Study Group. Here is a quote they have not used: ''The Study Group sets no timetables, and we set no guidelines. We believe that military commanders must have the flexibility to respond to events on the ground.''

The National Intelligence Estimate carries a strong warning against an early troop pullout. It said, ''If coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this estimate, we judge that this would almost certainly lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq.''

Despite these cautions, the proponents of this legislation are intent on taking us down a path that would lead to failure and defeat. Setting a date certain for withdrawing from Iraq is a dangerous idea. Our enemies will simply adjust their tactics and wait us out. The consequences of such a withdrawal will be far-reaching. It would signal defeat for the United States and embolden the terrorists in Iraq and throughout the world. It would enable Iraq to establish a beachhead in Iraq from which to operate, and it would be a catastrophe for the people of Iraq and the region.

There are signs that the new strategy is taking hold in Iraq. General Petraeus believes it will work, and he has our coalition forces engaged fully in this effort to succeed. It would be a grave and irresponsible mistake to undercut our soldiers by passing this measure before the strategy has time to be implemented.

The message we send here today should not be one to the terrorists to bide their time and wait for the U.S. to pull out. The message should be one of complete and total support for our troops and for an appropriation of the resources they need to succeed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Members what hurts our troops.

I found our troops, 44,000, without body armor. I found our troops with a shortage of jammers. I found our troops with a shortage of up-armored Humvees. I find our troops now, because of the policy, having to go back to Iraq before they have a year at home. I find our troops now because of the policy of this White House having to extend troops that have been there 13 months, and I find our troops having to go into combat untrained or not trained as well as they should, not going to the desert where they have this tremendous training area, going right into Iraq.

That is what hurts our troops. That is what hurts the morale of the troops when you send them without training, without the additional training they need, without the equipment they need and without the resources they need.

We are putting in the resources. If you vote against this bill, you are voting against the resources they need to go into combat.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a terrible bill. It is only allowed 4 hours of debate. We could have had more debate, but according to the Congress Daily P.M., the Speaker of the House is in New York City tonight at a fund-raiser. So we could have spent the time debating tonight. Instead, we are waiting until tomorrow and the time is limited.

Our soldiers are in need of our support, and they have sacrificed greatly and given their support to us, and they have kept us safe. We have been safe since September 11, 2001, but instead of providing only what the troops need in this bill, it funds domestic spending with $24 billion.

In addition in Title IX of this bill, the language will effectively deny our troop reinforcements or replacements. The language says that no unit may be deployed without being fully mission-capable. If this language were law during World War I, none of the troops would have been fully mission-capable, and we could not have deployed our troops to rescue Europe, and the world would be a very different place.

If this language had been law during World War II, our troops would not be fully mission-capable, and they would not have been available for the victories in D–Day or Iwo Jima, and the world would have been a very different place.

If this language were law during the Korean War, our troops would not have been able to leave the country because they were never fully mission-capable. They were using broken-down World War II equipment, and if they had not gone to rescue the South Koreans, the world would be a different place.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will not let our troops in Iraq receive the reinforcements and replacements they need, and let me tell you why.

To be fully mission-capable, there are three areas of judgment: personnel, equipment and training. Personnel, we can be fully mission-capable. We have the best soldiers in the world, and our units have the right number of people.

Training is a little more subjective. Most people say that they would be ready to be fully mission-capable. However, they do not train on the very same equipment that they use in the field. So there is some contention whether they are actually fully mission-capable or not. Some would say they are not, but definitely in the area of equipment we are not fully mission-capable. The reason: We take the best equipment we have and we put it in the field to protect or troops. We know it is the right thing to do, but our troops do not train on the same equipment they operate in the field. In fact, they could not leave the United States under this language. Right now, they go to Kuwait and they train on equipment. It is not the same equipment but it's close, it is not the same level of protection that they have when they get in field in Iraq. So they will never be fully mission-capable.

According to the Congress Daily A.M. this morning said Pentagon leaders have repeatedly told Capitol Hill they need additional war funds by the end of April. If they do not receive those funds by April, it will delay repairs, would exacerbate the readiness problem facing nondeployable units which already have equipment shortfalls. In other word, they would not be fully mission-capable, and the results of that, of not being fully mission-capable, is that our troops cannot receive the reinforcements and they cannot receive replacements. Our troops will be stuck in Iraq. Vote ''no'' on this bill.

The language in this bill ties the hands of our military, and it says that none of the troops that are in America today will ever have the ability to leave this country because they cannot be ''fully mission-capable.'' The Title IX language must be struck from the bill because it is very clear that if we do not strike the language, we cannot get any reinforcements out of the country, we cannot get any replacements out of the country, and therefore, our troops will be stuck in Iraq.

I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, and Chairman MURTHA have put together a very solid piece of legislation. This bill puts us on a path to end this war. This legislation holds the Iraqi Government accountable, and it holds President Bush accountable. Let us not forget, this is an Iraqi Government that refuses to pursue national reconciliation.

This bill takes President Bush's benchmarks and puts them into law. This is a bill about accountability. Others have said we are handcuffing, micromanaging. No, this is a bill about setting a policy to extract us from a misguided war.

I ask my colleagues, vote for this bill because it tells the Iraqis it is time for you to step up and defend your country.

I rise today in support of this important legislation and would like to thank Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA for their work in crafting this critically important bill. There are no easy choices to be made regarding Iraq, but the choices they have made are the right ones.

I believe there are two fundamental issues we must address concerning the on-going war in Iraq. First, we must provide the resources necessary for our troops on the ground so they can protect themselves and our allies. Second, we must redeploy them as soon as we can, and bring to an end American involvement in ill-conceived, poorly planned, and mismanaged war.

I believe this legislation achieves both of these goals. The bill provides more funding for the equipment and training of our troops than the President's request. It offers a new direction that promises to finally bring closure to our open-ended commitment in Iraq. And Mr. Speaker, this bill promises to give our returning troops the health care that they need, with the honor they deserve for honoring us with their service.

As the people's body, it is imperative that the House of Representatives listens to the will of the people. Equally important, it is imperative that the President listen to the will of the people.

After four years, $400 billion dollars, and the tragic loss of 3,200 service men and women, every survey of public opinion shows a clear majority of Americans disapprove of the President's handling of the Iraq War. And more Americans believe Congress, not the President, should be primarily responsible for setting policy in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, with passage of this legislation, we are taking the first steps to end our involvement in a war that currently has no end in sight.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and move us in a new direction in Iraq.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in opposition to the bill.

I want to say this: We have had a lot of good, sincere debates in the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations, but one of the things that, in our honest disagreement about, that we have not talked about as much is the effects that the surge has already had. I wanted to bring up some statistics.

The 4 weeks prior to the surge which began on February 15, we had 1,440 civilian deaths; since that time, 265. That is a reduction of about 500 percent.

In terms of bombings, prior to the surge, we had 163. Then from February to March, it is down to 102.

Similar with car bombings, down 35 percent from 56 to 36.

The surge is already showing a significant impact. Two-thirds of the Iraqis polled by a British polling firm, 5,000 people which were sampled, the largest poll in the history of Iraq, two-thirds of the people say they are better off now than they were under Saddam Hussein. Seventy-three percent say they are not in a civil war. Al-Maliki, the Prime Minister's approval rating has gone from 29 percent in September to 49 percent now.

We are making progress. We are not defending the status quo. We are changing the course, and the Petraeus plan needs to be given time to work, and that is very, very important.

The second point that I want to make is there are so many extracurricular things in the $23 billion in spending that have nothing to do with the war in Iraq. Now, I serve on the Ag Committee, and I want to mention some of those.

There is a $100 million increase in the PL–480 program, but there is not a single word of it in the report as to why this is justified, why this is considered an emergency, $100 million.

Secondly, we have $25 million in there for spinach recall. The USDA did what they were supposed to do, but I want you to know you are setting a precedent for recall. We are not in the product compensation business on recalls.

Finally, we have $5 million in the bill because of a Canadian fish import issue.

All of these things are good, debatable topics, but they do not belong in an emergency appropriation bill. I think they should come back through the committee process on regular order where we can have a good debate and look at them on a separate piece of legislation.

While some of the provisions I support, such as the peanut storage and handling provision and some type of agriculture disaster assistance, this bill is not the appropriate place for them to be considered.

Title II–P.L. 480 Grants—The bill contains $100,000,000 above the President's request for Title II–P.L. 480 Grants.

There is not a single word of explanation in the report as to what or where the additional funds are to be used for.

The President's request included $350,000,000 of which approximately $150,000,000 would go to Sudan and for populations in Chad affected by the violence in Darfur; $30,000,000 for Afghanistan; $95,000,000 for Southern Africa; and $75,000,000 for the Horn of Africa.

Just last month the Congress included $1,215 billion for this program in the Joint Resolution to fund this program for the remainder of fiscal year 2007.

The bill provides $140,000,000 in additional relief for loses related to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita of which $25,000,000 would go to provide additional compensation to livestock producers and $100,000,000 would go to provide additional compensation for citrus producers—it appears that these additional funds are included in the bill only for the reason of doubling the $80,000 payment that livestock and citrus producers have already received, taking their payments up to $160,000.

The need for agriculture disaster assistance has been debated for the last several months.

While disaster assistance is clearly needed in some areas of the country, this bill provides $25 million for spinach producers who had losses due to a nationwide spinach recall last fall.

The FDA did what is was supposed to do, and initiated the recall to protect consumers.

This assistance is unprecedented, and there will be pressure put on this Committee to compensate producers whenever other food products are recalled.

Can you imagine the cost if we get in the business of compensating producers for losses that they incur because of food recalls? The latest list of some of the food recalls from FDA and USDA include: bread; peanut butter; corn chips; olives; oysters; milk; fresh cut fruit; summer sausage; ground beef; and the list goes on.

The reason foods were recalled is because they presented a health risk to the public, and the FDA or the USDA did what they were supposed to do.

The bill includes $5,000,000 for compensation to aquaculture operations who may have incurred a loss due to a restriction on imports from certain fish from Canada.

The emergency order, put on by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, on these fish from Canada was due to outbreaks or potential outbreaks of a destructive pathogen responsible for several large-scale fish deaths in the Great Lakes region—the reason APHIS put the order in place was to protect aquaculture in the Great Lakes states, and somehow $5,000,000 makes it into this bill to compensate for possible losses without any justification. Where did this number come from?

Finally, there are no funds for USDA to administer any of the disaster assistance provisions in the bill that total nearly $4,500,000,000. Members are already reacting to proposed FSA office closures that are occurring all over the country. This will only exacerbate the problem.

IRAQI GOVERNMENT PROGRESS

According to the U.S. Embassy in Iraq, over the last 30 days they have seen important developments in the history of Iraq. The Iraqi government has taken steps to improve security, governance, economic development and economic opportunities.

Iraq's Prime Minister is actively leading the latest plan in Baghdad.

Prime Minister Maliki created six committees to oversee the non-security pieces of the Baghdad plan, with oversight of economic development, essential services, communications, community outreach and related functions.

Prime Minister Maliki's first trip to Anbar Province was a clear gesture and attempt to involve Sunni tribal sheiks into the government.

Anbar's tribal sheiks are switching allegiances away from the insurgents and towards the government of Iraq.

The tribal sheikhs have started providing police and army recruits to support stability in the region.

At the end of February, the Iraqi parliament's Council of Ministers passed a hydrocarbon law that outlines the equitable sharing of Iraq's oil wealth.

The Iraqi government hosted the Neighbors' Conference, the first international conference in Baghdad since 1990. The conference ended with regional and international partners pledging to fight terrorism and to enhance security in support of the goal of peace and security for the people of Iraq.

Iran and Syria along with Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Jordan, Turkey and the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council attended the conference.

MILITARY PROGRESS

SecDef stated (Mar 21) the deployment of Iraqi troops into Baghdad is right on schedule—10 brigades total.

Operational strength of the Iraqi Brigades in Baghdad has vastly improved.

First Brigade reported at 61 percent; Second came in at 65 percent; and the third came in at 85 percent. Other brigades on their way are reporting in the high 90s to more than 100 percent strength.

The problem was not related to fighting, but rather an issue with getting pay to families. Iraq does not have a financial system that provides for electronic transfer of monies—it is a cash transaction society. The Iraqi Government found that troops were trying to take money to their families and that is the reason they were absent.

They fixed the problem by paying deploying forces a bonus upfront so they could leave money with their families and not have to worry about them.

Overall, violence directed against Iraqi Civilians is down about one-third and murders/assassinations are down 50 percent.

Civilian deaths down more than 500 percent: mid-Feb to mid-March, 265; previous four weeks, 1,440.

Bombings down nearly 40 percent: mid-Feb to mid-March, 102; previous 4 weeks, 163.

Car bombs down nearly 35 percent: mid-Feb to mid-March, 36; previous 4 weeks, 56.

NOTES FROM SECDEF'S TALK AT ARMY CAUCUS—MAR 22

Active Army has met every retention and recruiting goal since 9/11

Need to grow Army and we're doing so by 7,000 a year

Vital to meet Active Army's goal of 1 year deployed and 2 years home; Guard/Reserve goal is 1 year deployed and 5 years home

Need to include Guard and Reserve in all of our plans

Modernization and putting them in Joint billets

We have programmed $46.4B for reset in FY 07/08

Modernization is also required—started $56B short

Need the FY07 Sup by April or we will have to take Draconian measures and begin to reprogram money, impacting all facets of the Army

Need $2B for BRAC this year and stated that we need to expedite the construction of the medical facility on Ft Belvoir and make Bethesda the premier medical facility

COMMONLY ASKED QUESTION IRAQ

Q: What is your view of the timetables and provisions that have been attached to the FY07 Supplemental?

A: It's important to elevate the level of debate. . . . question is how we incentiveize the Iraqi government. But, specific dates and strict conditionally would make it impossible for commanders to complete the mission.

Q: Do you think the operations in Iraq will be over on October 1?

A: Decisions need to be based by conditions on the ground. Setting a date tells your adversary all he has to do is wait. I think debate on the hill has been helpful; there is no military solution, it has to be a political solution and we are providing them the time they need.

Q: How is the deployment of Iraqi troops going? We have heard they are reporting at low strength rates?

A: In Afghanistan, there are about 12 financial centers that enable movement of money. Iraq has no such system yet, so troops have to take cash home to their families. First Brigades came in around 60 percent but other brigades are reporting in the high 90s to more than 100 percent strength. The problem was not related to fighting, but rather an issue with getting pay to families—troops were trying to take money to their families and that is the reason they were absent. They fixed the problem by paying deploying forces a bonus upfront so they could leave money with their families and not have to worry about them.

Q: Are we neglecting Afghanistan?

A: After I visited Afghanistan, I made the decision to extend the deployment of one Brigade and move the other Brigade in. We will be adding 3,400 trainers and overall about 6–7,000 soldiers. Britain and Australia are also providing more troops as we prepare for a Taliban offensive this spring. We think they may make a run at Khandahar and we want to hit them hard.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman talks about how we need to support General Petraeus. Let me quote from Thomas Friedman, who has had years of experience in understanding the Middle East. He said: I hope the Democrats under Speaker NANCY PELOSI keep pushing to set a deadline for withdrawal from Iraq because they are providing two patriotic services that the Republicans failed to offer in the previous 4 years. The first is policy discipline. The other useful function Speaker PELOSI and her colleagues are performing is to give the President and General David Petraeus, our Commander in Iraq, the leverage of a deadline without a formal deadline. How so? The surge cannot work without political reconciliation among Iraqi factions, which means Sunni-Shiite negotiations, and such negotiations are unlikely to work without America having the leverage of telling the parties that if they do not compromise, we will leave. Deadlines matter. At some point Iraqis have to figure this out themselves. Since Mr. Bush refuses to set a deadline, Speaker PELOSI is the next best thing. Do not underestimate how useful it is for General Petraeus to be.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire how much time we have on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 1 hour, 25½ minutes. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 1 hour, 28½ minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a member of the committee.

□ 1745

Mr. WAMP. I thank the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, for over 12 years in this House and over 10 years on the Appropriations Committee, I have worked really hard to try to be fair, bipartisan, cooperative.

I have to say, though, here today that campaign rhetoric is one thing but when the rubber meets the road on this huge, important bill to have this kind of a process in this kind of a bill is not right. To have over $21 billion of extraneous spending added to this bill, under a closed rule, which is not the regular way here in the House, especially on appropriations, and, frankly, to then even violate your own budget rules is not right.

I have to say that first. It is kind of insider talk, but it is important to know that this is not the regular order and not the way this should be done.

Then I respect all the Members in this House that have served in the military, and I respect so much the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his expertise here. But I disagree that if you vote against this bill, you are not supporting the troops, and you are not supporting the veterans, because I am going to do both, and I always do both.

I do believe that this bill needs to be changed dramatically. I hope to serve on the conference committee, and I hope that the product that comes back from the conference committee is very different, that it is more about supporting the troops and not all these extra things, and that we don't micromanage the war through the appropriations process.

Now, let me also say this. When the President said mission accomplished, he was talking about removing Saddam Hussein. We agreed as a Congress, over half the Democrats in the Senate voted to do it, almost half the Democrats in the House voted to remove Saddam Hussein. I wish that wouldn't have sent the signal that it was accomplished because the mission wasn't accomplished. The mission is not accomplished, and the mission may not be accomplished in August of 2008.

As a matter of fact, this threat is not going away. One thing I know a lot about is this threat of jihadism. I have read 20 books. I have been to lectures. We cannot retreat from this threat. We must stand against this threat.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this week Congress takes up its obligation to finally change course in Iraq. This week as we enter the fifth year of the Iraq war, more than 3,200 American lives have been lost, tens of thousands more are wounded, and sectarian violence threatens to spill over into the entire Middle East with no prospect for a stable, constitutional democracy in Iraq in sight. We must judge this war not for what we wish it were, but for what it has so clearly and tragically become, a mistake of historic proportions.

I believe America should be sending a clear signal by beginning to reduce our troop levels now so the Iraqi Government takes responsibility and diplomacy can begin for real. I support phased redeployment over the next year and will seek every opportunity to mandate such change in law. Let us serve our men and women fighting overseas and recognize their sacrifices by charting a new course in Iraq.

By voting for this supplemental appropriations bill, we vote for accountability in Iraq. We vote to force a change in policy and in law, requiring a phased, responsible redeployment of our troops over 12 to 18 months. There are too many lives at stake here, and, personally, I have crossed the Rubicon on this war.

Regardless of whether this bill is blocked by a filibuster from Senate Republicans or a threatened veto from President Bush, we must support this bill today. Passing this bill in the House will be the first formal act, the first step toward requiring a new course in Iraq. We all know our troops will do anything their country asks. But let us make sure their courage and their sacrifices advance a mission that enhances our security and our interests.

We need to begin reducing our troops and pursuing a new strategy in order to achieve a stable Iraq, a peaceful Middle East, and a more secure America.

That is our obligation. Let us honor it by voting in favor of this supplemental bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Illinois, the ranking member of the subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, RAY LAHOOD.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1591.

The bill is a bonanza for numerous factions of the majority party and many special interest groups. You want an increase in the minimum wage? If you pass this bill, it is done. You want agricultural disaster relief that occurred more than 2 years ago? You pass this bill, it gets done. You want billions of dollars for homeland security initiatives without going through the regular process? Pass this bill, and it is done.

Let me be clear, I supported an increase in the minimum wage, and I

supported it in the appropriations committee last year. I have voted to support relief for our farmers, and I do believe we have to increase our ability to secure airports and our ports, but not through this bill.

I do want to say a word of support and thanks to Chairman MURTHA and Chairman OBEY for highlighting Walter Reed and sending a message that we are not going to close the hospital. We are going to keep it open. We are going to fix it up. We are going to provide the money. That was an important provision in this bill.

I have constituents who are leaving Illinois shortly and will soon be back in harm's way. I have never voted against legislation that provided funding for them to safely execute their missions. I trust they recognize what is happening here tonight. They know that we will always work to give them the resources they need, but we will not undercut their efforts by telling our enemies that the United States does not have the fortitude nor the political will to continue our support for the Iraqi people and their government.

What is the benefit to giving our enemies a troop withdrawal date that they can circle on their calendar? Why would we give them the aid and comfort of knowing that if they continue their attacks for just 11 more months, the U.S. military will leave Iraq, and it will be under their control?

We must pass a clean supplemental that is focused on meeting military needs. We must quit. We must quit being 435 Commanders in Chief and allowing our military leaders on the ground in Iraq to continue to use their skills and expertise to prosecute the war free of political interference. We must acknowledge that the needs of our men and women in uniform are more important than deals made here, campaign sound bites and political grandstanding. We must remember those who sacrificed so much for this war effort and allow their fellow soldiers to continue the mission.

We have a job to do here. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bloated, misguided bill and return our focus to where it should have been all along, the needs of our troops.

Even with $25 billion in extraneous, nonemergency spending added to sweeten the pot, a big problem remains. You can dress it up all you want, but Members, regardless of party affiliation, know a bad bill when they see it. Leadership may be able to lard up this bill to gain votes, but apparently it hasn't been enough because they still don't have the votes.

I am very disappointed, but not surprised, that really surprised, that we are operating here today under a closed rule. I know Members of both parties would like to be able to offer amendments to try to salvage this legislation, but too many arms have been twisted and too many promises have been made to allow any changes now. One amendment passes, and the whole bill unravels. Apparently, one vote, up or down, is all you get when you consider a $125 billion package.

Let me be clear. I support an increase in the minimum wage. I support providing relief to farmers when disaster strikes. I support increased funding to improve the airport security process. However, none of these things is worth my supporting a bill that I truly believe will put the lives of our troops in danger.

During the Appropriations Committee markup of this bill last week, Chairman MURTHA included in his Manager's amendment the text of my amendment that prohibits the use of funds to close the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. I am grateful for his assistance about this issue that I consider to be vital to the care of our returning wounded military personnel. But even the inclusion of my own amendment in this bill is not enough to make me hold our troops in combat hostage to political grandstanding.

It is unconscionable to me that this House assumes that we can manage the war better than our military leaders. We cannot stand here in the protected environment of the House Chamber and tie the hands of our President and our combatant commanders on the ground in Iraq. We cannot promise our troops the operational money they need to safely do their jobs while announcing their withdrawal date to our enemies. Congress cannot and must not micromanage the war effort.

I have constituents who are leaving Illinois shortly and will soon be back in harm's way. I have never voted against any legislation that provided funding for them to safely execute their missions. I trust that they recognize what is happening here today. They know that I will always work to give them the resources they need, but I will not undercut their efforts by telling our enemies that the United States does not have the fortitude or political will to continue our support for the Iraqi people and their new government.

What is the benefit to giving our enemies a troop withdrawal date that they can circle on a calendar? Why would we give them the aid and comfort of knowing that if they continue their attacks for just 11 more months, the U.S. military will leave and Iraq will be theirs to control?

If enough votes are gained and enough arms are twisted and this legislation reaches the President's desk, he will veto it, with my strong support. Our troops will suffer while the majority continues to try to unite their deeply divided caucus. Our troops will continue their missions as best they can, but how long do you plan on making them wait for the funding they need?

We must pass a clean supplemental that focuses on meeting military needs. We must quit trying to be 435 Commanders-in-Chief and allow our military leaders on the ground in Iraq to continue to use their skill and expertise to prosecute the war, free of political interference. We must acknowledge that the needs of our men and women in uniform are more important than backroom deals, campaign sound bites, and political grandstanding. We must remember those who sacrificed so much for this war effort and allow their fellow soldiers to continue their mission.

We have a job to do here. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bloated, misguided bill and return our focus to where it should have been all along: the needs of our troops.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. One of the Members said, how many less Iraqis have been killed? I don't know how many less Iraqis we killed. I know 62 individual American soldiers or marines have been killed this last month.

I want to say about equipment, I have got a chart here with the Army National Guard. Every single National Guard unit in this Nation, all 50 States, doesn't have the Humvees they need.

Every State, they don't have the 7-ton trucks they need. Every State, they don't have other equipment, the equipment they need for jammers and so forth.

When you say they are training on equipment and are not fully trained, they don't have the equipment to train on. This bill provides that. When you vote against this bill, you are voting against the extra money to fix that problem.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for 2½ minutes the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. HUNTER of California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to address my good friend, Mr. MURTHA, who pointed out that there was a shortage of Humvees back here, particularly up-armored Humvees. Well, let me show you how many Humvees we had at the end of the Clinton administration: up-armored Humvees, zero.

We didn't have any up-armored Humvees for the National Guard to train on, for the Army to train on, for the National Guard to deploy or for the Army to deploy. We had zero. Actually, we had 1,300 at the end of 2000, 1,300. We now have 18,400 up-armored Humvees. We have got roughly 15 times as many up-armored Humvees as we had at the end of the Clinton administration.

Now, let me remind my colleagues how much body armor we had at the end of the Clinton administration, body armor. If I hear another parent call up because they are listening to this debate and they are listening to information which is erroneous, I think it is important for us to remind them, there was nobody armored at the end of the Clinton administration, not one stitch of bulletproof armor at the end of the Clinton administration. Today there are just under 1 million sets of body armor for our troops.

Now, let's talk about what we didn't fund in this bill. We didn't fund the ambush protection vehicles to the full extent that the Army asked for. The Army asked for $4.75 billion worth of ambush protection vehicles. Those are vehicles with the V-shaped hulls so that land mines will be deflected and they have strong enough sides so that IEDs will be deflected.

Now, my colleagues, I will tell you why everybody, Democrats and Republicans, should vote against this particular supplemental, and it is because of one of the restrictions that is placed

on this. There is a 15-day notice and wait period in this bill that says that no unit can deploy until notice is given 15 days before that deployment. We have not done that since our birth as a Nation, saying you can't deploy reinforcements, you can't deploy an emergency unit. It could be a bomb-clearing unit; it could be an IED unit. It could be a medical unit. You can't deploy it for the men and women of the Armed Forces who are engaged in combat until 15 days have expired. We have gone over this with the lawyers and they say it is a 15-day notice and waiver. You can't do it.

Vote ''no'' on this very bad, very defective bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can have charts, but the charts don't change facts. I would also observe that the important thing is not what happened 7 or 8 years ago. The important thing is what we are going to do today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, in Kosovo we had 30,000 sorties. We never lost one person to combat in Kosovo. Let me read the figures for you in 2001. All active duty Army divisions were rated highest readiness level. Do you know what they are today? Almost all are rated lowest level. Every National Guard unit today is rated the lowest level.

Mr. Speaker, we could not deploy our ground forces overseas for any threat. Our national security has been significantly increased because the depletion of our strategic reserve, our national strategic reserve. We got a problem here. We are trying to fix the problem. If you vote against this, you are voting against helping us to restore the equipment that we have lost in this country.

Mr. HUNTER. Would the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. MURTHA. I will yield.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for the courtesy of yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say we took a 1999 101st Airborne battalion. We compared them today with the 100,000 pieces of new equipment that they have got. The 1999 Airborne Battalion today, if it was rated C–1 in 1999, would be rated unready today, not because they are not good warfighters or capable, but because there is brand-new equipment. If you don't have your flu shot, you are rated unready for combat.

Mr. MURTHA. I take my time back.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MURTHA. Let me just say to the gentleman from California, when President Clinton was President, Bush as a candidate was running against him. He said, look, you are not ready to go to war. He said, two entire divisions of the Army would not have had to report until they are ready.

Let me tell you what it would be today. Almost no division in the United States is ready to report for duty if we had to send them out someplace else to a national threat. That is the difference today. Today we are trying to fix this. Today we put money in the bill to fix this.

Mr. HUNTER. Would the gentleman yield just briefly?

Mr. MURTHA. Yes.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman.

I think the gentleman would agree that 28,000 up-armored Humvees today is a lot better than the 1,300 that we had before. The body armor, you have 1 million sets of body armor today, much better than we had before.

Mr. MURTHA. The gentleman has to realize, we put it in. They didn't ask for much of this. I found the 44,000 shortage of body armor. I found the shortage of Humvees. We came back, and we put it in. BILL YOUNG, JERRY LEWIS and I put it in. The Armed Services is the one that is causing the problem.

Mr. HUNTER. The Armed Services Committee put in 10,000 jammers.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. Again, we can debate yesterday until the cows come home. What Mr. MURTHA and I are trying to focus on is what we do in this bill today to make tomorrow better for our servicemen and our country. That is the issue, and that is the issue that this bill tries to address.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. HOEKSTRA, the ranking member of the Intel Committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, a bill that burdens our troops with conditions and dangerous timetables while simultaneously rewarding politicians with heaping helpings of pork.

□ 1800

Providing full funding to our troops standing in the breach in the war against militant radical Islamists should be easy, and it should come without strings attached.

The bill before us today sends a terrible message to our brave men and women in the Armed Forces, those who are serving our Nation in harm's way, and gives radical jihadists vital intelligence on potential future troop plans and intentions of the U.S. rather than offering a clean bill with emergency funding for our troops in combat, or allowing an up-or-down vote on the Sam Johnson bill that pledges Congress will not cut off funds for our troops on the front lines.

We are being forced to consider a muddled supplemental, replete with pork-barrel spending, risky timetables and other items that do nothing to ensure America's success in the long-term war against radical militant Islam.

Rather than the House debating how to win the war against radical militant Islam, with a focus on the current fronts in Iraq and Afghanistan, we are engaged in political theater and not debating national security.

The bill before us ties the hands of our military commanders with timetables and measurements that supposedly force troop withdrawal, yet the bill before us contains provisions for targeting al Qaeda and training Iraqi security forces that could leave thousands of troops behind without the authority or the funding to take the fight to enemy insurgents. This is not a good plan. It is not a good place to be. Let's be committed to defeating radical militant Islam, and let's do it today. Vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. MURTHA is right; it wasn't Bill Clinton that sent our troops into Iraq without appropriate equipment and without a plan to win the peace, it was the Bush administration. The war against Saddam Hussein was over in a few weeks, yet for over 3 years they have been trapped in a deadly crossfire of an Iraqi war. This bill is not micromanaging the war, it is the next logical step as Congress rediscovers its voice and its constitutional responsibility as a coequal branch of government.

This weekend 15,000 Oregonians made clear that this day cannot happen too soon. This is hard for me. I have never voted for a supplemental appropriation on this war, but I will vote tomorrow for the first enforceable deadline. It is what Americans want, and it is what our troops and their families deserve.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for 2¼ minutes.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Democrats' supplemental appropriations measure currently before this House.

I am extremely disappointed before at the dramatically different tack this Democratic leadership has taken with regard to the emergency war supplemental.

Congress, instead of acting on a supplemental request that would support our troops, has introduced legislation to withdraw our troops. This bill, by attempting to micromanage the war on terror and implement a congressional war strategy, will tie the hands of the generals in the field.

Frankly, this bill crosses into dangerous territory for Congress. For if this bill passes, its supporters will have decided to take over war strategy, and we will have 535 Commanders in Chief. This is wrong for America's national security, and it is wrong for the troops serving bravely overseas.

Our troops deserve better than this, Mr. Speaker. And under a Republican leadership in the House, our troops got

the funding they needed without the gimmicks found in this bill. They deserve for this House and this Congress to stand ready to assist them by providing the resources needed for victory.

And let me be perfectly clear, I will not support legislating the micromanagement of this war from Capitol Hill. Members of Congress cannot and should not legislate defeat by passing this ill-conceived measure. And the Democrat leadership has decided to play politics by tying more than $31.5 billion in domestic spending provisions into a bill to secure votes.

Sure there are many domestic provisions in the underlying bill that I wholeheartedly agree with. For example, I fought side by side in bipartisan fashion for extension of the MILC program. And our cold winters in western New York make LIHEAP essential for our communities. But the House deserves the opportunity to make these domestic programs through regular order, not by discussing them as emergency spending.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we have a choice to make, a choice to support our troops by giving them the resources they need, or a choice to pay lip service to our soldiers and make generals and Commanders in Chief out of the 535 Members of Congress.

The right choice is obvious; and hopefully the Members of this body have the courage and the integrity to make that choice, support our troops. Vote ''no.''

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Thank you, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act.

For the past 4 years, the previous leadership in this Congress has given the President a blank check for his misguided and mismanaged war in Iraq. That war has taken the lives of more than 3,200 of our brave troops, wounded tens of thousands more; countless Iraqis have died.

Congress refused to fulfill its constitutional obligation for oversight and its moral obligation to end the war. So today, we take the first step toward meeting those duties.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed the Iraq war from the beginning; I voted against it in 2002. And as a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I want to bring our troops home sooner than the fall of 2008. But tomorrow, with this bill, we all will make a decision. Either we will continue to give this President a blank check in Iraq on a never-ending war, or we will have established a responsible timetable for withdrawing our troops. Bring this war to an end. The choice is clear for me, I will vote to bring this war to an end.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to yield 2 minutes to the marine from the Armed Services Committee, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened and, frankly, appalled that today in this House of Representatives we are debating a bill to put ''retreat and defeat'' into law at a time when we have our young men and women engaged in combat. There are many things, Mr. Speaker, which affect the morale of men and women in uniform and men and women in combat, but putting into law mandating their defeat is certainly one of them.

Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 2007, General Petraeus addressed the soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines and civilians under his command in a short letter. In that letter, General Petraeus explained quite clearly that ''the way ahead will not be easy. There will be difficult times in the months to come. But hard is not hopeless, and we must remain steadfast to help improve security for the Iraqi people.''

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes hard hopeless.

As a 25-year veteran of the Marine Corps and the father of a soldier recently returned from Iraq, it is with great hardship that I now oppose this emergency supplemental. This supplemental does not support our military; it undermines the best opportunity to prevent the dire predictions of our Intelligence Community when they put out that NIE saying that this course of action which will be driven by this bill will increase sectarian violence, cause massive civilian casualties, create a terror safe haven and a potential for wider conflict that would draw in other regional powers.

Again, General Petraeus said, in talking to his soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, ''Success will require discipline, fortitude and initiative, qualities that you have in abundance.'' Would that we have more of that here.

FEBRUARY 10, 2007.

TO THE SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AIRMEN, MARINES, AND CIVILIANS OF MULTI-NATIONAL FORCE—IRAQ:

We serve in Iraq at a critical time. The war here will soon enter its fifth year. A decisive moment approaches. Shoulder-to-shoulder with our Iraqi comrades, we will conduct a pivotal campaign to improve security for the Iraqi people. The stakes could not be higher.

Our task is crucial. Security is essential for Iraq to build its future. Only with security can the Iraqi government come to grips with the tough issues it confronts and develop the capacity to serve its citizens. The hopes of the Iraqi people and the coalition countries are with us.

The enemies of Iraq will shrink at no act, however barbaric. They will do all that they can to shake the confidence of the people and to convince the world that this effort is doomed. We must not underestimate them.

Together with our Iraqi partners, we must defeat those who oppose the new Iraq. We cannot allow mass murderers to hold the initiative. We must strike them relentlessly. We and our Iraqi partners must set the terms of the struggle, not our enemies. And together we must prevail.

The way ahead will not be easy. There will be difficult times in the months to come. But hard is not hopeless, and we must remain steadfast in our effort to help improve security for the Iraqi people. I am confident that each of you will fight with skill and courage, and that you will remain loyal to your comrades-in-arms and to the values our nations hold so dear.

In the end, Iraqis will decide the outcome of this struggle. Our task is to help them gain the time they need to save their country. To do that, many of us will live and fight alongside them. Together, we will face down the terrorists, insurgents, and criminals who slaughter the innocent. Success will require discipline, fortitude, and initiative—qualities that you have in abundance.

I appreciate your sacrifices and those of your families. Now, more than ever, your commitment to service and your skill can make the difference between victory and defeat in a very tough mission.

It is an honor to soldier again with the members of the Multi-National Force—Iraq. I know that wherever you serve in this undertaking you will give your all. In turn, I pledge my commitment to our mission and every effort to achieve success as we help the Iraqis chart a course to a brighter future.

Godspeed to each of you and to our Iraqi comrades in this crucial endeavor.

DAVID H. PETRAEUS,
General, United States Army Commanding.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. I first want to commend Speaker PELOSI for her leadership and tenacity, for doing the right thing for America; to Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA for working together to bring this bill to the floor.

In my 30 years of public service, this is probably one of the most difficult votes I will make, but it is the right vote. I will vote ''yes'' to support the supplemental.

This war has lasted longer than World War I and World War II. More than 3,200 young men and women have lost their lives, over 30,000 amputees and the like, mental health services that we don't yet know we will have to endure from this ill-advised war.

It is a good supplemental. Is it perfect? No. But it does begin to change course, to change course that this Nation needs that we begin to invest in America, to take care of our children, to bring our soldiers home. I wish we could bring them home tomorrow, but there is a process, and this bill begins that process by using the President's own benchmarks that the Iraqis would rise up and take care of their own country, their own people. This is a civil war; we ought not be in it.

I ask you to vote ''yes'' on the supplemental.

The Americans who live in the 13th Congressional District of Michigan want our women and men in our military home now. As a Member of Congress who has opposed the war from the very beginning, so do I. In my three decades of public service to the citizens of Michigan and all Americans, this is one of the most difficult votes I have had to cast as an elected official.

As you know, I voted against the resolution authorizing the use of force in Iraq. I did not support the pretext nor the context for our involvement in Iraq. I felt then, and I feel now, that we did not exhaust all of our diplomatic,

political or military options. Regrettably, I have been proven correct.

In January of this year, we will have been involved in Iraq longer than we have been involved in World War I and longer than we were involved in World War II. We will have lost over 3,200 lives, over 25,000 women and men wounded and maimed, and over $500 billion dollars in a conflict that, as of today, is only getting worse and worse day by day. I want our women and men fighting in Iraq home now.

Three decades of public service teaches you that Americans do not do revolutions, Americans do evolutions. As steadfast, as earnest, as honest as I, and the vast majority of my constituents, want our troops home immediately, I support this bill and will support this bill enthusiastically. Why? This bill does three things—first, it finally establishes and demands that the President of the United States be held accountable for our troops in Iraq and how our tax dollars are being spent. Second, it has a deadline for our troops to come home. Third, it provides some emergency support for some of the programs decimated by the permanent tax cuts for the rich and by the fiscal demands of the war.

As my colleagues who have been to battle in Iraq and who have borne the burden of war and its concomitant issues, I am not merely anti-war; I am anti-failure. This bill will get our women and men home, and it will require that Iraqis bear the responsibility for ultimately managing the country that is theirs.

Under this bill, the President will have to send troops to war under the same rules, regulations and guidelines established by the Pentagon. Rules that say that troops need adequate rest between tours of duty. Rules that say that no soldier or Marine will be sent without adequate training, equipment, or supplies. Rules that allow infantry commanders to have the final say in the welfare and safety of their troops. If the President chooses not to follow these long-established rules, he is to let Congress and the American people know why not following these rules is a national emergency.

Under this bill, accountability is demanded from contractors who are in Iraq. It cuts all of their contracts by ten percent, to allow Congress to see if taxpayer dollars are being spent on what these contractors say they are. For four years, there has been no accountability, no oversight, no responsibility in how the $500 billion that has been spent in Iraq—currently, we are spending an estimated eight billion dollars per month in Iraq—and finally, this bill establishes that accountability. As a Member of the august Appropriations Committee, this is not only my privilege, but my responsibility, to all of the taxpayers of America.

Under this bill, by July 1, 2007, the President must certify that Iraq is making meaningful and substantial progress in meeting political and military benchmarks, including a militia disarmament program and a plan that equitably shares oil revenues among all Iraqis. If the President does not provide this certification then U.S. forces must begin an immediate redeployment to be completed no later than December 2007, or 180 days.

This bill does not ignore the fact that it is everyday Americans who have also paid a price for this war. Senior citizens who could go without heat in the winter or air conditioning in the summer. Children who could go without health care. And it has been 191 days since Katrina landed, and over half of the houses, hospitals and businesses have still not been rebuilt. As much of an emergency as Iraq is, these are equally important emergencies.

I requested that the Committee add $1 billion in funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP); along with the Chairman, I was able to get $400 million. I requested that the Committee add $1 billion in funding to rebuild houses in the Gulf region; the Committee was able to commit $2.9 billion to Katrina relief. The bill also ensures the long term health of our warriors at home and abroad. It adds funds for those veterans who are disabled by Post Traumatic Stress Disorder; it provides for the hiring of more staffers at the Veterans Administration to speed up medical claims; it ensures that those veterans who have severe brain injuries have the therapy and care that they need; and it makes sure that Walter Reed Hospital remains open and that Walter Reed, as well as other VA hospitals, receives the funds they need to take care of our warriors.

Thirty years as a legislator will teach you that no bill is perfect, and that compromise and negotiation is the hallmark of this country. If this bill fails, the President is further empowered to do what he has been doing for the past 4 years—a process of failed promises, fratricide among warring factions in Iraq, and fomenting doom. Compromising your tactics is not compromising your principles. My principle is to bring all of our troops home as soon as possible; end this war; and rebuild America's reputation as the standard for human rights, freedom and dignity.

It seems ludicrous to this Member of Congress that our President has threatened to veto legislation that contains his own benchmarks for success in Iraq, ensures our troops have the training they need, and supports our veterans. For months, conservative and Republican commentators and elected officials asked "what is the Democratic plan for Iraq"? Ladies and gentlemen, this is that plan. While Democrats have offered a plan to support our troops and change direction in Iraq, Republicans are preparing to oppose legislation that funds protection and equipment for our troops and supports our veterans. Instead of working to change direction in Iraq, opponents to this bill are turning their backs on our troops and our veterans, and backing the stay-the-course strategy in Iraq.

I am a warrior for peace. I am a supporter of our women and men who serve our military throughout the world. I will vote for this bill because it provides emergency help to our Nation's senior citizens and children, who have borne a different burden from this war; it brings our troops home; and it demands, for the first time in four years, accountability, credibility, and responsibility from our President.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this and so many other issues affecting our national defense throughout his career in Congress.

I rise in opposition to this supplemental bill because, simply put, it is fiscally irresponsible and constitutionally flawed.

Mr. Speaker, emergency war spending bills should be about emergency war spending. This bill, with $124 billion in spending, only includes $111 billion in spending that is actually related to the war on terror in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

Thirteen billion dollars in this legislation will be spent on unrelated domestic spending; $25 million for spinach, $125 million for shrimp, $75 million for peanuts, $5 million for shellfish. That is not a war spending bill, that is the salad bar at Denny's.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that with the deadlines for withdrawal, retreat and defeat, this bill is constitutionally flawed. Congress can declare war. Congress can choose to fund or choose not to fund military operations. But from the very inception of this Nation, no truth has been more evident, Congress cannot conduct war. In fact, the fear of war by committee was debated and rejected in Philadelphia in 1787.

The Democrats have a plan to end the war. Our Commander in Chief has a plan to win the war. The problem with the Democrat plan is, as Orwell said, "The quickest way to end a war is to lose it."

Let's reject the Democrat plan for withdrawal, retreat and defeat. Let's give our soldiers a clean bill, no pork, no strings attached, and let's unite this Nation behind our Commander in Chief's plan to win a victory for freedom in Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 minute.

I would say to the gentleman who just spoke, for the last 4 years we have tried it your way. For the last 4 years we have had a Congress that did whatever George Bush wanted it to do, rubber-stamp, lock-step all the way.

Today is different. Today we have a Congress that is responding to what the public asked for in the last election. What you are seeing today is the new world of checks and balances. Get used to it. It is what the public asked for, and it is what they are going to get out of this Congress.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call upon the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 2 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the House is poised to vote on legislation that, if passed, will cripple our foreign policy for many years to come and place our troops and all American citizens in great danger. It is a bill that seeks to abandon the Iraqi people, that seeks to abandon our closest friends and allies in the Middle East, leaving them to fend for themselves against radical Islamic militant jihadists. It is a bill that provides a roadmap for the insurgents, giving them a detailed account of the benchmarks they need to focus on in order to ensure an American withdrawal from Iraq.

Regardless of victory or failure, this bill demands withdrawal from Iraq. It

demonstrates very little confidence in the ability of our troops to get the job done in Iraq and defeat the terrorists there.

My stepson Doug and my daughter-in-law Lindsey have served proudly as marine fighter pilots in Iraq, and Lindsey will soon head back to another tour of duty in Iraq. They do not believe that you can separate the soldier from the mission. They do not believe that we have an option to simply walk away. Doug and Lindsey and many others like them do not want Congress to add to the burdens and the dangers that they face by legislating restrictions, deadlines and arbitrary instructions that only benefit the enemy.

The obvious danger of this legislation has been demonstrated by the desperate measures that the majority has resorted to in order to overcome fierce resistance in their own caucus. An emergency war funding measure should not be used to pay for programs that benefit narrow, favored constituencies.

I doubt that this ambition by the majority to micromanage the war will be their last attempt. Are they envisioning assuming command and control of the positioning and movement of our troops; of setting daily targets for air strikes; of determining our negotiation strategy with allies and opponents?

□ 1815

Perhaps a war room should be set up outside this Chamber so that they can make it easier to offer instructions on the battlefield.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. OBEY for yielding me this time. I want to thank Mr. MURTHA for his leadership. And I assure them that I agree with them in principle. I just disagree in process.

The American public knows a simple truth: you cannot be against this war and vote for $100 billion to continue it.

The Democrats were elected in November because, as recent polls consistently show, the American people want us, are actually expecting us and are demanding of us that we, the Congress, bring our troops home as soon as possible. They do not trust the President to do the right thing. They want us to hold him accountable. The public didn't elect Democrats to bring our troops home in 2008. They elected us to be bold, to bring our troops home now.

Let me make myself very clear. I will not stop, I will not rest and I will not back down in my fight until every last American soldier is home safely with their families.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this irresponsible spending bill.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our brave service men and women who are fighting for freedom and democracy in Iraq to make sure that they are the best equipped and most successful troops in the world. While the Democrats would have you believe that this legislation does just that, it couldn't be further from the truth.

This supplemental is a prescription for defeat in Iraq by tying the hands of our military leaders and setting a date certain for withdrawing our troops. If we fail in Iraq, the resources now devoted by terrorist organizations and nations sponsoring terrorism there would be turned to spreading terror around the globe, including, again, on American soil.

It is through the hard work and sacrifice of our American troops that the ideals of freedom continue to be spread. We owe them the resources they need to complete their mission, but this bill does not meet that threshold.

Mr. Speaker, I am also alarmed that the Democrats are treating a wartime, let me repeat, wartime funding bill as a collection cup for pet projects.

Many Members have already mentioned the litany of pet projects in the bill, so I do not need to repeat these so-called domestic emergency spending provisions. I would like to mention, though, how ridiculous this bill must seem to troops and their families listening or watching us on C–SPAN.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how I will respond when asked by constituents why funding for some $15 billion in pet projects is necessary when attempting to fund the global war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that some of these extraneous provisions may be worth examining, but how would we know? We did not hold oversight hearings on these issues and have, therefore, abdicated our responsibility to the taxpayer. If there is a problem, I am sure we can make the necessary fixes in regular order.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this legislation and fund our troops with a clean supplemental bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), the caucus vice chairman.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I commend Chairman OBEY, Chairman MURTHA, and Speaker PELOSI for putting it before us today.

I come here also to speak to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. With all sincerity, no one questions your patriotism or love of country. And yet we hear you come down here and belittle the proposal that we have before us and call Democrats defeatists, when it is you who have surrendered your judgment. You surrendered that judgment when you didn't listen to Scowcroft or Eagleberger or Baker or Kissinger or even Powell or Shinseki.

When you don't listen to the generals or even the soldiers in the field, you mock men when they stand up here and in principle, like JACK MURTHA, who you know have always stood on behalf of the troops of this country, and today offers more than $4 billion more that the President has put forward. But because of your blind, myopic allegiance to a failed policy, you have surrendered your judgment to what is the right thing.

Chairman DREIER asked us what is victory. Victory is joining with us in this proposal. Victory is once again standing on the Capitol steps hand in hand, as we all were against the war in Afghanistan, and once again fighting terrorists by going after the guys who actually took down the buildings, who hit the Pentagon.

Stand with us in the war against terrorism. End this God-awful situation in Iraq. Provide the Iraqis with the back bone that they need to stand up by giving them the tough love and the deadlines that this legislation requires.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could I ask how much time we have remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida). The gentleman from California has 1 hour and 6½ minutes. And the gentleman from Wisconsin has 1 hour and 16 minutes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a distinguished graduate of the University of Wisconsin and featured in the Wisconsin alumni magazine.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the fine chairman of our Appropriations Committee, and say he would know that because he also is featured in the same magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this first counteroffensive to the Bush administration's reckless approach to the global war on terrorism that has yielded an Iraqi civil war, over 3,200 U.S. dead, nearly 25,000 injuries, the evaporation of the coalition of the willing, tens of thousands of dead Iraqis, growing terrorism, hatred of America across the Islamic world, and shock and dismay among America's closest democratic allies globally.

The Bush administration has no answers. In fact, their budgets for this war reveal how lost at sea they are. Every single year they have asked for more in emergency add-ons than they planned to spend in the base budget bill itself.

Yet our brave troops fight on to hold the military edge. And this bill helps us fight harder for them by not asking them to bear the full burden of this war, because it sets a timetable for progress and requires the President to meet benchmarks he, himself, has set.

Our vote today funds our troops but, importantly, signals that victory means one-third military and two-thirds diplomacy and good governance and sets a timetable to get there, not

just militarily, but strategically and diplomatically.

If they knew what they were doing, these expenditures would have been built into the base budget, not afterthoughts. Look how out of touch they are with what was required: FY 2001 (Emergency Supplemental); $13.9 billion; FY 2002 (Supplemental): $3.4 billion; FY 2002 (Supplemental): $14.1 billion; FY 2003 (Supplemental): $66.0 billion; FY 2004 (Supplemental): $86.1 billion; FY 2005 (Supplemental): $79.0 billion; FY 2006 (Supp): $69.3 billion.

Additionally, there is the critical money appropriated by Congress that the Administration did not even think to ask for: FY 2005 Defense Appropriations Act: $25.7 billion; FY 2006 Defense Appropriations Act: $50 billion; FY 2007 Defense Appropriations Act: $70 billion.

Despite Congress voting all the funding that was requested, and even adding some additional where necessary, how is that our soldiers across the theatre don't have the right equipment? Just today, I received a call from an uncle of a Marine about to be deployed to Anbar Province:

"His Kevlar vest isn't the right size, he has no visor to properly sync with his laser-guided weapon. The Marines are having to pay for supplies themselves like fire retardant gloves, duct tape, 550 cord, oil lubricants for the weapons, not enough boots, two sets of uniforms rather than the five they should be issued, and they are too big."

Our vote today funds our troops. But importantly signals that victory means ⅓ military and ⅔ diplomacy and good governance and sets a timetable to get there, not just militarily but strategically and diplomatically.

It falls to the Democrats to pick up the pieces of a failed foreign policy. And that is exactly what we are doing with this vote. No one here is operating under the illusion that we are presented with good choices. Importantly, this vote funds the troops we have in theatre. Although this bill holds the hope of redeploying our troops more effectively no later than a year from now, it continues to impose almost the entire burden of the mission in Iraq on our military. Meanwhile, U.S. policy is exacerbating terrorism and begetting violence that could spill over into Jordan, Turkey, Bahrain, Kuwait, Pakistan, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia—all while the Afghan war is becoming more challenging.

Whatever happened to the coalition of the willing?

Where are the neighbors of Iraq?

Where are the diplomats to address the Israel-Palestinian standoff?

In Egypt, 70 percent of the public unfavorably views the United States. In Jordan, U.S. favorability has fallen to 15 percent. In Saudi Arabia, from where the majority—9–11 terrorists emerged, the U.S. is disliked by 76 percent of it citizens. Gallup polls tell us why: America is viewed as not on the side of rising popular expectations for a more democratic way of life. The United States is viewed as a promiscuous culture in moral decay. Abu Ghraib affirmed them in their views.

Granted, no single vote here will quickly repair the damage to our nation's prestige, mend the broken hearts, or put back together the broken lives of thousands of American and Iraqi families.

No single vote will invigorate Iraq's neighbors to promote regional stability.

No single vote will win the war on terrorism.

No single vote will free America from her dangerous dependency on imported oil from dictatorships.

America faces a strategic challenge much larger than Iraq. It requires aligning America on the side of democratic dreams of underprivileged people, not just the super-rich, in the vast undemocratic places where terrorists are being spawned. The Bush Administration's proclivity to support the aristocrats of the world at the expense of everyone else is raining havoc down on our world as Big Oil lines up to pump out Iraq's oil—Exxon Mobil, Conoco Phillips, Chevron Texaco, even foreign companies as Total, Royal Dutch Shell, and BP.

I am not entirely comfortable with this vote.

I imagine no Member is entirely comfortable with spending another $100 billion, on top of $379 billion, on the war in Iraq, a war that has now lasted longer than World Wars I and II combined.

In my congressional district in Northern Ohio, communities are struggling to revive an unresponsive economy. Families are having trouble making ends meet.

In Ohio, we desperately need new roads and bridges and sewers. We need health care and education. But the Bush Administration is obsessed with Iraq. Billions of dollars for Iraq—pennies for Ohio. We are shortchanging our citizens and our children in the name of a failed policy.

This vote, however, marks the beginning of the end of the Bush Administration's colossal foreign policy debacle.

Our vote today will ensure a beginning to an end of this failed foreign policy that decouples our military from a failed foreign policy, of the immense drain on our purse, an end to the injuries to, and deaths of, our brave soldiers. And an end to the growing disrespect of our great country in every corner of the world.

I have opposed this war from the beginning. I said on this same floor in October 2002 that war against Iraq "will not make America safer, because unilateral military action without broad international support will isolate America further. It will thrust us into the position of becoming a common enemy in a volatile region where anti-western terrorism grows with each passing year. It will not make the region more stable either. The Bush approach will yield more terrorism and instability, not less."

How I wish that I could say I was wrong in 2002.

But what I feared most has come to pass.

In December 2005, General Abizaid said: "The battle against Al Qaeda will not be primarily military. It will be political, economic and ideological. If you look at the geography of Al Qaeda, there is not a place to put a military solution."

Since returning from Iraq, I have repeated what Generals Petraeus and Odierno said to us: "Victory is one-third military, two-thirds diplomacy and good governance." America has focused all of our efforts on our military campaign, while the Commander-in-Chief has failed to support our soldiers with diplomatic and political efforts to wrap around their operations. Instead, these valiant men and women fall victim to a Commander-In-Chief who has not only bungled the war on terrorism, but utterly failed in his role as Diplomat-In-Chief for our nation. He is isolating America. Why should our soldiers bear the heavy burden of winning when the good governance piece is completely absent?

President Bush refuses to listen, refuses to change course. His obstinate attitude is shocking.

I am voting for this supplemental precisely because it turns up the pressure on President Bush and forces him to account for his disastrous strategy. The status quo is not an option.

This war must end. Although this emergency supplemental spending bill is not a perfect solution to this vast problem, the legislation points the way to a long-overdue course correction.

It is important to note: it does so without endangering the courageous and patriotic soldiers serving us in the Middle East. It is an exquisite response to the false choices the Bush Administration specializes in offering to us.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen, let me just say this: the American people are waiting on this Congress to finally stand up and be Congress. This is one of the reasons why we are in the position that we are in right now is because Congress has not done its job.

One of the most sterling moments of that was 2 years ago when it came to attention on this floor that our young men and women were over in Iraq without body armor. Every news cast had it where they were going into dung heaps, into landfills, trying to get body armor.

It was Democrats, at that time, that stepped forward and put the amendment in the resolution to make sure that our troops have body armor. And that is the genesis of this legislation.

This is a big ball game, and you have got to get to first base first. And what we are saying is, when we move out with this resolution, paramount is taking care of our troops, making sure that they have the body armor.

I am here to tell you the American people know that this war has had a tremendous drain on our American economy. The importance of this measure, ladies and gentlemen in this House, is that we cannot go forward without the confidence of the American people. Passage of this bill gives us that confidence.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I come to the floor here, Mr. Speaker, to stand up for this Constitution, for our United States military, for our Commander in Chief and for the future and the destiny of America, because we need to take another level up along on our destiny.

But this Constitution gives this Congress only three things we can do with regard to war. One of them is to declare war, which we have not done since World War II, one of them is to raise an Army and a Navy, and by implication, an Air Force, and the next one is to fund it. There are no provisions in there for micromanaging the war, and that has been clear, and it is

a historical precedent, and there is no precedent throughout the last century, at least, that allows this Congress to assign 435 generals to this task.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that this is an unconstitutional appropriations bill. And if it should go to the President's desk, he should veto it in its entirety and bring it back here. Force this Congress to do the right thing that is constitutional and not be micromanaging in this war.

This is not a General Pelosi war to fight. This is a Commander in Chief, George W. Bush, fight.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), a member of the committee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation, in support of our troops, in support of our veterans, and in strong support of ending the Iraq war.

After 4 years of mismanagement, mistakes and excuses, the Bush administration and their supporters in Congress continue to be comfortable with a ''stay the course'' policy, while American troops are in the middle of an Iraq civil war.

Passing this supplemental appropriation requires leadership. It will be the Democrats passing this bill, taking the first historic step towards ending President Bush's Iraq war.

It will be Democrats who hold President Bush and President Maliki accountable for achieving the political conditions that will allow U.S. troops to come home safe and soon.

Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, Chairman MURTHA all deserve to be recognized for their courage and their leadership in bringing this war to an end.

And I urge all my colleagues to support this bill and take the first important step towards ending the war in Iraq.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield my colleague, BOB INGLIS from South Carolina, 2 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that setting deadlines for withdrawal from Iraq is unacceptable. I am in agreement with the concept of adding a series of success checkpoints, and I suggested as much in a letter to the President 2 weeks ago. It worked before when we set deadlines for a new constitution and elections, and I think it could work again.

But withdrawal is the Democratic leadership's only solution if the Iraqis fall short of the benchmarks. That is simply too simplistic. It is too limiting. It is tying the hands of the President and the Pentagon.

We should have benchmarks, but the response shouldn't be all or nothing. These benchmarks should carry a gradation of consequences, rather than an all-or-nothing withdrawal.

□ 1830

Pulling back to the perimeter is an obvious step between surging and withdrawal. There are other gradations that our military leaders could propose to the President.

To begin an immediate withdrawal upon failure of a benchmark is like writing a lease with an eviction-only remedy for a late payment. It makes sense to have a section in the default paragraphs calling for a late payment fee before you begin the eviction.

The leadership in Iraq needs to know that they don't have forever to make the decisions regarding dividing up the oil fairly and regarding returning Baathists to positions of public service. They need to know they don't have forever in coming up with a working model of pluralism. We are providing their protection. We have the right to tell them to hurry. We have an obligation to our servicemen and women to tell the Iraqi factions to hurry.

But we don't need to tie the hands of our field commanders and our President with an arbitrary withdrawal date, predetermined by some political purposes and not by what is happening in the Iraq.

The circumstances on the ground in Iraq have changed at least three times since we went in—from an action against a dangerous regime, to an action against insurgents, to a civil war between Iraqi Shias and Iraqi Sunnis.

The circumstances may change a couple of more times before we get Iraq to reasonable stability, and, who knows, the Iraqis may ultimately want us to retain a base or two.

This bill overreaches. This bill improperly limits the options open to our commanders and our troops. This bill makes no provision for any number of successes in Iraq, which are still quite possible. And I urge its defeat.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us provides an honest and sensible solution to one of the most complex and volatile problems ever to confront our Nation.

More than 4 years ago, this administration engaged in an unnecessary and illegal invasion of another sovereign country, and that has now been followed by almost 4 years of an increasingly disastrous occupation. All during that time, the Republican Party held the majority in this House, and they conducted no oversight of this activity whatsoever, and the consequences have been disastrous for our Nation.

This bill now provides us with the means and the direction to change these disastrous decisions made by this administration and the failure of oversight of the Republican Party. It enables us to help our troops. It provides them with the equipment that they need to carry out their obligations and responsibilities now theirs. And it provides us with a means to remove ourselves in the appropriate way.

Anyone with any sense is going to vote for this bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding.

And, Mr. MURTHA, you were right, and the leadership.

I rise here today because I stand next to those who have lost their lives, so many of them around the country, but so many in Houston, Texas.

I said I would travel with this board from Houston to Washington, and I said that I would do what was right to make their sacrifice one that we continue to honor. We mourn them. Their families mourn them.

This is the right direction because the military goes to battle, but we go to war, and the Constitution does say that this Congress can declare war. It was not declared. And, frankly, it is not an interference. The generals are working, but we are redirecting policy.

In fact, we are providing for unit readiness, length of deployment, time between deployments, money for Afghanistan, money for prosthetics, money for brain injury. We are providing for a new life for these soldiers when they return home. And like the former member of the Intelligence Committee says, this bill is right. I quarreled with it. I fought with it. But I believe it is the right thing, though many of us want a different direction.

Vote for this supplemental.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as a founding and active member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, someone who identifies closely with the peace movement and a ''no'' vote on the war itself, I rise in support of this measure because for the first time we have a date certain for the war to end, a date when U.S. combat troops must be out of Iraq.

It is not the bill I would have written, but it moves us closer to the goal, as clearly stated by Speaker PELOSI, of ending the war in Iraq.

Like many progressives, I have consistently voted against funding for this war. We have withstood Republican critics who say we are hurting the troops, because we know the way to care for them is to get them out of the meat grinder that is Iraq.

This vote draws a clear line between those who want to stay indefinitely in an unwinnable war and those of us who, along with the majority of Americans, want to end it. After 4 horrifying years of war, finally the issue before us now is when, not if, we will leave Iraq.

We aren't going to end the war with any one vote, but this vote should be the beginning of the end of this tragic chapter in our history. It will have my support.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

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

Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps this is the single worst bill to come to the floor since I have been in Congress.

It is likely unconstitutional. It creates 435 Commanders in Chief. It attempts to micromanage the war. It threatens our national security. It contains billions in unrelated spending. It wraps old-fashioned pork in the American flag. * * *

Twenty-five million dollars handed out to spinach growers, $74 million for peanut storage, $35 million for NASA.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the gentleman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman referred to us as producing ''bribe-as-you-go'' legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of having the House have its proceedings move forward, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the offending word or words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me simply congratulate the gentleman for withdrawing those words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the words are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for the remainder of his time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, again, $74 million for peanut storage, $35 million to NASA, $283 million for dairy products.

I question, is this the Democrats' version of fiscal responsibility? Is this their version of reform? Our national security should not be handled so frivolously. The cost of fighting this war obviously is high. The cost of fighting this war is obviously high, but the cost of losing this war is even higher.

I would say to my Democrat colleagues, if you don't believe in the mission, if you don't believe that our troops can win, then you have the power to bring them home, and bring them home today. But we shouldn't employ this slow-bleed strategy that could deny our troops vital reinforcements and vital equipment and open up pork-barrel spending to finance it.

A great Nation deserves better. We should vote this bill down.

□ 1845

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the main responsibility of leadership is to lead, and that is exactly what Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, Chairman MURTHA and other members of the Democratic leadership team are doing, and they are doing it with a plan.

My constituents who want this war ended as quickly as possible can take heart in the fact that this supplemental sets a time certain to begin to pull our troops out of Iraq and bring them to a peace-loving home, a home where we value peace, a home where the will of the people is listened to and heard, a home where we will continue to protect and promote democracy.

I support our troops, I support leadership, I support peace, and I support this legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know that good people disagree on this war, but, in my heart, this bill betrays our troops, ensures defeat and guarantees that when our fighting men and women come home to America, the terrorists will follow.

This bill cannot stand on its merits, but is brought with promises of spinach and peanuts and pork.

Not content to let our soldiers win this war, this bill instead substitutes a brilliant military strategy that gives our enemies this timetable: America will raise a white flag next year, but if you fight harder, we will quit sooner.

Thank God General George Washington wasn't hamstrung with such brilliance.

After the attacks of 9/11, I recall our enemies predicting America did not have the backbone or the will to persevere in this war. This bill proves them right.

On Monday, we buried one of our heroes in our community, Private First Class Cory Kosters. As I witnessed the remarkable courage and faith of his family, as I watched his flag-draped coffin presented at the National Veterans Cemetery surrounded by his friends and airborne brothers saying their final good-bye, I promised myself I will not quit on our soldiers, I will not quit on their mission. I will not guarantee America's defeat, nor allow future generations of Americans to live in terror because we lack the courage and conviction of the greatest generations that preceded us.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the amendment.

It is time to give the best fighting men and women in the world the policy that they deserve instead of the failed policy we have thrust them in the middle of.

After years of a blank check, the House of Representatives is finally representing the American people. They have told us to fund these troops, and we do in this bill. But they told us to make the Iraqis stand up and negotiate an end to their civil war, and this bill has in it the benchmarks and the leverage necessary to do that.

We have sent the best men and women in the world to execute the worst policy in the world, and finally this House of Representatives is representing the will of the American people. They say fund the troops, and we do. They say change the policy, and we do. And they say let the Iraqis take responsibility for ending their own civil war, and we do.

This is a policy as good as the men and women who are doing the fighting.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be a war supplemental bill, but there is so much nonwar spending in this bill. For example, one portion of the bill dumps millions of dollars in Liberia. The last I saw, Liberia is not even on the same continent as Iraq. And why does this bill have anything to do with funding Liberia and their needs?

But more importantly, this bill puts our troops at risk, because it sows the cloud of defeatism and cynicism that seems to be predominant in Washington, D.C.

Congresses before us have tried to run the war, even as far back as the Continental Congress. They were so upset with George Washington, they wanted to get rid of the Commander in Chief and replace him with somebody else. His comments to the Continental Congress then are worth noting today. He said, ''We should never despair. Our situation before has been unpromising and has changed for the better. So it will again.''

And that is what we must do. Support our troops. Give them the troops that they need to finish the mission that we have asked them to accomplish on behalf of national security.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE).

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the American people have paid a tremendous price for our 5-year occupation of Iraq. Over 3,100 U.S. lives have been lost and more than 23,000 wounded, and nearly half a trillion taxpayer dollars have been spent. In my own congressional district, nine servicemembers have given their lives to the conflict in Iraq.

I am committed to bringing our troops home safely and as soon as possible. The legislation before us today holds the Iraqi government accountable by imposing strict benchmarks for success. If the President cannot show that the Iraqis have met these standards by July 1, 2007, a troop withdrawal will begin immediately and must be completed within 180 days.

These measures not only provide the support our troops need and deserve, but they also force this President to think twice before asking our brave military men and women to serve a third or fourth tour in Iraq, and requires and provides the resources our troops need when they come home.

But this bill also honors our veterans by investing billions of additional dollars for their health care. And, for the first time since this war began, Congress is not giving the President a blank check.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can bring a reasonable, timely end to the war in Iraq, and if this bill does that, we will also protect our troops.

I urge my colleagues to cast their important vote for this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual spending bill, because we are voting to spend money for the military while putting conditions on the use of that money that will make it highly likely that our military will fail. That doesn't make any sense.

This bill is also an example of the wisdom of the Constitution that was written so many years ago, and we would be well advised to respect the wisdom of that Constitution that separates the powers among the branches.

We need to understand our role here as a Congress. It is not to micromanage dwell times and to put limits on deployments so that the sergeants and the captains who are jumping through enough hoops as it is have one more set of hoops to jump through, courtesy of the United States Congress.

History will not end on your schedule. We need real leadership from this House to focus on what America's vital national interests are and how we will pursue those interests for the long term.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

(Mr. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be down here, and I am glad that the chairman brought this bill up.

I can tell you the only thing that I can see in this bill is ultimate accountability and oversight by this Congress, which hasn't happened in the last two emergency supplementals, those that I voted on and those that I voted in the affirmative on.

But the good thing about this bill is that we have the troops back. We are saying that they have to be prepared, just like the Department of Defense says that they have to be when they go off to war. This is actually in this bill.

We look at this bill dealing with health care for our veterans, we look at planning, we look at the needs of our troops. Once they get back here to the United States, this bill covers and starts that investment that we have to make to make sure that we take care of our troops in the field and when they get back here at home.

So this is very, very important, Members. I would hate for my Members on either side of the aisle to be on the other side of this bill, because you have a lot of explaining to do when you get back home, the reason why you voted against this bill. You can call Members of Congress, General X and General Y, but the bottom line is accountability is in this bill and funding.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this is an extraordinary moment in American history. Indeed, I would suggest that this is an unprecedented moment in world history.

I know of no example in the history of mankind where a Nation at war with troops in the field has announced that on a date certain almost 2 years off it will simply unilaterally stop the war. I don't believe that has ever happened before in human history, and I believe it is a stunning moment.

What I do not understand is how you can explain that or defend that to either the soldiers you are asking to fight for the next year and a half or to their families. And I am not the only one who finds this to be a strange policy, a dangerous policy, a risky policy, an ill-advised policy.

The Los Angeles Times wrote just a few weeks ago, ''It is one thing for the House to pass a nonbinding vote of disapproval. It is quite another,'' they said, ''for it to set out a detailed timeline.'' It then went on and said, ''This is the worst kind of congressional meddling in military strategy.'' Those are the words of the Los Angeles Times.

Then let's look at another source. In 2005, now majority leader of the U.S. Senate HARRY REID said, ''As far as setting a timeline, that is not a wise decision, because it only empowers those who don't want us there.''

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relation Committee, JOE BIDEN, said a deadline for pulling out ''will only encourage our enemies.''

Senator HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON said, ''I don't believe it is smart to set a deadline for withdrawal.''

This is a policy that makes no sense, and this is a policy that can do nothing but harm our troops and our Nation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

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

Mr. WYNN. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. But it is not the bill I wanted. I think we should begin an immediate troop withdrawal, but this is a good compromise bill that has the virtue of setting a date certain.

Now, I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talking about ''micromanagement.'' Well, I will tell you, we have great United States troops who perform admirably in spite of the incompetence and lack of planning by this administration. And I will tell you what our troops deserve. Number one, they deserve that we meet the readiness standards that our military has established, and this bill says it. We will meet our readiness standards, and we will make sure our troops are adequately trained and adequately prepared before we deploy them.

The second thing they deserve, and this is very important, they deserve accountability by the Iraqi people. The Iraqis need to disarm their militias. The Iraqis need to come up with a political solution. The Iraqis need to divide the oil revenues. That is not something the military can do.

Third, our troops deserve a date certain not because we are ''losing the war,'' but because we are going to take a new direction that relies on negotiation and diplomacy, rather than warfare and bloodshed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), a member of our committee and the ranking member of the Financial Services Subcommittee.

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

□ 1900

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with regret to express my opposition to this supplemental appropriations bill. I oppose this bill because rather than the bill before us, we need a bill that cleanly has as its objective providing support for our troops, not a bill that is saddled with all kinds of extraneous programs, programs that should stand on their own merits, not be used to gain support. We need a bill that will have as its goal stability in Iraq, that will enable the Iraqi people to take responsibility for the future of their country.

The Iraq Study Group report has one recommendation that summarized the need for a clean supplemental that will provide the funds necessary to achieve the goals we all want for the future of our forces in this conflict, and I quote from this report: ''If the Iraqi Government demonstrates political will and makes substantial progress towards the achievement of milestones on national reconciliation, security and governance, the United States should make clear its willingness to continue training, assistance and support for Iraq's security forces and to continue political, military and economic support for the Iraq Government.'' And this is important: ''As Iraq becomes more capable of governing, defending and sustaining itself, the U.S. military and civilian presence in Iraq can be reduced.''

That is really what the goal of this supplemental is. I think it is vitally important that we have a clean bill that makes clear our goal of success in Iraq, that will reflect honorably on the sacrifices that have been made by the Armed Forces of our Nation, that is part of securing for the people of our

country freedom from terrorist threats.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this collection of unrelated expenditures. Vote instead for a clean bill to support our troops.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished caucus chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

As we work to craft this legislation and build consensus, Americans read headlines that said something like: ''Democrats divided, Democrats in disarray.'' But the truth is we were being deliberative.

We spent weeks listening to the diverse members of our caucus, folding their input into this bill, and I am confident we have produced a strong and pivotal piece of legislation because we drew from the broad spectrum of all of our Members. We are a diverse caucus and our diverse experiences and backgrounds reflect the priorities and perspectives of all Americans. I am proud of our caucus and this legislation we have produced.

We all seek to heal our Nation by ending the Iraq war. For the first time in 4 years, almost to the date, we have an opportunity to vote for binding legislation that changes the course in the Iraq war. This legislation ensures that the United States forces in the field have all the resources that they require, directs more resources to the war against al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan, improves health care for returning servicemembers and veterans. But most of all, it sets benchmarks and time lines for ending our participation in Iraq.

We all seek to heal our brothers and sisters in the gulf coast who have been struggling for 18 months against the solid indifference of this administration. The emergency supplemental bill waives the 25 percent match required by the Stafford Act so that the victims of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma can get the service they deserve.

This supplemental is also good medicine for the children in 14 States who have lost their health care. It contains $750 million to fix that problem.

This bill also is good tonic for our veterans and active military who in many instances are suffering as much from broken promises as they are from broken limbs.

This legislation includes money to fix Walter Reed Hospital, gives better military health to our military men, improves veteran housing, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I do not quarrel with those people who see this as a vote of conscience. I believe it is unconscionable to ignore children without health care. It is unconscionable to leave survivors of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma without disaster assistance. It is unconscionable to ask our soldiers to fight a war and not provide them adequate training and equipment, and I sincerely believe it is unconscionable to allow this open-ended war to continue, when with this bill, we can begin its ending.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I have a time check.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 54½ minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 61½ minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to one of the finest members of our Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

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

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, my concern with this supplemental is that it is designed to fail.

In section 1904, funding for the Iraqi security forces will be cut if the new government does not pass a constitutional amendment to ''promote reconciliation,'' whatever that is, to ethnic groups, I suppose. In short, to amend the Constitution in a way that is not defined in a period that cannot be completed.

Now, earlier on this floor, Representative CONYERS stated that it would take 10 years to pass an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to protect D.C. voting rights, and yet we expect Iraqis to pass a constitutional amendment to fix ethnic tensions in 6 months, not to mention the other tough challenges imposed by this bill.

This supplemental is like a promise written in disappearing ink: it is designed to fail.

During World War II, the Japanese stole blueprints of some U.S. submarines. They built a submarine, but when it launched, it turned upside down and sunk because it was designed to fail.

This substitute is designed to fail. It is designed to fail because it is going to defund the Iraqi security forces which are our best hope of success. Of all of the blood and the sweat and the tears that has been spilled in the desert of Iraq, is this how it is going to end, by a bill that is designed to fail by not funding the Iraqi security forces?

The trouble with the submarine, Mr. Speaker, is that my son and the sons and daughters of Americans across this Nation are inside. We cannot allow this substitute to pass because it is designed inherently to fail.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to the supplemental as it stands now. There are multiple reasons for opposing this measure. The first reason is that in my view we overly tie the hands of our Commander in Chief and those in the field who are leading our troops.

We cannot have a situation where this body micromanages what our Armed Forces are doing. It is a bad precedent, and I hope that we do not set it with a vote on this tomorrow.

A second reason for opposing this measure is some of the additional added spending. I fully support spending for our Armed Forces and for our veterans, and I am pleased with the work of the committee in plussing up funds for our troops and for our veterans for things that they need. But in some other areas, such as $25 million for spinach, which has been mentioned before, it may be needed but that should be done through the regular appropriations process.

We have an appropriations subcommittee that deals with foreign aid. That subcommittee can deal with the issue of whether Liberia should get additional funding. We have added too much to this bill when you add almost $25 million to an emergency military supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 61½ minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 51 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, thank you for allocating the time for me to come and basically disagree with you on this floor, but that is what democracy is all about.

I don't believe that this bill will do what it is intended to do. I don't believe it makes good sense to say that our troops should be well trained and well equipped, and then give the President the right to waive that.

I don't believe that the President will report to us in any fashion that we can rely on in July, which will determine whether or not we get out by December or whether we continue to give assistance to the Iraqis.

I don't believe that it is enforceable, and I don't believe that this war will end by next August even though I think that is what the leadership intends for it to do.

This war has been mismanaged. We have been misled. We have been made to believe we would be welcomed with open arms. There were no weapons of mass destruction. That the troops were getting trained and success was right around the corner, and even last week when carnage was taking place in Iraq and our soldiers were being killed, this administration was out in the media talking about we were succeeding. And we will continue to be misled. This war has been mismanaged.

We don't have any friends in Iraq. The Sunnis do not want us there. The Shiites don't like the occupation, and the Kurds don't like us. We are undermined on a daily basis.

Even Mr. Maliki, who is supposed to be our ally, is working with Sadr over in Sadr City, who controls the militias. The police departments that are supposedly working to secure the people

are part of the undermining that is going on. Our soldiers, when they are in confrontations, are deserted by the very people that they are supposed to train.

General said this cannot be won militarily, it must be done diplomatically. I don't see the diplomatic effort.

I don't believe that giving $100 billion to the President of the United States to continue this war will achieve the goal that we intend for it to achieve. I oppose this legislation. I will continue to work with the Out of Iraq Caucus, and I am hopeful we can end this war and bring our soldiers home.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago I visited our servicemen and women in Iraq. My visit confirmed my belief that we must support our troops and redeploy them. That is why I will vote for the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act.

When I met with the troops in Iraq, they told me that they lacked the basic equipment needed to do their job, like body armor, light bulbs for vehicles, and scissors for bandages and gauzes. In some cases, they told me that the equipment they use is unreliable due to excess use. Our troops are also concerned with the lengths of their tours in Iraq; they told me that they are not only demanding, but exhausting. Our troops are being overextended. For many of them, it is not their first tour, but their second or third. Many of them have missed the birth of their children or the death of their parents.

It is time for a new direction in Iraq. The U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act does that—it gives the American people the first step in a new direction to what our troops properly deserve. A new direction, with benchmarks for success in Iraq, with benchmarks that ensure our troops have the equipment and training they need, and a benchmark that guarantees a fully funded deployment out of Iraq. This bill makes it clear, and sends the message that the majority of Americans want—an end to the war.

In the last 4 years, we have spent close to $400 billion on the war in Iraq. The war on Iraq has claimed the lives of nearly 3,200 and more than 24,000 servicemen and women have been injured or permanently disabled. More than half of those will not be able to lead a normal life because of the severity of their injuries, impacting not only them but also their families. In the 32nd Congressional District of California which I represent, we have lost 13 sons to combat. Despite all this, the Administration has failed to outline concrete steps to end the war and has left our servicemen and women without adequate equipment and our veterans without proper care.

The U.S. Troops Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act will provide our troops with the equipment they need, require Iraqis to take control of their own country, help fight the real war on terror in Afghanistan, and establish a strategy for the redeployment of U.S. troops no later than March 1, 2008. This bill provides $1.7 billion more for military health care, including Walter Reed, and includes $1.7 billion more for our veterans, so those who served before and those recently serving have access to adequate care. It includes $2.5 billion to improve troop readiness and helps servicemen and women afford housing. This bill also represents help for those at home, including uninsured children and farmers whose emergent needs were ignored under the Republican leadership.

I don't support this war. I voted against authorization of force in 2002 and have repeatedly called for the redeployment of troops out of Iraq. The Bush Administration's failed policies in Iraq and Afghanistan have gone unchecked—until now. I'm voting for this bill because it will—for the first time—set a date for the war to end—a date when U.S. combat troops must be out of Iraq. The bill isn't perfect, but it draws a clear line between those who want to stay indefinitely in Iraq, and those like me who, along with the majority of Americans, want to end it. Passage of this bill is the beginning of the end for our soldiers not being prepared and not knowing when they will come home.

Let us not forget that these last 4 years so many of our sons and daughters and their families have given the greatest sacrifice. I remain supportive of our troops and know that they will continue to do a great job and we in Congress must do ours this week. I support the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act because I know it is the first real step to the redeployment and safe return home of all of our servicemen and women.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health, and Accountability Act H.R. 1591. Four years ago, I voted against the resolution giving the President the authority to go to war with Iraq because I had serious doubts about the need to rush into military action. U.N. inspectors were still doing their work examining Iraq's nuclear weapons program and had not found weapons of mass destruction. Our allies who supported President George Bush, Sr. for Desert Storm were not supporting us! All diplomatic efforts had not been exhausted and there seemed to be no clear goals or strategy. There was no exit strategy to bring back our troops. There was no evidence that taking action in Iraq was urgent when the fight in Afghanistan was still underway. A proposed budget for the war was never presented to Congress.

Now we are entering our 5th year of this conflict and my concerns have been proven correct. Most important, there were no weapons of mass destruction. The Taliban is resurging in Afghanistan because we diluted our efforts.

We still have no goals or strategy in Iraq and our reputation around the world has been seriously undermined. Thousands of young Americans have been killed, disabled or wounded. we will have spent half a trillion dollars on this war and there is no end in sight.

It's time to heed the recommendations of the Baker-Hamilton Iraq Study Group and take a new direction in Iraq. The legislation before us sets definite benchmarks and timelines that put the Iraqi government on reasonable notice that they must assume responsibility for their own destiny.

This Supplemental Appropriations Bill lets the American people know when our troops will begin coming home.

Many of my colleagues oppose setting a deadline because they believe the insurgents will just outwait us. But unless we are prepared to be in Iraq forever, this fear will always be a concern. History has shown that insurgents and terrorists are very, very patient.

The religious and secretarian hatred in the Middle East has been present for centuries and our presence in Iraq for a few more years is not going to change that. Our presence in Iraq will just get thousands more of our servicemen and women, caught in the middle of their civil war, killed and wounded.

My Republican colleagues had no qualms about mandating to President Clinton when our forces had to come out of Kosovo. It seems to me that this is not any different.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that will bring an orderly, responsible end to the war in Iraq.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq is a disaster. We are engaged in a war that should never have been fought and that was presented to the American people and this Congress over 4 years ago wrapped in falsehoods and mendacity. Our military is being drained of personnel and materiel in an occupation that, we were told, would never occur because we would be greeted as liberators.

To say that the President's prosecution of this war has been mismanaged misses the much more important point that President Bush exercised extraordinarily poor judgment in initiating an unnecessary war of choice. Our soldiers, their families, and indeed the entire country, now bears the legacy of the President's headstrong rush into this quagmire.

The President, with the Iraq War supplemental appropriations request, has again asked the Congress to give him a blank check to continue an endless and bottomless war. But that is not what the President will get with this bill. Instead of a blank check, the Congress is providing a much needed check and balance to the Executive Branch.

The bill before us today requires the President to certify to the Congress that certain tough benchmarks have been met. If he cannot so certify, an immediate redeployment of U.S. forces must commence. Under the bill, by July 1, 2007, the President must certify that Iraq has met political and military benchmarks, including the implementation of a program to disarm the militias. By October 1, 2007, the President must make another certification of Iraq's progress, including that militia control of local security has been eliminated. And even if the President is able to make both certifications to Congress, this bill requires that U.S. forces begin withdrawing from Iraq by March 1, 2008 and complete that withdrawal no later than by the end of August 2008.

These limitations on the President are important, as they will pave the way for the United States to finally withdraw from Iraq.

This bill also prohibits permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq, which is an essential precondition for the reestablishment of public trust in the United States within the Middle East and especially Iraq.

Particularly significant to me is a prohibition included in this bill which bars the use of funds from this supplemental in contravention of the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. I have had to fight to include this provision in previous appropriations bills under the Republican Congress and I would like to thank and commend Chairman MURTHA for his leadership and courage on this issue. In this bill, my restriction on the use of funds for torture also includes a specific ban on the use of funds to carry out renditions, which the President has used to transfer detainees for interrogation or other purposes to countries known for the use of torture.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to see the war continue another day. I want our troops home immediately, and I am frustrated beyond words by the President's continued intransigence in the face of overwhelming evidence and opinion. The bill that this House is debating today will take us closer to the moment when every American soldier, sailor, airman or Marine in Iraq can be brought home.

I urge adoption of the bill.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans do not support the President on Iraq. Yet he persists.

Our caucus is united in our desire to end this war and bring our troops home safely despite our genuine disagreements as to how and when to bring this about. Within this disagreement, we reflect the broad spectrum of opinion in our country. Yet, as Members of Congress, we must take action to change the trajectory of this war, to come closer to the goal of ending the war.

By setting deadlines for the President to meet his own articulated benchmarks, this bill places us firmly on that path.

This bill is not perfect. There will be "no" votes because there are deadlines and "no" votes because the deadlines are too distant. The "perfect" bill that all of us can support will not materialize and we will be no closer to ending this war.

At the same time, until their safe return, we must support our troops and provide them with the equipment and protective gear they need while they are in harm's way.

With this bill, Congress for the first time since the war began is not handing the President a blank check or rubber stamping his failed conduct of this war.

I strongly urge passage of this bill.

□ 1915

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for tomorrow.

Mr. LEWIS of California. That is agreeable to us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 261, further proceedings on the bill will be postponed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

IRAQ WAR SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up on the debate which we have just temporarily postponed until tomorrow morning on the supplemental appropriations bill for the Iraq war, and I wanted to start off by reiterating the statement made by Mr. SHADEGG of Arizona in which he said he knew of no point in history where a country at war declared an end date for when they would be getting out of that war, the point being that most countries fight wars until the war is finished, based on the war situation, and not based on a calendar and an arbitrary date at that.

I think that is very important as we have this vote tomorrow because we are, in fact, hurting our troops if we make the announcement right now to the enemy that by March of 2008 we will be leaving. We know particularly in the Middle East and in Iraq that in cities such as Tikrit and Fallujah, as we have been there the last 3 or 4 years, that whenever the enemy wants to, it can lay low and wait till our troop situation or troop level shifts, and then they come out of the woodwork. I think if we do announce that we are going to be gone in March 2008, no matter what happens on the field of battle, then that enemy is going to use that same tactic to just wait until the Americans are out of town.

If we do leave that country before the job is done, then what happens, Mr. Speaker, is it could cause chaos. A civil war could erupt, and a lot of people say, well, I do not care if a civil war erupts. But how do you know it is going to stay in the boundaries of Iraq? Why would not the Shiites in Iran, for example, get involved in it? We already know they are getting involved in supplying the Shiites in Iraq with things. We do not know what will happen in that volatile area.

What happens to our ally Israel? We know that the Arab countries want to wipe Israel off the map. Are we doing Israel any favors if we abruptly withdraw and arbitrarily withdraw from Iraq?

And what happens to the oil reserves? I know it is interesting, everybody likes to say no war for oil, but the reality is you cannot fight a war without oil, and you cannot run our economy without oil, and petrodollars can stir up a lot of trouble around the globe. Just ask Hugo Chavez in Venezuela what he has done with his petrodollars, street money, and here we would be turning over the second or third largest oil reserves in the world over to a terrorist anti-American state.

Think about this for a minute in that context. America drilling and tapping into all the reserves that we have, we control 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. We use 25 percent. We import 60 percent. If you wanted to declare war on America, you would look at our oil supply, as countries have always looked at the energy or food supply of any country that they have planned to invade.

I want to say this. I represent Fort Stewart. This week the 3rd Infantry Division starts on its third deployment to Iraq. General Lynch, the commanding general, just left on Tuesday. But back in Hinesville, Georgia, there are 318 memorial trees that have been planted in memory of 3rd Infantry soldiers who have lost their life in Iraq. I have gone to some of the ceremonies. It is a sad thing, but even as you leave the field, the memorial field, soldiers say, we want to complete this job.

I have visited soldiers in the hospitals in Baghdad and at Walter Reed and in Ramstein, Germany, in Landstuhl, and they all say they want to go back and finish the job. But I do not want to tell you that I can speak for the troops because there is thousands of them, and I always resent when people come here and say this is what the troops want, because the troops are just like the rest of America, we want a lot of things, and America is divided on this.

But I want to say to the Democrats, I think that you have done the right thing. This war has needed more oversight. I believe we as Republicans were remiss in not having more oversight. I think putting up goals in the form of what we would like the Iraqi Government to do, I think that that is fitting and proper, but I think to have hard and fast deadlines is unreasonable.

We, in this over 200-year constitutional government, cannot do things that we should do. Last year, for example, we were not able to pass a budget. We did not pass all of our appropriation bills. The important thing is the Republican Party, certainly as the majority party, we are guilty, but the point is we could not even do that in our own government. How do we expect the Iraqis to do it by an arbitrary date set?

So I recommend that we recommit this bill, hammer out some of the differences, and then bring it back to the floor in a different and improved product.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time.

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

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

IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING BILL

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, those elected to serve in the people's House sometimes must decide matters of war and peace, in other words, matters of life and death, and nothing is more important.

Today we stand at the crossroads of one such momentous decision, and let

no one doubt that the lives of American soldiers and Iraqi civilians hang in the balance.

This is a vote of conscience and one of the most important votes I will ever cast in the House of Representatives.

I wish we were debating the language of the 1970 McGovern-Hatfield amendment. It called for directing funds only for the safe and orderly withdrawal of U.S. troops from Indochina. I enter into the RECORD at this point the Iraq version of the McGovern-Hatfield that I want to offer.

PROPOSED MCDERMOTT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1591, MODELED ON MCGOVERN-HATFIELD

After April 30, 2007, funds herein appropriated may be expended in connection with the activities of American Armed Forces in or over Iraq, Iran or Syria bordering Iraq only to accomplish the following objectives:

(1) the orderly termination of military operations and the safe and systematic withdrawal of remaining armed forces by December 31, 2007 and

(2) provision of humanitarian and reconstruction assistance to the people of Iraq.

SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN'S SPEECH IN FAVOR OF THE MCGOVERN-HATFIELD AMENDMENT, SEPTEMBER 1, 1970:

''Every senator in this chamber is partly responsible for sending 50,000 young Americans to an early grave. This chamber reeks of blood. Every Senator here is partly responsible for that human wreckage at Walter Reed and Bethesda Naval and all across our land—young men without legs, or arms, or genitals, or faces or hopes.''

''There are not very many of these blasted and broken boys who think this war is a glorious adventure. Do not talk to them about bugging out, or national honor or courage. It does not take any courage at all for a congressman, or a senator, or a president to wrap himself in the flag and say we are staying in Vietnam, because it is not our blood that is being shed. But we are responsible for those young men and their lives and their hopes.''

''And if we do not end this damnable war those young men will some day curse us for our pitiful willingness to let the Executive carry the burden that the Constitution places on us.''

''So before we vote, let us ponder the admonition of Edmund Burke, the great parliamentarian of an earlier day: ''A contentious man would be cautious how he dealt in blood.''

I wish the legislation before us was that direct, but we do have legislation before us and a momentous decision to make.

Over 4 years ago, a vote in this House enabled this President to take America to war. Earlier today I told Speaker PELOSI that I will cast my vote to bring America home to peace. I want to get all of the soldiers out of Iraq tomorrow, but safely extracting over 140,000 U.S. troops cannot be done overnight, and the safety of our soldiers in leaving Iraq must be paramount.

I want to end this incomprehensible war tomorrow, but as a medical doctor, I know that no matter what we do today, this war will go on for decades in the minds of psychologically wounded soldiers and in the bodies of severely injured soldiers.

What we have before us today is a first step, and despite my serious misgivings about it, it is a step in the right direction, which is out of Iraq.

Speaker PELOSI has given America a plan, a timetable and a course of action demonstrating the leadership we have not seen from the President on Iraq. The President has lost the trust of the American people, and he deepens the mistrust at home and around the world every time he speaks about Iraq.

Instead of confronting reality, the President stubbornly adheres to a fiction of his own creation that a military victory will be achieved in a nation in the throes of a full-scale civil war, with an American presence inciting unspeakable violence against our soldiers from all sides.

The Iraqi people have seen their lives sink into misery. Millions have fled their country or been displaced from their homes. Those remaining live in terror that a trip to the market will end their life, and very often it does.

The Iraqi people want us out because they see the U.S. as an occupier. They want the U.S. out because it is their country and their oil, not ours.

This war should never have started, and Americans at the end of the 21st century will still be paying for this Presidential misadventure.

Preying on the fears of the American people, this President devised a war-first policy, unheard of in American history. The President implemented his chilling foreign policy in Iraq. When just cause for a war did not exist, the administration made it up, preying on America's vulnerabilities after 9/11.

They called it a war against terror, but now we know it was a war of revenge and a war to control oil. It was never about exporting democracy. It was always about exploiting the fears of the American people to do what the White House had been planning long before 9/11: Invade Iraq, control its government, and enable foreign oil companies to reap a bonanza of profits by extracting Iraq oil and perpetuating America's addiction to oil.

Speaker PELOSI has given us a plan, not as strong as I want, but one I will support as a bare minimum because it has a timetable and demands accountability from Iraq leaders; bare minimum, but dramatically better than what we have, a war without end from a President incapable of only escalation, not negotiation.

The heroes of our Nation, the soldiers fighting and dying on the front lines, deserve to come home. The Iraq people deserve to decide the future of their own country.

With this legislation, we acknowledge the wisdom and the will of the American people. We realize that the Iraq war is a fraud, and perpetuating it by sacrificing more innocent U.S. and Iraq lives is a tragedy we can no longer tolerate.

I urge my colleagues to vote with Speaker PELOSI and vote for peace.

□ 1930

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to celebrate a remarkable anniversary, that which marks a day of Greek independence which took place 186 years ago on March 25. It is also a celebration which recognizes the strong ties that bind together the United States of America and Greece.

What a blessing to be able to straddle two brilliant cultures that have been the beacon of liberty and justice for humankind. Nothing makes me prouder than to call myself American, for it was the United States that welcomed my grandparents and allowed them to bring their morals, their values, their faith, their rich ethnic traditions and work ethic to this great land of opportunity and freedom.

God, indeed, shed his grace on America, as he has on Greece, the prototype for the democratic republic that became the United States. Imagine, what a curious notion it may have seemed thousands of years ago when the ancient Greeks put forth the idea, a man being able to engage in self-rule. The originality of ideas articulated by Plato, Socrates, and all the great thinkers of ancient Greece served as an inspiration to America's colonial leaders like Jefferson, Washington, Madison, and Hamilton.

It is the American revolution in turn that likely served as an inspiration for the Greeks that were suffocating under the Ottoman rule. 186 years ago the people began a journey that would mark the symbolic rebirth of democracy in the land where those principles to human decency were first espoused.

March 25, 1821, is a historic day for all people who treasure freedom. Greece rose up in arms, fought brilliantly and finally overthrew the Ottoman rule, showing the world their deep and abiding commitment to democracy. The flag of revolt was raised by Bishop Germanos of Patras. Cries of Zito I Ellas, ''Long Live Greece,'' and Elefteria I Thanatos, ''Liberty or Death,'' could be heard from the mountains of Suli to the shores of Crete.

In fact, the bravery of the Suliotes demonstrated that acts of courage were not limited to the men of Greece. The fierce patriotic villagers of Suli fought the Ottomans in several battles. News of their victories spread to nearby villages and inspired others to revolt. When the women, who were left alone, learned the Ottoman troops were approaching their village, they began dancing the Syrtos, which we still do today, a patriotic Greek dance. One by one with the children in arms, the Suliote women sacrificed themselves for the cause of liberty. They chose death rather than oppression.

Stories of sacrifice like that of the Suliotes are plentiful. These actions, as

well as the exploits and victories of the Greek Navy under Miaoulis, Kanaris, Bubulina, and Kolokotronis inspired the people of Europe, who finally brought pressure upon their governments to intervene in the fighting and compel the Sultan to recognize Greek independence, which finally secured the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829.

We commemorate Independence Day each year for the same reasons we celebrate our 4th of July. It proved that a united people through sheer will and perseverance can prevail against tyranny. Both of our nations share an illustrious history in defense of this cherished ideal. Both countries have shared a common commitment to the principles of equality and freedom. In many ways, the American experiment might not have been possible without the Greek experience.

Indeed, as Thomas Jefferson noted: ''To the ancient Greeks we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves, American colonists, out of the Gothic darkness.'' Democracy and freedom are the guiding beliefs that give hope to millions around the world.

Remembering the sacrifice of the brave Greeks who gave their lives for the cause of liberty helps us all realize how important it is to be an active participant in our own democracy.

As Plato noted: ''The penalty good men pay for indifference to public affairs is to be ruled by evil men.'' Greeks, like Americans, have never been indifferent to the welfare of mankind. We share a belief that citizens must be engaged in governmental affairs and must work to promote liberty and justice throughout the world. That is why we honor those who secured independence for Greece nearly two centuries ago. Let us always remember their commitment to freedom. God bless America and Zito I Ellas.

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

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

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

H. RES. 106 AND THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GENOCIDE SCHOLARS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues this evening to support House Resolution 106, a resolution that reaffirms the Armenian genocide.

I also wish to express my support for its swift passage in the House of Representatives. As the first genocide of the 20th century, it is morally imperative that we remember this atrocity and collectively demand reaffirmation of this crime against humanity.

The resolution, which I introduced with Representatives SCHIFF, RADANOVICH and KNOLLENBERG, has over 180 cosponsors. It's also the exact same resolution that passed the International Affairs Committee last Congress by an overwhelming majority.

I strongly believe it is important for Members to understand that this is a matter of historical fact. Many Turkish deniers have been meeting with Members of Congress and sending correspondence, discouraging this resolution. They are claiming that passage of such a resolution would be untimely and counterproductive.

Mr. Speaker, for 92 years this has not been reaffirmed here in this Congress. I think 92 years is far too long for a proper recognition to be made, and its reaffirmation is a matter of conscience.

In the meantime, the Turkish Government has threatened to close supply routes to U.S. troops in Iraq if this resolution is considered. It's appalling that a country who claims to be our ally would put the lives of soldiers at risk in the pursuit of its desperate campaign to deny the systematic slaughter of 1.5 million Armenians.

The highly reputable International Association of Genocide Scholars recently wrote to Members of Congress urging support for the Armenian genocide resolution, and I request permission to insert their letter in the RECORD.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GENOCIDE SCHOLARS

March 7, 2007.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS: We write to you as the international organization of scholars who study genocide. We strongly urge you to co-sponsor H. Res. 106, the House Resolution recognizing and commemorating the Armenian Genocide.

In three previous statements of the International Association of Genocide Scholars—first, a unanimous resolution declaring that the Turkish massacres of Armenians in 1915–1918 constituted genocide; second, an Open Letter to Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan calling upon him to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide; and third, an Open Letter concerning scholars who deny the Armenian Genocide—we have made our position clear: the historical record on the Armenian Genocide is unambiguous and documented by overwhelming evidence. It is proven by foreign office records of the United States, France, Great Britain, Russia, and perhaps most importantly, of Turkey's World War I allies, Germany and Austria-Hungary, as well as by the records of the Ottoman Courts-Martial of 1918–1920, and by decades of scholarship.

We believe it is important for Members of Congress to understand that Turkey's nine-decade-long campaign to deny the facts of the Armenian Genocide is driven by a government that has yet to engage in the honest historical self-critique that is a vital part of the democratic process. The numerous trials and imprisonments of Turkish intellectuals and journalists and the assassination of the Armenian-Turkish journalist Hrant Dink in January make this clear. It should be noted that there are Turkish scholars who are urging their government to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide, and many parts of Turkish society share this pro-democratic perspective. We would note, however, that a government that still encourages extreme, uncritical nationalism has created a false narrative about the Armenian Genocide in order to absolve its predecessors of responsibility for the extermination of the Armenian people and their culture in the Ottoman Empire in 1915.

We are aware that you may be pressured by a small number of academics who support Turkey's denialist stance for often self-interested reasons. Such academics willingly falsify, distort, and manipulate the evidence in sometimes subtle ways to present a false view of history. These academics violate the ethical obligations of historical scholarship. We have noted that academics who deny the Armenian Genocide are no different than academics who deny the Holocaust, the Rwandan Genocide, or the Cambodian Genocide. The recent conference in Teheran devoted to Holocaust denial is a case in point. ''Where scholars deny genocide in the face of decisive evidence . . . they contribute to false consciousness that can have the most dire reverberations. Their message, in effect, is . . . mass murder requires no confrontation, but should be ignored, glossed over. In this way scholars lend their considerable authority to the acceptance of this ultimate crime'' (Roger Smith, Eric Markusen, Robert Jay Lifton ''Professional Ethics and the Denial of the Armenian Genocide,'' Journal of Holocaust and Genocide Studies, vol. 9, Spring, 1995).

We urge you to reject the Turkish campaign of denial, as you may be meeting with groups and individuals who are ardent deniers. We would underscore that the Armenian Genocide is not controversial, but rather is denied only by the Turkish government and its apologists.

We urge you to pass H. Res. 106:

(1) It is a recognition of an historical turning point in the twentieth century, the event that inaugurated the era of modern genocide. In spite of its importance, the Armenian Genocide has gone unrecognized until recently, and warrants a symbolic act of moral commemoration. The Armenian-American community first arrived in the United States as refugees and survivors of this great catastrophe and of earlier massacres in the late 19th century.

(2) Congress will honor America's extraordinary foreign service officers (among them Leslie A. Davis, Jesse B. Jackson, Oscar Heizer, and Ambassador Henry Morgenthau) who often risked their lives rescuing Armenian citizens in 1915. These courageous American diplomats left behind some 4,000 reports totaling 37,000 pages, now in the National Archives, documents that prove the Armenian mass murders were government-planned, systematic extermination—what Raphael Lemkin named genocide. By this resolution the U.S. Congress would demonstrate that the moral principles and courage of those foreign service officers continues to represent a powerful example of American leadership. It is in the interest of the United States to support the principles of human rights that are at the core of American democracy.

(3) Inasmuch as the popular effort in the United States to rescue and bring relief to the Armenians, first from massacres in the 1890s and then from genocide in 1915, set the

stage for the era of modern human rights activism, H. Res. 106 would honor this significant contribution to United States history.

(4) We expect that the United States would not permit foreign governments to intrude on its own legislative process. We also expect that the U.S. government would not be influenced by threats to close American military bases or cut off sales of military hardware, especially when that pressure comes from a country with a deeply disturbing human rights record today, including violence and repressive measures against writers, minorities, intellectuals, and scholars.

(5) As crimes of genocide continue to plague the world, Turkey's policy of denying the Armenian Genocide gives license to those who perpetrate genocide everywhere. Just as we would not sanction denying the Holocaust, we cannot give credence to Turkey's falsification of the facts of 1915. Denial is the final stage of genocide, as it seeks to demonize the victims and rehabilitate the perpetrators.

We believe that it is in the interest of the Turkish people and their future as proud participants in the international democratic community to acknowledge the responsibility of a previous government for the genocide of the Armenian people, just as the German government has done in the case of the Holocaust.

We would be happy to meet with you in person, and would gladly supply you with the scholarly evidence that has led to the unanimous resolution of the International Association of Genocide Scholars that the Turkish massacre of over one million Armenians from 1915 to 1918 was a crime of genocide.

Sincerely,

ISRAEL CHARNY, PH.D.,
President, International Association of Genocide Scholars.

GREGORY H. STANTON, J.D., PH.D.,
Vice President, International Association of Genocide Scholars.

I would say, if I could quote some sections of that letter, in that letter the scholars state their position clearly, noting that the Armenian genocide ''is proven by foreign office records of the United States, France, Great Britain, Russia and even of Turkey's World War I allies, Germany and Austria-Hungary.''

They also say: ''Just as we would not sanction denying the Holocaust, we cannot give credence to Turkey's falsification of the facts of 1915; denial is the final stage of genocide.'' They are unanimous in their findings.

Mr. Speaker, the American people and this Congress should deserve a full and truthful account of the role of the Turkish Government in denying the Armenian genocide. Congress should be allowed to reaffirm that genocide was orchestrated by the Ottoman Empire in 1915 to exterminate its Armenian citizens.

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

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

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

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

U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this body will vote on the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health, and Iraq Accountability Act.

After 4 years of failed policies from the Bush administration, and absolutely no accountability demanded by the previous Republican-led Congresses, this body has the opportunity to say enough. We say enough to continuing the open-ended war with no end in sight. We say enough to giving away hard-earned taxpayer dollars to the Iraqi Government without any real mechanisms for accountability. We say enough to ignoring the will of the American people who have overwhelmingly demanded a new direction and a new course in Iraq.

This week the Iraq war will enter its fifth year. It has already eclipsed the length of the U.S. participation in the Civil War, World War I, World War II, and the Korean War. More than 3,200 American heroes have paid the ultimate sacrifice, while more than 24,000 have been injured, and tens of thousands of Iraqis have been killed, just as millions have been fleeing the country.

Despite this immense sacrifice and hardship, the President's war strategy has not made the Middle East or our Nation safer.

Today the Middle East is less stable than it was in 2003. An Iraq in chaos and an emboldened Iran has fundamentally changed the balance of power in the region in a way that undermines the security of our Nation and the entire region. The war has caused us to lose sight of the mission in Afghanistan where the Taliban is resurgent and Osama bin Laden, Ayman al Zawahiri, and other key members of al Qaeda, the terrorist group responsible for killing 3,000 Americans on 9/11, are still at large and still plotting against us.

Our own National Intelligence Estimate tells us that the war in Iraq estimate has increased, and the threat of terrorism globally has increased.

Just 2 weeks ago, I visited Iraq, and I met with the brave servicemen and -women. I deeply admire these individuals and their families. Out of pure selflessness and a profound love of our Nation, they have volunteered to serve. They do so humbly and honorably.

The Bush administration owes them a strategy that is worthy of their sacrifice. When they failed to provide it, we must hold them accountable. Our Nation can no longer afford the failed policies put forward by President Bush.

We must step forward, abandon the rubber-stamp policies of the previous Congress, and reassert our place as a coequal branch of government. Tomorrow we will have the opportunity to meet this obligation and put the administration on notice. The days of writing a blank check for the mistaken and mismanaged war are over.

When we send our men and women into Iraq without the proper equipment, training and rest, as the President continues to, we expose them to greater danger. This legislation we will vote on tomorrow recognizes this fact by requiring the President to honor his own standards and the standards the Department of Defense has set for the troop readiness, training and equipment.

When our own wounded warriors return to the United States, we as a Nation have an obligation to ensure that they are taken care of. There is simply no excuse for the deplorable conditions of neglect that our soldiers have faced at Walter Reed medical center. That is a national disgrace.

This legislation addresses our veterans health care crisis by adding $1.7 billion to treat the growing number of veterans, to address the maintenance backlogs at the VA health care facilities, and to ensure a significant level of personnel to deliver quality services. This legislation recognizes that the only solution in Iraq is political and diplomatic.

As General Petraeus, the top military commander in Iraq, has said: ''There was no military solution to a problem like that in Iraq.''

This legislation will hold the Iraqi Government accountable by requiring them to meet their own benchmarks for political progress.

We are putting them on notice that they must take the political steps necessary to achieve stability, including disarming the militia and a plan that equally shares oil revenues around the country.

We are also sending a strong clear message to the Bush administration that they must engage in tough diplomacy needed to ensure that Iraq's neighbors do not continue to undermine the efforts of our troops or they undermine the hope for stability in Iraq.

Most significantly, this legislation will lead to the responsible end of our military engagement in Iraq through a phased redeployment of U.S. combat troops.

Instead of continuing the President's policy of open-ended commitment, strategically redeploying combat troops from Iraq, while maintaining a small presence to train Iraqi troops and engage in counterterrorism operations is the most responsible strategy in Iraq.

We will move our troops from direct engagement. It will require the Iraqis to protect Iraqis, and it will allow our Nation to be better prepared for other contingencies affecting the security of our Nation.

Let there be no mistake: this is the President's war, and the President must be held accountable for its military and diplomatic failures. With this vote, we are demanding that the President meet his obligations to our men and our women and to our Nation.

With this vote, we are fulfilling our promise to the American people that we set a new direction in Iraq.

And, with this vote we are putting forward the leadership needed to bring the war in Iraq to a responsible conclusion and bring our troops home.

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.)

□ 1945

SUPPORTING THE IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the stay-the-course strategy in Iraq has failed. The war in Iraq is entering its fifth year, longer than U.S. involvement in World War I and World War II. It is time to stop the open-ended commitment there. It is time for the Government of Iraq to take responsibility for their own security. It is time to start the process of bringing our troops home. It is time to refocus our military efforts to combat terrorism. It is time to send a clear message that Congress will no longer provide a blank check to fund this war. It is time to pass the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health, and Iraq Accountability Act.

Supporting this bill supports the troops before, during, and after they are deployed. This bill enforces the Department of Defense's current standards for military readiness and provides $2.5 billion in additional funding to ensure that our troops are properly equipped and trained; it provides $1.7 billion in additional funding for health care for our troops, and another $1.7 billion to ensure our veterans receive the care they need and that they deserve. We must support our troops in the theater and when they come home.

This bill is tough on terrorism, tougher than the President's current plan that pays little attention to the war in Afghanistan. It adds $1 billion to the Department of Defense efforts there. We have lost our focus in the war on terror. We must redirect our military efforts on thwarting terrorism in Afghanistan and eliminating al Qaeda. This bill does that.

The current strategy has not worked largely because the Iraqi leadership has no real motivation to make it work. This bill holds both the President and the Iraqi Government accountable by ensuring that real progress is made. It is time to turn over the control of Iraq to their people.

Our troops have done their part, and they have done it magnificently. The American people have done their part as well by giving us their sons and daughters who ousted Saddam Hussein. With the cost of this war approaching one-half trillion dollars, it is time for the people of Iraq to spend their dollars, supply their troops, and setting their differences. The destiny of Iraq is now in Iraqi hands.

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.)

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

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

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

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

SUPPORTING THE IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will vote on legislation to set a path for the responsible redeployment of American troops from Iraq. I will support this bill because it will end American involvement in the Iraqi civil war and bring our troops safely home.

This week marks the fourth anniversary of a war born in deceit and prolonged by mismanagement. I voted against the invasion in 2002; I will vote now to end this war by supporting the Iraq Accountability Act with its benchmarks and timetables for redeploying U.S. forces from Iraq.

For 4 years, previous Congresses neglected their oversight responsibilities while the administration made mistake after mistake. The congressional majority failed to conduct thorough investigations, demand accountability, or offer policy alternatives. We have paid a steep price for that neglect, including the lives of more than 3,200 American Armed Forces, with another 24,000 wounded, many critically.

The new Congress is providing long overdue leadership, taking action to end U.S. involvement in a civil war with no end in sight. Responsible military disengagement from Iraq is in the national security interests of the United States. There are no easy, cost-free options. But our perpetual presence in Iraq has sapped our military strength, undermined our credibility around the world, and limited our investments in domestic priorities like health care and education.

This week, the House of Representatives has a choice: Either endorse the President's open-ended commitment, or adopt a plan that demands accountability, sets a timeline for redeployment, and restores the readiness of our Armed Forces.

The President's strategy of indefinite intervention is simply not sustainable. The situation in Iraq has moved beyond our military's ability to shape events in a positive direction. Extending our presence merely delays our ability to recover the ground we have lost, our diplomatic initiative, our global reputation, and the broken state of our ground forces.

The Iraq Accountability Act has three key components:

First, it uses President Bush's own benchmarks to require the Iraqis to assume responsibility for their own security. If they meet those benchmarks, all American forces would leave Iraq by the summer of 2008. If they do not, American forces will leave as early as the end of this year.

Second, the bill supports our Armed Forces by requiring the President to certify that any troops deployed to Iraq are fully and properly equipped, and that their deployment follows Department of Defense standards for readiness and rest between deployments.

Third, it provides funds needed to ensure that returning troops and veterans receive the best possible health care and other services they deserve.

The American people expect us to say where we stand on the war in Iraq. By supporting the Iraq Accountability Act we are voting to use the long-neglected powers of Congress to bring U.S. involvement in the Iraqi civil war to an end. I urge, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Iraq Accountability Act when it comes to the floor tomorrow.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

FRESHMEN DEMOCRATS PROMOTE ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am RON KLEIN, and I represent Florida's 22nd Congressional District in Congress, which is southeast Florida, Fort Lauderdale to West Palm Beach area, and I have the privilege of anchoring tonight's freshmen's Special Order. We decided as a group of freshman, and there was a large group of us that were elected this year, to meet on a regular basis and to discuss policy, those of us who had contested races, those of us who did not have contested races, but all of us new with this process coming in with a fresh perspective and the belief that hopefully we could influence the process in a way that would move things along, which is, I think, the loud message we heard from the people that elected all of us, both Democrats and Republicans this year.

Tonight our Special Order is going to focus on the importance of accountability and oversight within our Nation's government. There is no question that the ability to exercise accountability and oversight among the executive and legislative branches, that is our branch and the President's branch, is vital to making sure that our government is operating and governing within the highest ethical and moral standards, and makes sense. It is also important to make sure our government is doing the right thing for our people.

It seems that every time we are turning on the news lately or pick up the newspaper, there seems to be some story about where there is no accountability. And the oversight and lack of accountability seems to be the prime topic of conversation back home in our districts, in our offices, in our supermarkets, in our churches and synagogues. If you just think about the most recent one, the United States attorney scandal, where a number of U.S. attorneys were fired; and, of course, there is a question about for what purpose they were fired and whether there is a reason, and now there is a question of getting all the information out on the table.

The ongoing concerns over Valerie Plame and the outing of Valerie Plame. And, of course, I think most of us as Americans understand, when someone works for this country as a member of our intelligence services, we owe that person the highest degree of respect and integrity and make sure that their position is held confidential. And certainly anybody who is responsible for outing that person should be held accountable and punished.

Conditions at Walter Reed Hospital. And we are going to talk about that a little more tonight, and, unfortunately, other veterans hospitals. And I am happy to say that in my area and in many other parts of the country that there are some very good things going on in our veterans hospitals and our veterans outpatient clinics, but many times it is a matter of having the resources to have enough doctors in place. And I know I have heard from time to time about long waiting lines. But there are places like Walter Reed and other places that have now been identified where you had mold and you had ceilings falling in and lack of care, and people that were working there that were overworked and unfortunately not providing the type of treatment that should be awarded. The highest level of respect should be awarded to our men and women who are our heroes in this country.

And, of course, the no-bid government contracts being awarded to companies doing business in Iraq to the tune of billions of dollars of waste, and certainly not accomplishing the major goals. One of the goals we went in there with, of course, was to take out Saddam Hussein, but I think everybody understood very quickly that if we were going to be successful in changing the hearts and minds, that some of the rebuilding activities, getting electricity on, getting hospitals up, creating jobs, those kinds of things would be very, very important to making the people of Iraq feel that this was a worthy cause to set up their own government. Unfortunately, we have spent billions of our money over there, and, unfortunately, the condition is in many ways worse today than it was with the fall of Saddam Hussein.

The news on these subjects is everywhere. So tonight we are going to talk about accountability and oversight, and my colleagues who are going to join me tonight as freshman Members recently elected are going to be talking about how we are working to restore those features of accountability and oversight to Washington and our government.

A couple things I just want to touch on before I turn over to my colleague Congressman HODES. On November 7, which was last year's election, we believe that the American people, I know we all heard this as we walked door to door and heard from the American people, they wanted change. It wasn't necessarily Democrat or Republican; they wanted people to come together, find common ground, and move forward. And fortunately for this country, this House has, in fact, started that process. There were six items very quickly that were passed in the beginning called the 100 Hours, the Six for '06, everything from fixing the Medicare prescription drug program, which I know many of our seniors are concerned about making it easier to use, less costly to the taxpayers; minimum wage, making the minimum wage higher, of course, is a key issue; lower student loan rates; and a number of other issues like energy policy. These are the things that we came to work on and that were done.

We also passed the lobbying reform bill and a full disclosure bill which has already significantly reduced the influence that lobbyists have on this legislative process. We need to do more, but we certainly took a lot of the right steps by not allowing lobbyists to take Members of Congress out to lunch. We had that in Florida, we changed that, and I am glad we changed that here, too.

And, of course, the earmark process. And for those of you who don't know what earmark is, that is this idea: In the past, Congressmen, Members of the Senate and House, would go behind closed doors and add millions and tens of millions of dollars, even hundreds of millions in some cases, of special projects in the dark of night to the budget without any consideration by all the Members of Congress. And that needs to change, and I am very happy to say that with new earmark reforms in place, that will change.

The way it is changing is very clear: Anything that is presented needs to be presented in the light of day. It needs to be publicly disclosed and laid out for the Members of the Congress so that a legitimate project in Alaska should be a legitimate project in Florida. Even though it may benefit one State, we all

represent this country, but it has got to be done the right way.

This week we passed important legislation which curbs waste in Federal contracting; strengthens protection for whistleblowers, and those are, of course, people that discover and come forward when there is waste and corruption in government; and also provides long overdue of the veterans health care crisis and other Federal issues. We are going to talk about accountability of tax dollars. We are going to talk about a number of other things.

I am joined by some colleagues here, and I would like to introduce them. We have got Congressman ELLISON, who is going to join us and talk to us a minute; Congressman HODES. Congressman WELCH is going to join us for a few minutes.

You look like you are poised and ready to go, Congressman HODES, so why don't you kick off and give us a little oversight on what you are going to talk about on oversight and accountability.

Mr. HODES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for being here with us tonight. I am delighted to be a new Member in the House of Representatives, the people's House, sent by my constituents to help restore the fabric of our democracy, which, during the past 6 years, has really been torn and undermined by a rubber-stamp Congress which refused to ask questions of an administration conducting its policies largely in secret, taking the American people down a path with counterfeit leadership, a leadership that used fear and intimidation to lead, instead of real leadership which helps people face reality, come together and seek common ground and solutions.

And for many people, when they think of the United States House of Representatives, they think of Congress as a body which raises revenue and figures out how to spend it. It sets taxes and sets a budget. And that is how a lot of folks think about Congress, and sure we spend a lot of our time doing that.

□ 2000

But there is another very important function of the United States Congress in our constitutional scheme, and it is completely independent of what party is in the White House, what party is in the majority in Congress, what party is in the majority in the Senate. It is the way that, in the wisdom of the Founding Fathers, they set up this great government of ours so that there would be checks and balances, there would be controls. And the accountability and oversight function of Congress is what we have restored with this Democratic majority.

There have been great leaders who have recognized that important feature and that important job of Congress. And I have got a chart here, a little board and a quote that is really important and talks a lot about what it means for Congress to exercise its function of accountability.

President Woodrow Wilson said, ''It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it sees. It is meant to be the eyes and the voice and to embody the wisdom and will of its constituents. The informing function of Congress should be preferred, even to its legislative function.''

So here is President Wilson, some years ago, recognizing that the oversight and accountability function of Congress is perhaps even more important than the legislative function.

So for this Congress, while the last Congress might have been called ''the rubber-stamp Congress'' or the last Congress might have been called ''the Katrina Congress'' because they presided over such a disaster for us, I bet that this Congress, under Democratic majority, is going to be ''the accountability Congress.''

Now, one thing that is interesting, I want to take us back for a moment as we sort of set the tone for tonight to talk about something that happened in ancient times. It has been said that the ancient Romans had a tradition. Whenever one of their engineers constructed an arch, at the capstone was hoisted into place, the engineer assumed accountability for his work in the most profound way possible, he stood under the arch. In the President's war on terror, the capstone he chose is Iraq, but it is everyday Americans, and especially our veterans, returning soldiers who are wounded and our veterans who stood under the arch as it crumbled.

Over the past few weeks, we have sustained blow after blow as the President's plan fell apart. But it is not the President who will pay the billions necessary to stabilize Iraq, it is not the President who slept in molding infested rooms at Walter Reed Hospital, it is not the President who lost his job because of a political decision. But maybe it ought to be.

The confluence of events of recent weeks, the Valerie Plame scandal, the Walter Reed scandal, the politically motivated firing of U.S. Attorneys, is the result of an administration that went too far for too long without any meaningful oversight, without any meaningful accountability, without a Congress to hold it accountable. It has been said that absolute power corrupts absolutely. And for years, absolute power is what our Republican colleagues, who were in control until November of 2006, gave to this administration.

Tonight, I come to the floor with my colleagues to talk about restoring accountability to government because the arch has fallen on us, and we are going to repair it.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. HODES. I think you laid it out very well.

I think the average American believes very strongly in accountability and oversight because they understand, that's how they live their lives. If you have a business, you can't do anything without keeping track of your books, keeping track of you inventory, keeping track of your personnel, your employees, and knowing that there is an end-point. And you will make money or not make money by running it efficiently with oversight. And I think that nobody is asking for any more than that in government. And, unfortunately, as you have pointed out very eloquently, that is exactly what has gone on without anybody looking after it. And many of the committees were either not operating or were abolished in the last number of years, and that just doesn't make any sense.

So I think you pointed out very appropriately that we are glad I think in a way that the Democrats are leading, but I think the Republicans are now joining us. And, again, this is a bipartisan approach to fixing this.

Mr. ELLISON, I know that you have been leading and talking about this as well, so give us some of your thoughts, please.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, let me thank my colleagues, the gentlemen from Florida and New Hampshire, both for their eloquent remarks. I am looking to my colleague, Congressman WELCH and his remarks, but I would like to say that the bedrock idea behind accountability in government is trust in government. If somebody is not accountable, if they are not answerable, if they don't have to tell you whatever you want to know, if they can tell you to take a hike, take a walk and they don't have to listen to you and they are not answerable to you and not accountable to you, as the public, then what you cannot have is trust.

Trust goes away when accountability goes away. Trust leaves the room when there is no one to answer the question about what happened. Trust leaves the room when you cannot have a public official look you in the eye and say here is what happened, the good, the bad and the ugly.

Accountability is not about perfection because when you have a human endeavor, there is no such thing. But accountability is about being able to say, you know what, those folks up there on Capitol Hill, I believe that they are doing the best they can because when I asked my question, they gave me an answer. When I came forward with my concerns, they gave me a reply. They had the documents. They were able to say, here is what is going on.

But when government, Madam Speaker, will not answer, we have problems, we have a lack of trust, and unfortunately sometimes people disengage. But this Congress is here to turn that around. This Congress is here to say, no, there will be accountability. You can trust your government. You can expect that your government is going to be operating on your behalf.

Let me turn to an example. One example is that for the last several years

we have had prosecutors, United States Attorneys, trying to do the best they could in many instances at ferreting out corruption in government. We saw prosecutions go on, former Congressman Cunningham and others, and we saw prosecutors who were appointed by a Republican administration to essentially do their job. As you know, Madam Speaker, prosecutors are not like other attorneys. Their job is to seek justice, find the truth. They are ministers of justice, whereas other attorneys, very correctly, have, within the rules, no other obligation than to zealously represent their client. But prosecutors have a higher calling than that, and that is because it is their job to protect the public.

But what we found out recently is that eight of them have been fired, and it appears very clearly that the reasons were entirely political. Eight of them have been fired, and the evidence that has been unearthed so far in only 3 months of this ''accountability Congress,'' as the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire is calling the phrase, in this accountability Congress, the first 3 months we have seen getting to the bottom of this question of justice being undermined.

The Democrats have brought back accountability. And what we have seen that is unfolding right now is that the Justice Department has released thousands of pages of e-mails based on the demands of the accountability Congress, and internal documents as well, related to this U.S. Attorney scandal. These documents would not be in the public domain. They wouldn't be in front of the people. They wouldn't be available for questions to get to be asked and answered but for this accountability Congress.

I am so proud to be associated with this accountability Congress because what it means is that the U.S. Attorneys, whether they be U.S. Attorneys or food inspectors or people who work at the hospitals taking care of our veterans, they now can know that there is not going to be an intolerable condition that exists for too long before some inquiring person in Congress says, what is going on over there. Thank heavens for it.

And I just want to point out, and I will get back to this in a little while, I just want to point out that even Patrick Fitzgerald, who was a prosecutor in a recent case that you may have heard of, the Scooter Libby trial, in which he obtained four convictions out of five counts, he himself was rated as ''not distinguished.'' He was not distinguished in the eyes of the Bush administration officials. And I can see why they would find such a gentleman as ''not distinguished,'' because he did not evidence enough loyalty and obedience to the administration, but he certainly did bring forth some real accountability in government.

I am going to yield back now, but I am going to be sticking around because I have more to say about this. I am going to yield back now; but before I do, I just want to say that accountability breeds trust in government and trust in government promotes an active, engaged citizenry which is fundamental to democracy.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. ELLISON.

I think that, again, the example you gave is something that is on our front pages. We are hearing about it and we are listening.

Some people have said, well, what is the difference if someone is coming forward or if they are coming forward under oath. Well, I like to see, when someone comes forward, that they put their hand up and say, I swear to tell the whole truth. I can't imagine somebody wouldn't want to do that and what are they hiding if they are not prepared to do that. That seems to be a little battle going on between the Congress and its investigative authority and the President. But, again, I think you put your hand up, we are expecting the truth anyway, and I think that is an appropriate thing to do.

Mr. WELCH, our representative from Vermont in our class, why don't you share with us some of your thoughts on this.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. You know, it is very elemental: you get what you pay for, you account for what you buy, you are responsible to the people that hire you, you are responsible to the voters.

The opportunity that I have had about addressing some of these issues of accountability, maybe I can just tell a few stories about some of the hearings we have had, because it is worse than I expected. I come from Vermont, where we don't know how to waste things. We do it over recycle, reuse, do all of those things. But, you know, I am on the Oversight and Government Operations Committee, and we have had a number of hearings. And let me just tell a few stories, because I think rather than have me give some conclusions, let people just hear what some of the facts are.

We had some hearings on Iraq expenditures, Iraq relief money. And the Government Accountability Office has come up with an audit that suggests that a minimum of $10 billion was wasted. But a couple of graphic examples came forward that just stunned me, frankly. One was that our Federal Reserve, at the orders of the government, sent $12 billion in taxpayer money, in cash, loaded in skids, shrink wrapped in plastic cellophane over to Iraq. Now, why did that happen? It wasn't accounted for, but it was sent over there to pay salaries for people who were working in Iraqi ministries. And of course it happened at a time when there was a desperate effort on the part of the administration to show some progress in Iraq. And one of the ways of trying to show progress is that we have these ministries up and running and we have employees who are working and doing the basic jobs of providing electricity, of dealing with pensions, and the things that are the functions of government.

Most of that money went missing because it turned out that some of it was literally handed out from the back of pick-up trucks in Baghdad, and it went to employees who were ghost employees. There were these various ministers in the Iraq Government who had a position of influence and saw an opportunity and they took it and made millions and millions of dollars of taxpayer money.

Now, you know, there is no Republican, there is no Democrat, there is no Independent who can fathom the idea of literally loading 347 tons of 100-dollar bills on C–147 transports and sending it to a foreign country to be handed out on street corners. At home, when I go to Vermont and I tell this story, I almost pinch myself because it is so astonishing that I am wondering whether it is true. Unfortunately, it is true. That is something that is happening with taxpayer dollars.

Another example: $57 million was spent, Madam Speaker, awarded a contract to a Falls Church company that was going to construct housing in Baghdad, I think it was outside of the airport, it was going to be for, Congressman HODES is on that committee, so if I get some of these details wrong, you can correct me. But basically it was a housing contract that was going to provide housing for trainees of the Baghdad police. Not a bad idea. One problem: the housing was never built. The only residue of the $57 million are hundreds of mobile homes that are now parked, unoccupied, on a tract of land outside the Baghdad Airport.

Now, even our government got embarrassed at this. And someone in the State Department suggested that what we should do, since we had all these homeless people in Baghdad but they couldn't live there, we didn't have housing units set up, we just had these facilities, the suggestion was why don't we donate these mobile homes to the victims of Katrina. And I had the opportunity to ask the question everybody else would ask, was it their plan to move the folks in New Orleans to Baghdad or was it their plan to move the mobile homes from Baghdad to New Orleans? That actually happened, all right.

A third example: this isn't so much about wasting taxpayer dollars; it is about violating basic rules of political integrity really.

□ 2015

This whole question of global warming that people now recognize is real, it is urgent, and it is immediate. And I believe it is becoming a bipartisan consensus. We are not arguing whether it is true.

Well, we were arguing whether it was true. In our committee we had before us a press person that worked for the administration, and his job was to edit reports. Editing apparently included

taking scientific conclusions that were reached by scientists doing a scientific method, experimentation, drawing conclusions, maintaining academic integrity, and then putting them through what was an edit that was a political filter that actually changed the outcome of the scientific conclusions. And it was all intended to meet the political agenda of the administration that wanted to resist the conclusion that global warming was real, urgent, and immediate.

There are certain lines you can't cross, and that is one of them. The people of this country, obviously, are entitled to the benefit of honest science. Then we have to make a decision, all of us, about what to do with it, what policies should we pursue. But, bottom line, we have to have that integrity.

So these are just a few examples that I was exposed to as a Member of Congress serving on committees. And I think it reinforces the point that you are making because every American wants and is entitled to accountability, honesty in whatever element of the government we are working in, with our finances, with the services of scientists, and every other sector.

So my friend, Mr. KLEIN, those are a few of the experiences I have had serving on a committee here.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. The examples obviously go right back to what I think we all believe in strongly as Americans: common sense. Use common sense when you do anything. When you make decisions, use common sense. When you follow up, use common sense. I mean, the examples that you have cited are so extraordinary, they defy common sense.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. It is really true. And it is not a partisan thing. I am trying to figure this out because all these things did happen on the Republican watch. And it is a Congress that I think turned its back on its responsibility. But I sometimes wonder whether that concentration of all power and a reliance on ideology meant that if you had an ideology and you had a set of facts and if they didn't fit, you would throw the facts out and stick with the ideology. But it is not a productive and winning strategy. So I have been mystified by it.

And, Ron, you and I come out of State legislatures that are smaller, where Republicans and Democrats tend to work together. You have this close relationship and a lot of this stuff just doesn't happen there. So it is mystifying to me how it happens here. But I think it is a lot less likely to happen now that there is a cop on the beat and that our committees are just checking under the covers to see what is going on.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I am glad to see, Mr. WELCH, some of the legislation coming forward. Mr. WAXMAN and others have proposed eliminating or limiting no-bid contracts and putting all this out there. And I think this is a bipartisan issue. Nobody seems to have any problem with it. But I think, as you said, it is long overdue.

Madam Speaker, we are joined by another Member of our freshmen group, and it is Mr. PERLMUTTER from Colorado. We are now geographically dispersed from the Southeast to the East to the Midwest and the West.

So why don't you give us some of your thoughts from the Colorado perspective.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Good evening to my friends from the freshmen class. And I just want to say I listened to my friend from Minnesota as well as my friend from Vermont, and the reason we are here, the reason Mr. ELLISON is here, the reason Mr. WELCH is here, Mr. KLEIN is here, Mr. HODES is here is because this Nation wanted checks and balances, and checks and balances means accountability.

There has been no accountability in Washington for the last 6 years; and as a result, we have had a variety of problems that have continued to arise again and again and again and again. And we can start with the no-bid contracts in Iraq, and the fact that there is some $10 billion that has evaporated into the ether. That is the kind of thing that we have to stop, and that is the kind of thing that the people of America voted to bring a Democratic Congress into being so that there were checks and balances to these no-bid contracts; checks and balances to a loss, a complete loss, of $10 billion, the whereabouts of which we are going to try to find, as the Congress of the United States of America is supposed to do, so that we act as a counterbalance to the executive branch. We aren't just here as a rubber stamp.

So start with Iraq. Let us talk about Katrina and the response that was just a horrible failure by this administration to a massive disaster in the United States of America, and the response after the disaster occurred has also been a disaster. As a member of the Financial Services Committee, it is clear that now we are 19 months after the hurricane which basically decimated New Orleans and many cities along the gulf coast, and yet we have not reconstructed, renovated, rebuilt much of the housing that was completely obliterated in that storm. So not only was the initial response a poor one, but after that the response has been very minimal and has to be improved. That is what checks and balances are about.

Checks and balances are when an administration, for whatever reason, releases the name of a CIA agent to punish her, to punish her husband, to whatever. It is completely wrong and needs to be stopped. And that is why people expect accountability in our government and they like checks and balances.

We have had revelations, Mr. KLEIN, over the past 2 or 3 weeks as to some of the conditions, particularly at Walter Reed but other veteran hospitals. Again, checks and balances and accountability would rein in excesses or neglect, one or the other. We have seen far too much of it. And we, as part of this freshmen class, are bringing those checks and balances back.

Now, obviously the other side doesn't like it. My friends on the Republican side, today they have been complaining with no end as to the approach we are taking to bring benchmarks to this war in Iraq. And they are complaining and complaining and complaining. But, finally, there are going to be checks and balances on this President and the way he has conducted the war in Iraq.

We are supporting our troops. We are supporting the veterans, and we are bringing conditions and accountability to the administration and accountability to the Iraqi people, as it is time for them to pick up what we have been carrying now for the last 4 years.

The American people understand checks and balances. They were tired of one-party government that led to excesses and neglect. We are here to provide accountability. That is exactly what we are doing. The administration doesn't like it. My friends across the aisle don't like it. But that is what the people sent us here to do, and that is precisely what we are doing.

And with that, Mr. KLEIN, my friend from Florida, I would like to yield back to you or to any of our other friends who are on the floor with us tonight to talk about why we are here.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. PERLMUTTER. And I think we have heard from some of our friends and we have a lot of others within the Democratic side of the freshmen class. There are 41 of us. It is a big class this year, along with the rest of them, Republicans as well. And I think the message is pretty clear, the things you are talking about, the checks and balances. And, by the way, we have our checks and balances with the President. There are also checks and balances with all the agencies. And those are some of the things we are talking about tonight, to be sure things are operating the way they should. A big budget. A lot of money. It has to be spent properly. We feel very committed to that.

Mr. HODES, I know you want to add another thought here.

Mr. HODES. Madam Speaker, I was thinking about what our colleague Mr. WELCH talked about in terms of the investigation into the way in which the administration may have interfered for political purposes with the administration of justice by the United States Attorneys, causing the firing of United States Attorneys for political purposes. And it is interesting to me.

I come from New Hampshire, a small State. And probably many of the folks who may be listening tonight and many people in this Chamber, although there aren't too many, have heard of the name Daniel Webster. And Daniel Webster said a very important thing. He said: ''There is nothing so powerful as the truth.'' And, really, that is what we are talking about.

Our colleague Mr. ELLISON talked about trust, and what we are really

talking about is bringing truth to government, bringing integrity to government, bringing openness, bringing transparency, authentic honesty back into the Halls of Congress and wherever oversight and accountability take us. And in terms of what is happening with the United States Attorney scandal, if we have learned one thing about this administration, it is how it responds to its critics. When someone says something they don't like, they get rid of them. The current U.S. Attorney scandal is really just the latest example.

And now folks are probably seeing that there is a conflict. The White House doesn't want people from the White House to come to Capitol Hill in the open light of day under oath to tell the truth to committees in Congress and committees in the Senate. And the question you have got to ask is, what is there to hide? Why not come, take an oath, tell the truth, and deal with the issues?

I started my legal career in New Hampshire as a prosecutor. I was hired by a good Republican, a man named David Souter, who is now sitting on the United States Supreme Court. And what I learned as a prosecutor from David Souter was that the critical thing about the prosecutor's role was that the prosecutor serves the people. My job was to stand up and serve the people of my State. The job of the U.S. Attorney is to stand up and represent the people of the United States. U.S. Attorneys don't represent the President. They don't represent any particular politician. They represent all of the people. And so their judgment has to be independent judgment in order to see that justice is done because what we are after is justice, not political retribution.

So you can imagine what happens in our great system of justice if instead of thinking about truth and justice, the United States Attorney is motivated by political influence. It perverts the system of justice. It means no justice can be had. So the investigations that are going on now, the accountability and oversight over the administration having the folks come down and talk to our committees is absolutely critical. It is fundamental to the preservation of the democratic fabric of this country, because if an administration, if White House officials can exert pressure on the United States Attorneys and remove their independence, then the people can't depend upon our system of justice.

So this may be one of the most important of the investigations and the new accountability that we are seeing in Congress. And, frankly, what I have said to folks back home is we are not going to let this go by without getting the answers. So when folks see the battle over the subpoenas, when they see the White House resisting having its people come down, folks are asking why. What are you afraid of? Let the truth come out. Let's find out what happened. Now, that is accountability. That is oversight, and that is why the American people sent us here.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Well said. I know that Mr. ELLISON wanted to add something to that also.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to see if the gentleman from New Hampshire would yield to a question.

Mr. HODES. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. Are you familiar with the terminology ''a chilling effect''?

Mr. HODES. Absolutely, sir.

Mr. ELLISON. If a prosecutor, a minister of justice, is required to make sure he doesn't step on any toes of the administration or a particular political power or to make sure that he is not supposed to offend a particular party and if such a prosecutor were to do so, they might lose their job, could that have a chilling effect on the zealous prosecution of anybody who might violate the law?

Mr. HODES. Mr. ELLISON, that is called a Siberian express. That is not just a chilling effect. That is ice cubes in your shoes. That puts the fear in the prosecutor. Now, prosecutors are brave people, and these U.S. Attorneys were brave people standing up to do their job. But it has to have a chilling effect, and it is exactly what we are talking about. The independence of our United States Attorneys is the hallmark, the foundation of the Federal system of justice, and it has to be preserved. And that is why it doesn't matter whether the White House is Republican or Democrat. If this was a Democratic administration that was doing this, we would be doing the same thing if we were following Woodrow Wilson's advice and doing our job here in the Congress.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. PERLMUTTER is about to jump through the microphone.

□ 2030

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I do have a point that I want to make. The power of the Federal Government is awesome, and if anybody is on the receiving end of the power of the Federal Government, you have a tough hill to climb. So the reason the people expect their U.S. attorneys and their government to operate in truth and honesty and in justice is because that power is so great, and when it is abused, the trust of the people goes right out the door, and without the trust of the people, we don't have much of a government here.

The people, in their unbelievable wisdom, maybe that is a little over the top, but the people in their wisdom chose to elect a Democratic Congress and a Democratic Senate because they know checks and balances can stop that kind of abuse. And we are seeing it now.

It is a shame that we see that U.S. attorneys, who could have been fired for any reason except for reasons that might ultimately be unethical, were being let go and were being threatened. That is just wrong, because the administration wanted to see the power of the Federal Government come down on somebody they didn't like.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, we have one of our senior Members present, you can tell because the rest of us freshmen have dark hair, one of the senior Members who is a mentor to all of us. Mr. LARSON of Connecticut is one of the people that truly all of us look up to. Please join us.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing out my age, but I am here primarily to salute you for continuing to do this kind of work.

I think, as Mr. PERLMUTTER pointed out, that the American public, who is always further ahead than the Congress is, found its voice in the November election, and you have given voice to the American people here in the people's Chamber, especially in the area of accountability. Because, quite frankly, as we debate today and throughout the remainder of this year, what we hear from our colleagues on the other side, and I don't question their patriotism or their love of country, and hopefully they don't question ours, but I do question their judgment.

Prior to you getting here, there has been a surrender of judgment on issues of oversight and review. So you are a breath of fresh air. You are the sunshine that needs to shine into every corner of this great institution of ours, because the people you are sworn to serve and who you have come here to represent, we are clearly proud in the leadership, of the efforts of this majority-making class that has set a new direction and a new course for this great country of ours.

I thank each and every one of you. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. We appreciate your guidance and counsel. As we are listening to many of the things, we are glad to add a new energy to the process here. You can see it here tonight.

I want to bring Mr. ELLISON back in. He was really making a passionate statement.

Mr. ELLISON. I also want to add my voice to great things to our leadership, which includes Mr. LARSON from the great State of Connecticut. He is an able and well-qualified leader, and it is just great to see him setting the proper tone for our class.

My question was this. We have several Members of the bar who are now in Congress, and I just wanted to throw a question out.

The President has offered to make a deal, and the deal is that the Democrats could interview, not under oath, not on the record, certain White House aides about this scandal regarding the firing of the U.S. attorneys who have been, it appears, perhaps fired for prosecutions they did do and for prosecutions that in their discretion they did not do that could somehow benefit

somebody who was running on the other side.

My question is, how does this deal stand in the light of this new spirit of accountability? This deal that would say, yes, White House aides can come in, no going on the record, no under oath, no transcript, behind closed doors, how does that deal stand in the light of this new spirit of accountability?

Mr. HODES. You know, I can give you a perspective on that. I won't take too long to do that.

My experience, and I had many years as a prosecutor and also many years as an attorney in court, is that the oath that you take to tell the truth is a powerful thing. It is a meaningful thing, and it is an important thing, because when a person swears to tell the truth, it has the effect of opening one's eyes to the importance and the majesty of the process that is involved in coming before a body, whatever body that is, and holding up your right hand and swearing to tell the truth.

What happens then is, frankly, the person who is going to tell the truth and swears to tell the truth is subjected to a host of requirements and possible penalties if they don't tell the truth. That also turns out to be a powerful motivator.

In this country we have trial by jury where witnesses come to tell the truth. We have investigations by Congress where witnesses come to tell the truth. And that really has proven to be the best, clearest, most open way in an open, transparent democratic government, like the one that we want to have and want to preserve, to get to the truth.

That is all we are asking. We are not intending to ask folks to say or do anything they didn't do or to tell us something that isn't so. We just want to get to the truth.

So a deal that has people behind closed doors without a transcript of the proceedings, with no way to review what has been said and no ability to do anything if they don't tell the truth, just doesn't cut it.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Obviously there are so many things to talk about in terms of the oversight and accountability. One of the things that I think really hit hard for a lot of the people, particularly if you served in the military, was the Walter Reed Hospital revelation.

Many of us have not served in the military. We may have some family members that receive veterans benefits and things like that. We think of people we ask to serve our country or may have served in the past. They are American heroes on so many levels, and they deserve the highest level of care. So it was shocking, and then shocking even more so when we found out this has been going on for a while.

I think this oversight we have been talking about, the accountability, the proper funding, the proper level of care, doctors, nurses, things like that, so many people in the system are doing good jobs, but there are clearly deficiencies.

Mr. WELCH, you have some thoughts on that.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Yes, I do. Every American is appalled at what was revealed, the degrading circumstances for our troops at Walter Reed. There were many things that were obviously disturbing about it, the vermin, the rodents, the peeling paint, the unsanitary conditions.

But that is the tip of the iceberg. What was really heartbreaking when you met the veterans was that they were completely lost and abandoned. We had people with head injuries that had very severe cognitive problems who were in an administrative morass and nightmare. They were abandoned really for 4 months before anyone knew that they were there.

We had amputees who were a mile away from where they needed to be without prosthetics and were supposed to somehow find a way to walk to where their doctors' appointments were. The administrative breakdown was enormous, and it really reflected a culture of disregard.

One of the things that came out as we started investigating this situation out at Walter Reed was that the breakdown of services was very predictable because there was a substantial reduction in the number of personnel that were needed to provide the services.

Step one, you know that if you are having significant increased military activity in Iraq and Afghanistan, you have to anticipate you will have an increasing need for services to treat injured soldiers.

Two, in response to that, the government, the Bush administration, following its ideological hard line about privatization, put to bid certain services that were being offered at Walter Reed. It turned out that the government workers who were government workers had an opportunity to bid on that. They had the lowest bid. Mysteriously, and we still haven't gotten to the bottom of this, Madam Speaker, their bid was adjusted upward $7 million, not by them, but by the reviewer of bids. They then came in second, and the contract was awarded to a private company, IAP Worldwide Services.

Now, we don't know what the bottom-line connection is. What we do know is the following: Number one, what had been personnel of 300 went to 50. Now, it is cheaper to have 50 people on the payroll than it is to have 300, but you also don't get the job done, especially when the number of wounded soldiers is increasing. So that is shocking right away.

Number two, this company, IAP, had all kinds of problems, even though it received millions and millions of dollars doing Katrina relief.

Number three, the head of the IAP Company is a former very high executive in Halliburton, a company that I just have to say has ripped off the American taxpayer and made billions of dollars on this war in Iraq.

Now, how is it that there is a disposition that is so powerful that you put privatization and ideology ahead of a bottom line, the nonnegotiable bottom line that you are going to provide the services that our men and women in the service returning from Afghanistan, returning from Iraq need? It is absolutely and completely unacceptable. That shouldn't be a bipartisan thing. We ought to be doing whatever it takes to make certain that our men and women do get the services that they need.

Lack of accountability makes people lax. They are not looking over their shoulder knowing that somebody is going to be checking to find out if they are getting the job done, if they are ripping off taxpayers, if they are performing up to standards.

That is a major responsibility. We are candid with one another. We know that people are pretty fed up with government. The reason, there are a lot of reasons for it, but one of them is they don't have confidence that we are taking care of their taxpayer dollars. That gets so embedded in people's sense that they lose faith that the government will be there when there is a Katrina, when our soldiers are coming home from Iraq. Our job, together, is to restore that confidence by performance, not by talk; by accountability.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I agree with that.

Mr. PERLMUTTER, I think you wanted to add something to that as well.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I think I was elected to bring change to this Nation, a new direction to the Nation and positive things to this Nation, whether it is energy independence or assist with a whole variety of things concerning change in the direction in Iraq. I did not come looking to go on a witch hunt and to continue to do that.

The people obviously wanted checks and balances. They wanted oversight and accountability. Something like Walter Reed or something like we have just had with the Justice Department, those are things that just appeared now. These are not us going back and trying to dredge up old issues. These are things that have happened because of the neglect of the administration. These are things that appear, and we need to deal with them now.

I think the question is judgment. Before there wasn't good judgment. There wasn't oversight. There wasn't accountability. There weren't checks and balances. The people expect this from its Congress and from its Senate with respect to the White House.

Walter Reed is a shame. It is a shame. It is supposed to be one of our finest medical institutions anywhere in America or the world. It is there for our bravest men and women who have served us valiantly and have been harmed and hurt in a variety of ways, psychologically, physically, and we need to make sure that a place like

Walter Reed really does provide the care and the service and the best quality of medical services that we can provide, and not what has occurred.

The Congress today is something that gives Americans a chance for accountability, gives us a chance to deal with this administration on a straight-up basis, and the fact we are here, we are going to see improvements, just the fact that we are here, because it isn't just a rubber stamp anymore. There really is oversight.

□ 2045

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, let me say in these final few moments tonight, I want to say there have been over 91 hearings on Iraq alone. But we have also had oversight hearings on Hurricane Katrina. Several of them, in fact. Subcommittee Chair Waters went down to New Orleans to get the real story from people who are living it.

On the Committee on Financial Services, we are going to be talking about predatory lending. Today we talked about executive pay and shining some light on that issue.

On the Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee Chairman NADLER held a hearing on civil rights enforcement, what is the Attorney General's civil rights division doing in the area of civil rights enforcement.

I have participated in hearings on the increase in immigration fees and how those fees are going up in a precipitous manner and questions were asked and officials were made to answer.

So as I said before, this is a time of accountability. We are slowly trying to restore the public's faith in government. They have a right to believe that their government is honest, fair dealing, accountable and transparent. I couldn't have been prouder in the committee hearings I personally have been a part of on issues from the National Security Letters and the FBI executive pay, civil rights enforcement, immigration; there has been a whole range.

I think the story is not necessarily one thing like the Valerie Plame incident or Walter Reed or the U.S. Attorneys; but there is a prevailing, systematic reexamination of how government does business. I am proud to be associated with it.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. ELLISON. Mr. HODES.

Mr. HODES. Thank you, Mr. KLEIN. It has been a pleasure to be with you here tonight and have this conversation with the people of this country about what oversight and accountability brings to government.

I started my remarks this evening with a quotation from former President Woodrow Wilson. And I want to go back further in time to end my remarks with a quote from John Stuart Mill who said: ''The proper office of a representative assembly is to watch and control the government, to throw the light of publicity of its acts, to compel a full exposition and justification of all of them which anyone considers questionable.''

And it is that light of publicity, the light that we shine with accountability that helps preserve this government and leads to an open and transparent government. I am privileged to serve on the Information Subcommittee of the Government Oversight and Reform Committee. One of the things that we did which is essential in terms of the accountability of government, we brought to the floor and passed in this Congress in a bipartisan way much-needed reforms to the Freedom of Information Act. It is an act which every citizen can take advantage of to gain information about the government, to hold the government accountable, find documents and information that is the citizens' right to have.

What we did was we restored the Freedom of Information Act to its rightful place where there is now once again a presumption in this government that the government should be open and disclose to its citizens what is going on, what it has for information and documents unless those documents fit into certain narrow exemptions. This has been a critical thing that we have done in this Congress.

I am proud to be a new Member and working hard for accountability. And when the American people see that they truly have an accountability Congress working for them to eliminate waste, fraud, abuse and corruption, to save taxpayer money, they will once again regain trust in their elected officials and in the people's House.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank you, Mr. HODES, for being part of our freshman class and our working group that is going to be here every week. The 110th Congress is strengthening oversight, and the proof is in the pudding.

People can say, I have lost confidence in Congress, but look at what we are doing. We have had dozens of hearings in the Foreign Affairs Committee just on the ability of working with our diplomatic efforts and all of the strategies in dealing with Iraq on the nonmilitary side. In the past, there have not been enough opportunities to do that.

We've had hearings on the veterans health care crisis and Walter Reed, the politicalization of the Justice Department and how wrong that is and that needs to be cleaned up, the Hurricane Katrina response and the things we are doing right now, passing legislation to truly get people back up on their feet. Global warming and energy independence was mentioned, and the fact is that we are getting down to the things we need to do as Americans to deal with our energy needs and the fact that there is an environmental impact. And, of course, upcoming hearings of oversight on everything from Valerie Plame to oil and gas royalties and National Guard and intelligence.

This is part of the mandate of the last election. I look forward to working with our freshman class. We will be doing this every week. We certainly want input from our constituents back home. Tell us what you think we can be doing. We look forward to working with both Republicans and Democrats to build on this theme of accountability and oversight.

DEMOCRAT BUDGET AND TAX INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHWARTZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about two issues tonight. I am going to start out by talking about the Democrat budget and the tax increases that they are proposing, and I want to talk a little bit about the emergency supplemental. The two are tied together in many ways in terms of the hypocrisy we are seeing come forth from the Democratic leadership.

The House Budget Committee is in the midst of marking up the fiscal year 2008 budget resolution. As it currently stands, the proposed budget assumes the expiration of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, which have given us this vibrant economy that we have. It is going to create, therefore, a $392.5 billion tax increase, the largest tax increase in American history.

It proposes no changes to slow the exploding growth of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid that would result in deficit reduction.

Those 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, as I have said, have helped create a very vibrant economy. They produced real tax decreases in the tax burden on North Carolina's married couples, single parents and families. Almost every taxpayer in North Carolina, low income, single, married or self-employed would lose valuable tax cuts under the assumption in the Democrat budget proposal.

It is not a real surprise, though. We knew this was going to happen. It is business as usual for the Democrats and proves that their promises to be fiscally responsible are just empty rhetoric. I have said before this is a smoke-and-mirrors Congress, and that is exactly what it is.

It would return us to the Democrats' beloved tax-and-spend model for government. They have willfully abandoned their pledge for fiscal responsibility. They pledged to do PAYGO budget rules and spending restrain to curb the deficit, and they have done none of that.

Last year, Republicans rejected $14 billion in nonemergency spending that the Senate tried to attach to the emergency troop funding bill, but the Democrats are doing just the opposite.

Now I want to talk about the supplemental. The emergency supplemental, the Democrats said they would never try to coerce people into voting for legislation they didn't want to vote for. Last week they said they weren't whipping this bill, they were just trying to talk people into voting for it. Well, if this is gentle persuasion, I would hate

to see what whipping a bill is. The Members on the Democrats are being threatened and coerced into voting for this. Their votes are being bought with millions and millions of dollars of pork barrel spending that has been put in the supplemental. It is really a slam against our troops.

The proper role of the Federal Government is the defense of this Nation. We may not be completely happy with every way the dollar is being spent on defense, but if that is the case, then what we need to do is have true accountability. Using the word ''accountability'' doesn't make it so. We heard our colleagues here talking about that. If we wanted true accountability, we would be holding the kinds of hearings that would give us accountability. Instead, we have ''gotcha'' kinds of hearing. Every hearing here now is a gotcha kind of hearing.

Don't take my word for the fact that this is a terrible bill that they are bringing up, what they are calling the emergency supplemental. The Los Angeles Times called for the bill to be vetoed. It said: ''It is absurd for House Speaker NANCY PELOSI to try to micromanage the conflict and the evolution of Iraqi society with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks.''

So in addition to the wasteful spending that is going into the emergency supplemental, we are hearing from even the liberal press that this bill does not deserve to pass.

They are using our troops as bargaining chips. The Politico said: ''Democrat leaders see this emerging strategy as a way to encourage their liberal members to vote for the supplemental budget bill.''

They have willfully abandoned their pledge of fiscal responsibility, and we should not be allowing our troops to be used as a pawn in the hands of the Democrats to get funded programs they want to fund that they take off the budget because it is in the emergency supplemental. It is not a part of pay-as-you-go.

Even the Democrat leaders concede that their own bill is flawed. Democrat whip JAMES CLYBURN has described his party's proposal as a ''bitter pill to swallow,'' again in the Politico.

We should reject this bill. I believe we will reject this bill. We need to support our troops. We need to give them the reinforcements they deserve. We need to win this war on terror. The Democrats never talk about winning; they only talk about losing. That is not the American way. The American way is to take the challenges presented to us, face them squarely, and win and do the things that are right.

REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as always, it is a privilege and an honor to be recognized to speak on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I bit my tongue over the last hour and listened attentively to some of the dialogue that was taking place. It is important, I believe, to correct the record at least on the portion I was paying attention.

The issue that was being discussed by the six or seven on the other side of the aisle was about the eight U.S. Attorneys who were fired by the President. There are great, huge, yawning gaps in the description that came out. For the benefit of the people listening to that portion of it, I will attempt to fill in the gaps.

One is the President dismissed eight U.S. Attorneys. That runs about 85 short that were fired summarily by President Clinton. Talk about a chilling effect on your ability to prosecute if you happened to have been looking into Whitewater or if you happened to have been the prosecutor of Dan Rostenkowski and you found yourself immediately fired, and then subsequent to that, your successor achieving a conviction in the case of Rostenkowski, and then watching President Clinton pardon the very subject of your investigation, I would think that would be a chilling effect on a prosecutor.

But the allegation was made that ''the independence of our U.S. Attorneys is the hallmark of justice.'' Well, yes, I think that is true, but they serve at the pleasure of the President, and the President has the authority and he has the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that those U.S. Attorneys are conducting their job, that they are actually prosecuting cases, locking people up in prison and not only taking them out of the crime job market, but also providing an example that keeps other people from committing crimes. When those prosecutions are not taking place at the pace they need to, if they are failing to distinguish themselves, then it is the responsibility and the duty of the President and subsequently the Attorney General to direct that they be removed.

The allegation that the firing of U.S. Attorneys for political purposes was a statement made by the gentleman from New Hampshire. Political purposes. There is no evidence that has been submitted on either side of the aisle that says they were fired for political purposes. There has been speculation, but that is an allegation that I think is a heavy allegation and it is an unjust allegation, and the people who make those kinds of allegations have a responsibility to come forward with some shred of evidence that they base their opinion on rather than wishful thinking.

□ 2100

This is no scandal, Mr. Speaker. It is not a scandal because it is eight U.S. attorneys. Eight U.S. attorneys, and there is not a partisan divide here that can be seen. It is not like there were eight Democrat U.S. attorneys that were investigating Republicans in office. There is no evidence of that. It is more like there were Republicans and Democrats who have been admonished in the past and challenged by Members of this Congress, at least in one particular case, for not being aggressive enough, for not providing the kind of prosecutions necessary to enforce our borders.

Now, that is something that is essential to our national security, and if the allegations that are made here on the floor of this Congress and the statements that are made in committee and the witch hunt that is going on by submitting and requesting, subpoenaing the White House's closest advisers whom the President relies upon to be able to give him unfettered counsel, and they cannot be intimidated. Talk about intimidation, a subpoena to come before Congress and be questioned on the record about your most private advice to the Commander in Chief of the United States of America is what is going on here.

This is an unjust, unbalanced overreach, and it is my advice to the new majority to start acting like the majority because you are going to have to take responsibility for governing. You have not shifted gears from demagoguery of the past into the responsibility to provide policy that is going to direct this country into the future. It is high time that that happened. Break the mold. Let us go forward with good policy, and remember, if you have the gavels, you have the responsibility to make statements that are precisely correct, accurate all the way, truthful in every way possible, and move this country forward in the right direction and provide solutions, not just criticism.

I expect that subject will come up a little bit more, Mr. Speaker, within the next 53 minutes or so. Hopefully that will dispatch that subject for tonight.

But I would raise also there are two more issues before us tonight, Mr. Speaker, and one of them is hanging in the balance here in an unprecedented move, and that is the effort to provide a voting Delegate for the District of Columbia here in the United States Congress. It is an astonishing thing for me. It is an astonishing thing for me to be one of 435 Members of this House of Representatives who comes down to this floor every 2 years, and I bring my own Bible down here to make sure I am not short a Bible because I want my oath to go before God and country, for God and country, and take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, so help me God. I add those words to my oath, and I have done so every time that I have been here to take that oath.

I believe that if there is a bill before this Congress, and as we analyze it constitutionally, if any of us come to the

conclusion that it is an unconstitutional piece of legislation, it is our responsibility or our duty, our obligation, our oath to uphold such unconstitutional legislation. We have taken an oath to do so. Vote ''no'' and clearly articulate the reasons why that bill is unconstitutional.

So Mr. Speaker, I have clearly articulated that before the Rules Committee, before the Rules debate here on the floor, and with the case of the bill on the floor, and I will seek to do that again for the edification of those that were not paying attention and still think that they can come around here tomorrow or next week or whenever it is that the majority gets the votes lined up and vote for an unconstitutional bill because they think it fits their politics. That is not what this oath is about, and so this D.C. district sets this way.

The first unconstitutional provision is this. Article I, section 2 of the Constitution says that the Representatives shall be Representatives of the States chosen by the people of the States. So if D.C., the District of Columbia, is not a State, it is a clear constitutional provision that prohibits this Congress from bestowing a Member, a voting Member representing the District of Columbia into this Congress because the District of Columbia simply is not a State.

Now, there are a couple of ways to resolve this issue. One would be to adopt the District of Columbia as a State, in which case they would get a Representative for the House of Representatives and two Senators. If that could be done and this Congress could pass it and we adopt District of Columbia as a State, that would be a constitutional solution.

Another constitutional solution would be to simply to take the populated areas outside our Federal buildings, just a little bit outside the Mall, from the Potomac River all the way up here around to the east side of the Capitol, set that aside as the District, and the balance of the District then could be ceded back to Maryland. That then could be incorporated into the redistricting process, and the people that lived in the District would be able to vote for a Representative in Congress.

But the arguments made on the other side go something like this, Mr. Speaker, and that is, well, we think that it is a violation of the 14th amendment, a violation of the equal protection clause, for people to live in the District of Columbia and not have a vote, be able to elect a Member of Congress.

I would submit, if that is so compelling that one can ignore the Constitution's clear language, then, Mr. Speaker, it is equally compelling to demand two Senators for the same region, and some will acknowledge that that is the goal, and some will deny it.

But this Constitution has always been kind of an inconvenient thing, Mr. Speaker. What is inconvenient about it is it provides constraints, constraints for both sides, Democrats and Republicans, constraints for all of us who have a political reason or a policy need that does not consider the long-term best interests of the people of the United States.

This Constitution is the law of the land, Mr. Speaker, and I will submit that our Founding Fathers considered this when they established this constitutional Republic that we are in, and as they considered this, they looked at the democracies, the relatively pure democracies that they had in the Greek city-states 2,000 and 3,000 years ago, and they concluded that in the case of the pure democracy, the result was the same effect as if you had two wolves and a sheep taking a vote on what is for dinner. The majority rules, and the sheep is dinner.

So are we going to get let those kind of whims wave back and forth across the floor of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, or are we going to adhere to a Constitution that we have sworn an oath to uphold? I will submit that what I am seeing is the two wolves are taking a vote on what is for dinner, and the sheep is the Constitution here, and the minority in the United States House of Representatives, and I have pledged to uphold this Constitution, I will stand in the way to the last breath of an unconstitutional provision, no matter what it is.

But the arguments that were made here on the other side of the aisle primarily, Mr. Speaker, came down to this: That there are two very well-respected attorneys that have written opinions that will take the position that it is not unconstitutional for this Congress to ignore the Constitution and confer a voting right on a Member from the District of Columbia. Yet, as I look at those two names, they are high and stellar names, Mr. Ken Starr and Mr. Viet Dinh. I have worked to some degree with both of them and read their opinions, and I recognize that when one goes off to law school, one of the first things they teach you, Mr. Speaker, is argue this side of the case, now argue this side of the case, take the position on the right side, take the position on the left side.

There are two reasons for being able to argue both sides of every issue, Mr. Speaker, and one of them is so if you are hired to argue one side, you are prepared to do so; you are not stuck in an individual ideology. The other one is, if you want to survive in the attorney business, you can provide for billable hours because you are a lot more flexible to be able to go on either side of an issue.

Well, I do not allege that these legal opinions that have been produced by Mr. Starr and Mr. Viet Dinh do not have a basis. They do. I just submit that it is a weak basis, Mr. Speaker, and as I read through that, there is the foundation of the Tidewater case. Their argument there is that because a court found in favor of allowing the people in the District to have the Federal court protection and conferred that kind of utilization of the court on the residents here in the District of Columbia, that that implies that they are citizens of a State. Well, that is an utterly weak analysis, Mr. Speaker.

Then the second argument, and that seemed to be even an argument that they hung their hat on even more, was the argument that, and believe me, the Framers understood there was going to be a District of Columbia. When this Constitution was ratified, they knew that. They defined it within the Constitution itself in Article I, but what they provided for was for the 10-mile-by-10-mile section that was laid out to become the District of Columbia for a period of time, that was from 1791 until 1801, that roughly 10-year period of time, until the Federal jurisdiction was applied here in this District, they allowed the people that before that time had been residents of Virginia to vote as residents of Virginia, and they allowed the people that had been residents of Maryland to continue voting as residents of Maryland.

So nothing changed for the people that were residents of the District for 10 years until the Federal jurisdiction was established, at which time then they did not have a Representative here in this Congress, and have not had all this time for this 200-plus years.

Well, the argument that was made by the two stellar legal scholars was because Congress allowed the people that lived here in this District to vote as residents of Maryland or Virginia, as the case may be, for 10 years, somehow that established a precedent or a constitutional right to have a Representative in the United States Congress, an utterly weak argument, and a precedent it was not.

Mr. Dinh admitted what the analysis comes down to, because there was an agreement between the House and the Senate, and the President signed the bill and let them vote conditionally for a 10-year period of time, that it was no precedent like you would get if the Supreme Court had made a decision. The only decision was no one disagreed with, so there was no constitutional argument to be resolved. In fact, no constitutional precedent was established either.

We go forward, and now equal protection under the law, Utah, to give a resident or a Member at-large so that if you are a resident of Utah, you can go and vote for your Representative in your district and the Representative that would be the Representative at-large in Utah. In fact, if you are a Member or a candidate, you could vote for yourself and somebody else to come here and do the same job. That is not equal protection under the law.

There was a case in 1961 called Baker v. Carr that tied this down to as close to an individual population balance as you could possibly get. That was the beginning of one man, one vote. There was a subsequent case in 1964 that speaks to it as well, but Utah also blows this Constitution sideways.

There are many reasons to vote ''no'' on this, and the difficulty that the majority has, and now unprecedentedly pulling a bill down as it was to go up for final passage and refused to allow a vote after days of building up to this with no explanation is unprecedented in this Congress, and that violates, I believe, the right of the people to be heard and the right of their judgment to be recorded here in a recorded vote on whether the District of Columbia will have an unconstitutional Member in this Congress or whether they will not, Mr. Speaker.

So that kind of cleans up the air here and gets us to this point where we are at the subject matter we came here to talk about, and what I would like to do to kick that subject matter off would be to yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, the tenacious Marsha Blackburn.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa so much, and I thank him for hosting our Republican Study Committee hour this evening so that we can come here and talk a little bit about what those of us in the Republican Study Committee are doing, and certainly how we feel about the supplemental budget that is before us, a vote that we will take tomorrow. I appreciate the context that Mr. KING has brought to our debate tonight.

It is so very interesting to listen to our colleagues across the aisle. They talk about how they are going to change things, and when we talk, Mr. Speaker, about the change the American people wanted to see in November, they were not talking about subpoenas and hearings and vilifying people. The Democrats said that was not what they were going to do, and we know there are many who would like to make the President responsible for every single thing that has gone wrong.

We understand that, and we accept that, but it is unfortunate that when they come down here and they talk about honesty and accountability and trustworthiness and oversight and responsibility, their actions do not match their words. Their actions do not match their words at all.

What we continue to see in the supplemental budget, in the D.C. voting bill that they pulled from the floor today, and the budget that they will bring before us next week are a lot of accounting gimmicks, trying to move spending off line, hiding dollars, budget manipulation and deception. My goodness, this does not match up to what we hear from their rhetoric at all.

We know that there was all this talk about trying to be certain that we kept the spending low, and, Mr. Speaker, it took our colleagues across the aisle, as they took the majority, it took them 2 days to increase spending and 2 weeks to increase taxes on the American taxpayer, on the middle-class families working so hard to make ends meet, 2 days to increase spending.

□ 2115

They have spent well over an additional $50 billion so far. Two weeks to increase taxes, and as this budget that the Democrats are working on comes to the floor next week, they are going to invoke the largest tax increase in U.S. history, $400 billion over 5 years. That does bring us to the point of talking about the supplemental, and that is before us. Because as we hear all of this rhetoric, what we see is a budget, a supplemental bill that is to be there for our troops.

We all know that there is a lot that our troops need. When it comes to meeting their needs, when it comes to meeting their readiness, there is a lot they need. One of the reasons for that, when you go in and you look at the decade of the 1990s, budget after budget after budget, the military was cut. Funding to the military was cut. Funding to veterans, funding to veterans health care, funding to programs for the military retirees, funding for the active duty, funding for equipment, funding for artillery, funding for research and development, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, year after year after year. The Democrats chose to cut that.

Bill Clinton chose to cut that because they had other priorities. They were do the dot-com boom. They were into issues that were other domestic issues, but the Nation's security was not a priority. Certainly, even the current Speaker of the House was quoted in last year's campaign as saying national security shouldn't be a campaign issue.

There is nothing more important than the security of our families in this Nation. There is not one thing more important.

I have so many places I could go to talk about what has happened to this budget, to this supplemental bill that is before us tomorrow. It is to be the emergency spending bill for the war on terror, for our issues in Iraq. USA Today even had an editorial calling this a bad bill, because they don't see, and I agree with them, I agree with USA Today on this, they don't see an additional $500 million for the Forest Service as an emergency spending. They don't see $283 million for the Milk Income Loss Contract Program an emergency, or $120 million to compensate for the effects of Hurricane Katrina on the shrimp and fish industry, or $100 million for citrus assistance, or $74 million for peanut storage costs or $64.4 million for salmon fisheries or $54 million for asbestos mitigation, or $48 million in salaries and expenses for the Farm Service Agency, or $35 million for NASA risk mitigation or $25 million for spinach growers or $25 million for live stock.

Even USA Today doesn't see that as emergency spending. I agree with them, because it's not.

I bet that many Members of this House had a wonderful mother like my mom has always been. My mother was always very good at saying, when I was doing something that maybe wasn't appropriate, she would say not here, not now, this is not the place.

Well, as good as some of these programs may be, not here, not now, this is not the place. The men and women in the US military are worth more. They are worth more than the actions, the actions and the conduct that is being carried forward in this budget. It is the wrong place, and this is the wrong time to spend $21 billion on discretionary spending that the Democrat majority does not want to carry to the floor and debate. They want to hide it. They want to keep it out of sight. They don't want anybody to know this. They just want to get the spending in there. Because, why? They want to circumvent their own PAYGO rules and their own budget rules. It is not the time; it is not the place.

Now, if the leadership of the Democrat Party is so into instant gratification that they cannot wait to take it to committee and go through the proper channels, then I think they need to have a reevaluation about what is important. I can tell you what is important to my constituents. It is knowing that when they put their head on the pillow at night, they are safe. It is knowing when they drop their children off at school, they are safe. It is knowing that when those children graduate from high school and from college, they are going to have a brighter future. It is knowing that as they work hard to build a business, that they are going to have the opportunity to grow that business. It is knowing that when they retire, that they are going to be able to enjoy every single day of that retirement.

It is knowing that, yes, indeed, they are going to be accountable, they are going to support their government, and it is knowing that their government is going to be there to support the fundamental values, the underpinning of this Nation, and to support the men and women who put their lives on the line every single day to go and defend this country and defend their freedom.

You know what, if it were not for those men and women in uniform, if it were not for them doing their job, if it were not for the fact that they have done their job time and again during the course of this Nation's history, you and I would not be standing here tonight having this debate.

There is a price that is paid for freedom. Every penny we appropriate in an emergency bill deserves to be spent on the men and women wearing the uniform defending that freedom.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee. Certainly I wish to associate myself with all of her remarks, and I appreciate the consistency and the persistence with which Mrs. BLACKBURN comes here to the floor and participates in committee in every way possible to move the right agenda here in America.

I reflect upon a thought that crossed my mine a week or so ago or maybe 2

weeks ago in committee, as I was listening to the kind of argument and debate that was coming from the other side of the aisle, and the discussion was about people who have food anxiety. We established food stamps for people who were suffering from malnutrition, and then we extended those benefits to those that were hungry, and now the effort is to extend those benefits, not to just those that, we can't make the argument that people don't know where their next meal is coming from any longer, so now the argument is made that people wonder where their second, third, fourth and fifth meal is coming from, and that is called food anxiety. Food insecurity is the more appropriate term they likely use, food insecurity.

It occurred to me, this Constitution, I waved it around a little earlier, provides some constitutional rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But as I read back through my history and recognize that FDR back in the 1930s made another speech, and it's called the Four Freedoms speech. Those four freedoms, as he defined them, are etched into stone down in FDR's monument. First is freedom of speech, the second is freedom of religion. Those are constitutional rights. Speech and religion are one and two, third and fourth are freedom from want and freedom from fear.

Now, those aren't constitutional rights. They are extra-constitutional rights, as articulated by FDR. But they were used to advance an agenda that grew government more dramatically than ever before, and it eclipsed the vision of most Americans. But they are really not rights. They are not constitutional rights. It's a vision or an image to have freedom from want and freedom from fear. Now, I don't know how you ever get to that point where you are free from fear. I don't think that can be guaranteed.

But we have gone another step now with the food anxiety or the food insecurity part. Now we have gone from our real freedoms, freedom of speech and religion, all of our Bill of Rights, to freedom from want and freedom from fear as articulated by FDR. Now, because of food insecurity language, now the argument is we need to make sure that people are free from the fear of want, freedom from fear of want.

So you should never have to wonder about whether you could pay your rent. You should never have to wonder about where your next meal is coming from. You should never have to wonder if you are going to have a job or if you are going to get fired, because government can be all things to all people. Government can take this safety net and turn it into a hammock, and no one has any anxiety. Perhaps we could cure ulcers if we could just have enough Federal money to do that.

If we are free from fear of want, we will also be free of the ambition to provide for our future wants and needs. If that's the case, the productivity in America will go down dramatically, and we will watch this work ethic in our culture collapse. One of the things that drove me to work my entire life was fear of want and not knowing, necessarily, even where my next meal was coming from, not knowing if I was going to be in business the next week or next month, but knowing I was the one in charge, I was the one in control. I had to not only work hard; I had to work smart.

That has given millions of Americans to succeed, freedom from fear of want, a new right in this new Pelosi administration. I offer that thought for edification and consideration.

But I also recognize that the gentleman who represents the vast majority of the State of Nebraska and some of those spaces out there are, indeed, vast, Mr. SMITH. I appreciate your arrival in this Congress, the values that you bring here, and the principled stand that you take. Often there are many things that tie western Iowa to all of Nebraska, and particularly western Nebraska. I appreciate you being here on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Thank you to the gentleman from Iowa. It's great to be here. I take this responsibility, not only this evening, very seriously, but being elected as a Member of the United States House of Representatives very seriously.

My primary responsibility, I believe, is to protect the freedoms that so many Americans enjoy and, perhaps, have taken for granted for a time. I think back to the terrorist acts leveled on our country, and that is a constant reminder that we cannot sit idly by, that we cannot let division sway us from our goal. I believe that one of the fundamental sources of our freedom is through economic freedom, and that is why I requested a spot on the Budget Committee.

Incidentally, last night, we had a long markup of the budget. It was very enlightening to me as a new Member, and it was very enlightening to me, I think, some of the rhetoric and the objectives of a budget. We know that so often we want to tell people, yes, in terms of the of new programs, of new spending. There comes a time, though, when we are going to have to pay for that.

There was a lot of rhetoric exchanged in terms of what tax relief has done for our economy, some would say what it hasn't done for the budget. But I don't know if it's just coincidence that the economy turned around with tax relief. I don't think it's coincidence, to be quite honest with you. But it is interesting how the allegations are leveled that the Bush administration tax relief or the Reagan tax relief or, quite honestly, the President John F. Kennedy tax relief had nothing to do with a rebounding economy subsequently.

It was very enlightening to me, in fact, when I was visiting the JFK Library in Boston, or outside of Boston. This is not the Ronald Reagan Library; this is not the Bush 41 or the Bush 43 library. This is the John F. Kennedy Library that has an entire exhibit devoted to the economic policies of tax relief leading to economic prosperity.

I believe that it has to do with the very basics of economic freedom that individuals, families, you name it, when they have those dollars in their hands, they can spend it more wisely on the economy, rather than paying it into the government, and then the government doling it out as a redistribution of wealth or whatever the case might be.

□ 2130

But it does amaze me that we are here listening to the need for so much more spending. In fact, a high level of spending wasn't enough to get enough support, so they made it even higher to bring on more support. That concerns me, and I know that it concerns many Americans as well.

But as we were marking up the budget last night in committee well into the night, it was interesting how we heard that the majority wants to maintain the tax relief relating to the marriage penalty, tax relief relating to the child tax credit, but yet the budget doesn't show that. The budget does not show that. And it just spoke volumes, I guess, in terms of sound budgeting according to the principles I think of economic freedoms that should be instilled there.

But when we talk about something, we politicians kind of get a bad name now and then, or maybe more often than that, for saying one thing and doing another. That is unfortunate, because this budget says one thing and does another, and that is my concern.

It is interesting that there were amendments proposed for the budget resolution last night that would have solidified the tax relief one measure at a time. So there was the option of cherry-picking, if you will, good parts, bad parts, whatever the case might have been for others wanting to support these amendments. If they like the child tax credit, but didn't like the dividends reduction in taxes, they have the option to choose one without the other. Every single amendment was rejected. Every single amendment. That concerns me a great deal because, like I said, it eats away at what I believe is a fundamental freedom that we should enjoy in America, that being economic freedom.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman would yield, and just inquire as you were working through that budget last night, what kind of message did you get from the majority party on how much support there was for the Department of Defense budget and how much support for military spending? We are having this debate here on the floor today and starting again tomorrow morning. Did you sense that there was a commitment to support our military financially, our troops, and their mission?

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I did not sense that commitment. It would be hard for me to speak or to speculate. And I am not here to beat up on those with whom I disagree. That is not my job.

I do believe, though, that this supplemental spending bill, and I don't want to take up all of your time, but I do want to touch briefly on the fact that this supplemental spending bill with the caveats that many would call micromanaging the war is the wrong thing to do. I don't think we want to give our enemy any hint of what our plans are. A date certain withdrawal is the wrong thing to do. Certainly that was not discussed, especially in the spending context that we have heard so much here today about and well into the future.

There is a lot we can worry about in the past, but if we don't focus on the future, we are not doing our jobs. And as we look at protecting the freedom, I can't help but think how productive we could be with a more unified approach. And I believe that military generals are trained highly, and that we should entrust in their abilities the objective of doing what they need to do so that we can see success overseas. And I cannot say that enough, but I truly believe that turning a spending bill into a bill to micromanage the war is the wrong thing to do.

Constitutionally the President is the Commander in Chief. No one else is the Commander in Chief. And the Commander in Chief makes the tough decisions. And we can again look at the past and perhaps learn from the past and apply those lessons to the future, which we must do and can do. And if we pay attention to really look at the information and the facts and the data, we can do the right thing, and that is availing the resources to our military, to those most highly trained, those closest to the situation, and allow those folks to make the right decision.

I yield back, but I certainly appreciate this opportunity and would certainly encourage my friend from Iowa to continue his pursuits here, because I think it is helpful, and I hope to join again. Thank you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska, a Mr. SMITH who has come to Washington to stand up for middle-American values, and to hold the line on the spending in the Budget Committee, hold the line on the constitutional issues with the micromanagement that is coming out of here with this supplemental spending bill, this emergency supplemental spending bill.

And I will make no such pledge that it isn't my job to challenge the people with whom I disagree with. In fact, I believe it is my job to do that, and I intend to step up every time and draw those bright lines when I think it is imperative that those bright lines be drawn.

So here we are with this bill on the floor being debated several hours today, with 1 or 2 hours left in the debate for tomorrow. And maybe it will go to final passage, maybe the votes won't be there, maybe the vote will get pulled down just like D.C. voting was pulled down today. They take it all the way through the process, and, at the time it is supposed to go up on the board, realize, we lost the debate, so now we can't allow a vote. That is exactly what happened here in the House of Representatives today. The people's voice wasn't heard.

We have got a little debate to go tomorrow. People are going to sleep on this tonight, and they are going to think about the President asking for $99 billion to provide for Afghanistan and Iraq, the surge in Iraq, the strategy that was part of the Iraq Study Group's recommendation, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group's recommendation, and the effort to succeed in Iraq.

And it is interesting that the President has retooled our approach here. We have a new Secretary of Defense, Secretary Gates; we have a new Secretary, at least an Acting Secretary of the Army, Mr. Geren; and we have a new Commander at Walter Reed Hospital, we have a new Commander of CENTCOM. And this is a new plan, a new plan put together by the individual who wrote the book on counterterrorism and the most successful general that I believe that we have seen come out of the Iraq theater, and that is General David Petraeus, I believe the most impressive military individual I have met in my time here, in fact in my life. And his strategy is part of the same strategy that the Iraq Study Group put out. And having written the book on counterterrorism and being endorsed without opposition for his confirmation for a fourth star by the United States Senate, and within a week the United States Senate is back trying to jerk the rug out from underneath his plan, trying to oppose the surge in Iraq and trying to oppose the 21,500 extra troops that go in there. And now we are seeing a little wavering, a little quavering, and some people going a little wobbly because they are starting to see the positive signs in the effort in Baghdad.

Now, the situation there is kind of interesting, Mr. Speaker. Baghdad and 30 miles around outside of Baghdad is where 80 percent of the violence in Iraq is taking place. And it occurred to me, it was actually back in December, I was reflecting back upon the 101st Airborne 62 years earlier had been surrounded at Bastogne during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II. Bastogne, a city that had seven roads leading to it and through it, was the centerpiece of the transportation link. It was the key to success or failure in the Battle of the Bulge, and maybe it was the key to victory or defeat for either side in World War II, at least in the European theater.

And so, as the 101st Airborne was surrounded at Bastogne, mercilessly being shelled by the Germans, and the Germans demanded the surrender of the 101st, General McCollum's response is famous, and it should echo throughout all of American history when he said in his response to the Germans, ''Nuts.'' We understood what that meant, being Americans. The Germans didn't. They had to go get their linguists to try to understand what it meant, and they still, I don't think, have figured out to this day. Well, that was in one word, four letters, the American spirit of defiance, the American spirit of perseverance.

And there they were surrounded at Bastogne, hopelessly surrounded, and their response was, ''Nuts.'' We are hanging on and we are going to defend Bastogne. And shortly thereafter we had General Patton and the 3rd Army that came and relieved the 101st Airborne. They argue to this day that they didn't need the help of the 3rd Army, that they had the Germans right where they wanted them.

That was the American spirit 62 years ago, Mr. Speaker, and today 80 percent of the violence is within Baghdad or 30 miles from Baghdad. Baghdad is essentially surrounded; it is not a stronghold. We have always gone wherever we wanted to go in Baghdad, or any other city in Iraq for that matter, even though the press calls it a stronghold. We went wherever we wanted to go, and we go more now than we did before. Baghdad is significantly pacified, but Baghdad was surrounded by peace, a relative peace at least, and the violence was in there.

Now, if we had pulled out, or if sometime in the future this side of the aisle is successful in shutting off the resources so that our military can't succeed in their mission, and we pull out of there, I believe history will judge us nuts if we do such a thing, Mr. Speaker.

There is too much at stake. There is no discussion on this side of the aisle here about the consequences for pulling out. No one has a plan for victory. No one over there will utter the ''V'' word, the victory word. No one will define it. They are just a group of ''defeatocrats'' that can't get it out of their head that America's destiny is worth more than marking political points against your opposition.

So we sit here with more than 3,000 lives sacrificed for the freedom of the Iraqi people and the destiny of the world, because if we don't defeat this enemy here in Iraq, as Prime Minister Maliki said right here behind where I am standing right now, he said, ''If the terrorists can't be defeated in Iraq, they can't be defeated anywhere.''

Now, if Mr. MURTHA gets his way and troops are deployed out of Iraq, the bill doesn't say where, but he has said where: Okinawa. Okinawa. Over the horizon is Okinawa, and we can put our troops over there, and then we can fly them wherever we need them whenever we need them. I would say we might as well take them right to Afghanistan. And I am going to explain the reason for that, Mr. Speaker.

First, this is a poster of Muqtada al-Sadr. He is quite an interesting character. He started out in this conflict as a militia general, and he wasn't doing very well down south of Baghdad a couple of years ago when he suffered huge, huge casualties in the Madhi militia. In fact, the casualties were so heavy that he decided to become a politician instead of a general, and so he entered into and built a little coalition and picked up 30 seats in the Iraqi Parliament. He also took over the security on the civilian side of Baghdad International Airport, along with one portion of the Shia region of Baghdad and some of the area to the south. Muqtada al-Sadr, not a friend of the United States, an individual who has empowered himself by attacking the United States and denigrating the United States and inspiring his followers the same way, and this is how he did it.

And I was sitting in Kuwait City, the date is right here, June 11, 2004, waiting to go into Iraq the next day, and I was watching al-Jazeera TV, Mr. Speaker. Now, Muqtada al-Sadr came on, this burly face, and he was speaking in Arabic, so I was looking at the crawler underneath in English, and it read just like this: ''If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu.'' That was Muqtada al-Sadr, June 11, 2004. Al-Jazeera TV. I attest to that; I was there, I wrote it down; I saw it; I heard it. And that is the statement that he made.

Now, I went back and picked up the book written by General Vo Nguen Giap, and it is, ''How We Won the War.'' And he is writing about the Vietnam war, how they won the war. And very early in the book he takes the position that because the United States did not win a clear victory in Korea, they understood that we would maybe not have the will to win a clear victory in Vietnam. So their strategy from the beginning was to fight the war in such a way that it would break down and defeat American public opinion and encourage the antiwar activists all across this country and around the world. That was a part of their calculated strategy that is in the book, ''How We Won the War'' by General Giap.

Now, it hadn't occurred to me that because we settled for a truce at the 38th parallel in Korea at the place, the same line as the beginning of the war was the end of the war. But because we didn't push the Communists all the way out of North Korea and draw a new line, they believe that we could be defeated because we didn't demonstrate the will to succeed.

Carl Von Clausewitz wrote the treatise on war, and the name of the book is, ''On War.'' And he states in there, ''The object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war.'' To destroy the enemy's will and ability, Mr. Speaker. And I believe Clausewitz lists will ahead of ability because it is more important here. Your will to succeed, your will to prevail is more important than your ability to conduct war.

In other words, if you are fighting an enemy, and you destroy their airplanes and their navy and their tanks and their guns and their ammunition, and they still have the will to fight you, they will come at you with IEDs or rocks or fists or boots or clubs, because they still have the will to take you on.

But here in this Congress, there have been dozens, there are scores, there, in fact, may be more than 100, there may be more than 200 that don't understand that when they stand here on this floor and they speak against our military's mission, they are encouraging people like Muqtada al-Sadr when he is inspiring his people by saying, ''All we have to do is keep attacking Americans, and they will pull out of Iraq the same way they did Vietnam, Lebanon and Mogadishu.''

□ 2145

And if we should do that, Mr. Speaker, I can show you the next poster you will see on this floor, the next quote that will show up in the news media.

This is another notorious individual: Osama bin Laden. Where is he? We are looking diligently for him. One day we will find him.

But the lesson from Muktadr al-Sadr, the lesson that needs to be understood by the Defeatocrats is that if we pull out of Iraq, we don't win there. You have al Qaeda taking over. You have Iran coming in and taking over 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil. You have Iran with their hand on the valve that could shut off at the Straits of Hormuz, 42.6 percent of the world's export oil. Doing so let's them control the world economy, including that of the United States, including that of China, empowering Russia, empowering Iran, intimidating and controlling the entire Middle Eastern oil supply by Ahmadinejad. That is what is in store for us if we don't prevail.

And so Maktadr al-Sadr has laid it out, and he has got a clear vision. His vision isn't hard to figure out. General Giap has figured it out, just from seeing that we would settle for a truce at the 38th Parallel, and we have got Maktadr al-Sadr seeing that and Vietnam and Lebanon and Mogadishu, and several others, by the way.

But if we pull out of Iraq, our troops aren't going to be deployed to over the horizon, Mr. MURTHA, or over to Okinawa, Mr. MURTHA. They may get to go home for a little while and polish their boots, but they are going to Afghanistan, because that is the next stop for these terrorists that are going to keep coming at us until we defeat them or capitulate.

And so this will be the next quote you will see if we pull out of Iraq. It will be Osama bin Laden this time, and he will be saying, if we keep attacking Americans they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu, the same way they left Iraq. That is what is in front of us if we don't have the will to prevail, Mr. Speaker.

And these kinds of unconstitutional supplemental or emergency spending bills that tie so many strings on to the hands of the Commander in Chief, that if he adheres to the language that is in here, ties his hands so he can't win.

Now, why would you not be for victory? Why would you send money over there and not provide a way for the troops to win?

This bill pulls us out of Iraq. That is the goal and they have said so. Their goal is not victory. Their goal has been defeat for a long time so they can say I told you so. To put a stain on this administration perhaps. To try to gain political favor, perhaps. But whatever is their motivation, I will submit that this appropriations bill is unconstitutional because it is micromanagement of the duties of the Commander in Chief.

And so I will submit that this Constitution gives this Congress three responsibilities when it comes to war. The first one is to declare war. We haven't done that since World War II. The second one is constitutionally to raise and equip an Army and a Navy, and by implication an Air Force. The third one is to fund the war. That is it. No other constitutional responsibilities. Declare a war, raise a military, fund military. But the President is Commander in Chief because our founders lived through the mistakes of trying to run a war with a whole series of micromanagers and trying to do so by consensus or majority rule within the Continental Congress.

The Continental Congress tried to micromanage the war that was fought by the Continental Army. And they were so stung by that painful effort, and the only thing that preserved them was they had the will for victory. They carried themselves through the hardest of times, barefoot at Valley Forge, because they were determined that they were going to defeat the British and establish a new nation. And that is the legacy that the founders have passed along to us. And they drew bright lines in this Constitution because they understood you couldn't fight a war by committee. You couldn't fight a war if a Congress was going to micromanage the Commander in Chief. So they drew the line clearly, and there is no equivocation, and there is no historical record about the founders wondering about who had what responsibility when it came to fighting a war. No. It was the Commander in Chief. And they gave Congress the authority, declare a war, raise the Army and the Navy, and then, I said by implication, the Air Force, and fund it.

So if you don't want to support our military, and if you don't want to support their mission, then you ought to have enough intestinal fortitude to

come down here with a bill that unfunds our military and face the wrath of the American people and the wrath of the United States military, who, by the way, are 100 percent volunteers, not just to join the military and put on the uniform, but for the mission that they are on.

Everyone there has had an opportunity to retire from the military in such time since the beginning of this conflict. Yet, Mr. Speaker, they step forward and they re-up and they volunteer in greater numbers than one ever anticipated. These are brave souls that are on a mission. And to say to them, after they have volunteered for one or two or three or more deployments, well, thanks a lot for the effort, but we are not going to let you finish the job, we are going to drag you home.

Well, I would say to that that I could quote a colonel that I went to Iraq with not that long ago, and he said, and I don't know if I will find it so I will speak from off the cuff and this will be close. It won't be probably an exact quote. He said, don't save me. I volunteered for this mission. Don't save me. I am here because I volunteered for my children. I am here to fight this war so my children don't have to fight this war. You are not doing me any favors if you try to pull me out of this mission that I am committed to. And I have children at home that I am here to defend.

Now, I would say, also, that probably the most profound statement that I heard from a military person over there was a major from Kentucky. And he is a farmer, a father, loved his cows, worried about his bull, wanted to see the digital picture of his new bull, and loves God. And he said to me, he said, we have everything we need. So when you pray for us, meaning the military, pray for the American people. Pray they understand the threat, and pray they do not lose their resolve. We will not lose ours.

That is the kind of personnel we have that put their lives on the line for the future of freedom in the world, for the safety of the American people so that we can ultimately prevail in this long, long war against these global terrorists who believe that their path to salvation is in killing us.

It is not going to be easy. It is not going to be over quickly. And, in fact, every time we step back and show weakness, it empowers the enemy and we are more likely to hear this statement sooner.

But this is not over if we pull out of Iraq, as General Pelosi and Mr. MURTHA would like to do. It is not over. They will follow us here. And they will be more empowered. They will have a base that is protected that they can operate from out of Iraq. And you hand over that oil money to the Iranians, they will be spending it to buy missiles to deliver nuclear weapons, not just to Tel Aviv, not just to Western Europe, but within a few short years to the United States. And we will face an enemy that is a lot tougher than the one we are facing right now.

We need to resolve this issue in the Middle East now. This is the time to do so. Put the cross hairs on Iran's nuclear and tell them cease fighting this proxy war against the United States within Iraq. Resolve and pacify Iraq, and turn our focus over to Afghanistan. Because if we don't do so, this man and his allies turn Iraq into a terrorist base camp, and they turn their effort to Afghanistan to try to drive us out of there and destroy the freedom that has been established there, where people voted for the first time on that soil in all of history.

That is what we are faced with. This is a long war. We need to step up to it. We need to understand that. We need to let our voluntary military perform their mission and stand with them, because not only do we stand with our military, but we stand with them in their mission. I do so on this side of the aisle. I challenge everyone on that side of the aisle to do the same.

It is intellectually inconsistent to take a position that you can support the troops and not their mission. And it is constitutionally inconsistent, in fact unconstitutional, to micromanage a war from the floor of Congress and tie so many strings in there that they can't be met, so that it is certain that if this language passes and the President adheres to it that there will be an end to this sort of victory.

And I ask the President, Mr. Speaker, to stand on this constitutionally. He has the authority to do intra-departmental transfers. If the money goes to DOD and it is directed to an aircraft carrier and we need armored Humvees and Strykers and bulletproof vests, he can mothball that aircraft carrier and put the money where it is needed. That is why he is Commander in Chief. That is constitutional. This bill is not. And I urge that all Members stand up and vote ''no'' on this when it comes to the floor tomorrow.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to come back before the House this evening. And I must say that tomorrow is going to be the judgment day as it relates to Members that are willing to lead on behalf of the men and women in uniform and those that have worn the uniform, and even making sure that we take care of some of the issues as it relates to homeland security.

Today there was a 3-hour, 4-hour-or-so debate on the emergency supplemental that is coming up tomorrow. And you know, part of the mission of the 30-Something Working Group is to come to the floor to make sure the Members have accurate information and to make sure that we provide good information, not only to the Members, but also to the American people. And having Members come to the floor that may represent one view or another is a part of our democracy, and I embrace it 110 percent.

I think it is also important for the Members to be able to receive up-to-date information and also talk a little bit about the past. And I think the past is something that we should embrace from time to time to allow the Members to be able to make a good assessment on how they should vote.

A couple of days ago, Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor and I recommended to some of the Members that it is important on both sides of the aisle that maybe some of us need to go see the wizard and find some courage and also find a heart when it comes down to standing up for the men and women in uniform.

And I talked a little bit about what is in this supplemental bill, emergency supplemental, which is over $125 billion and which will be, from what I understand, the last supplemental outside of the budget.

Now, when we talk about this emergency supplemental, this is for a war that we are going into the fifth year of. And I just want to say that again: a war that we are going into the fifth year of. It has lasted longer than any other conflict in U.S. history. And I just want to make sure the Members understand that.

We have heard statements on the floor. Members come to the floor, especially on the other side of the aisle, saying, well, we just need to give the troops what they need and then, you know, not have any oversight or any language in the bill that may bring about accountability.

Well, I voted for two past supplementals. I said that the other night. I will say it again. Some parts of that supplemental I did not like, but the last thing, the last thing that I wanted to do was to vote against the troops having what they need that are in harm's way. And I think that is important.

I don't know how I would have been able to go home to talk to my constituents and say that I voted against the supplemental because there was a part in it that I didn't agree with, while we have folks that are in a forward area, while we have men and women on the ground in Afghanistan, while we have men and women that are patrolling the streets of Baghdad now because the Commander in Chief sent them there to do so.

We want to support those men and women in harm's way and their families while they are here, and in this supplemental we are going to support them when they come back.

We are in the majority now. The Democrats are in the majority. But we have a minority spirit, to make sure that there is no Member in this House left behind because of a lack of information on what they are going to vote

on. And that is the reason why I am here.

□ 2200

I returned back to the Capitol tonight to talk a little bit about what is in this supplemental and what has happened in the past. Now, we had a number of Members on both sides of the aisle that talked a lot about what is not in this supplemental and what should be in this supplemental in the future. And I can tell you right now, it is far beyond what the President has called for as it relates to emergency dollars.

And when I see my friends on the other side, and I do say friends, I can tell you every Member that is in leadership now on the Republican side voted for a timeline for Bosnia. I mean, I just want to make sure that Members understand that, because there may be some Members who weren't here at that time, including myself, and it is important.

When we start to close out on this bill tomorrow, you are going to have Members of the Republican leadership that are going to come to this floor and call the Speaker of the House ''General'' what have you, call the majority leader ''General'' whatever they want to call him, call the whip ''General'' this, that, and the other. Meanwhile, here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where they voted for the very same thing when President Clinton was in office.

Bosnia didn't have half of the conflict that Iraq has now. Not even a quarter of the money that has been spent in Iraq was spent in Bosnia. I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. There is a difference when you come to the floor and speak a cappella and when you come to the floor with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let us talk about what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD says because I want to make sure that Members understand. And if that was all about politics, I would be home right now doing whatever, reading a book or spending some time with the family right now, because if it was about politics, I would say I want the Republican minority to vote ''no.'' I want them to vote ''no'' so that they have to go home and tell their constituents that they voted against increasing veterans' health care funding, they voted against making sure that out of the 100 Stryker Brigades that we have in the Army, that they voted to make sure that some bureaucrat from the Department of Defense can waive their own rules and not make sure that those men and women have what they need to go to battle. And in every Stryker Brigade and every Stryker unit, you have to have a driver, a gunner. You have to have three individuals in that vehicle. And it is very, very important that everyone understands that we have to give our men and women what they deserve when they go into harm's way.

Let me just talk about the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here. June 24, 1997, House Republicans brought to the floor an amendment that would set a timeline, a date certain, to withdraw from the U.S. peacekeeping mission in Bosnia, a mission that was only 18 months old. Mr. Speaker, I said this mission now in Iraq is in its 5th year. That was 18 months old.

Now, if my colleagues on the other side want to call someone General, Colonel, four-star, Secretary of Defense, whatever they want to call them, we are, as Members of Congress, to make sure that we carry out the oversight of any action of the U.S. taxpayer dollar. They don't want to talk about the investment that U.S. taxpayers have made in this war. They don't want to talk about the sacrifice of the over 3,222-plus members of the Armed Forces that are not coming home again, Mr. Speaker. They don't want to talk about the 10,000-plus members who were injured in Iraq that cannot return back to battle because of their injury. The Republicans do not want to talk about the casualties of this war as it relates to families that will no longer have their loved one back home, and they don't want to talk about the accountability that they did not put forth when they were in charge of this U.S. House of Representatives to say, Department of Defense, if you have regulations saying that military personnel that are going into harm's way, that they have to have armor, that they have to have the support staff, that they have to have everything they need to go to battle; if you aren't willing to stand by that, then don't criticize what we are doing.

I hope that my Republican colleagues follow and come along and join us because this is national security. This is not an issue of partisanship, or I am a Republican and you are a Democrat. That should not be the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have said personally I voted for the supplemental that the Republican majority put forth two times in a row, not saying, I am a Democrat and, because they are Republican, I am going to vote against it.

Yes, I want to see redeployment in this war, but I do not want to leave our men and women without what they need to be able to fight the battle. There won't be a lack of ammunition or a lack of food or a lack of support or a lack of backup when there is a patrol out on the streets of Baghdad.

Do I support the President's surge? No, I do not. And I voted in the affirmative for the nonbinding resolution that came before this House that said that we do not support the surge that the President has put forth. Just because I disagree with the President doesn't mean that I need to disagree with the men and women in harm's way.

Now, some Members may have problems with this. They may not like a word over here or something that is said over there. But the bottom line is when you start looking at the morale of the men and women in uniform, the worst message that we can send to them is that because of partisanship, because someone is a Republican or someone is a Democrat, that I am voting against it because my party leader said that I need to vote against it. I am here as an American, not as a Democrat here tonight, because I think it is important that we think about those families that cringe to hear about another casualty in Iraq of a U.S. military personnel or a nonforeign personnel that is in Iraq. And by Members saying, I don't want to vote for that because there is certain language in there that I disagree with, I think it is not a good enough reason for Members to say that I am not going to vote for it.

We talked about a commander. We talked about a gunner. We talked about a driver in a Stryker force vehicle. We talked about 100 brigades that are out there now. I have been to Iraq twice. I don't need to come to the floor and say, I am a member of the Armed Services Committee and I have been to Afghanistan, and I have been to many of the other ''stans'' in the Middle East to understand what our men and women are facing in harm's way. I have been to military bases. I have met with military families before. I don't need to come to the floor and talk about that. We have some Members saying, well, I love the troops.

Well, I love the troops more than you.

No, I have a tattoo saying that I love the troops more than you.

I believe we can come to the floor and talk tough and talk about what we believe in. But when it comes down to it, Mr. Speaker, Members are going to have to take out their voting card come tomorrow, and they are going to have to vote if they support the troops or not, period, dot. They can say, well, I support them, or what have you, go home, talk to the VFW and march in the Veterans Day parade and write letters back to their constituents that I support them 110 percent. The bottom line is that there is nothing in this bill that the Democratic majority has put forth that has not already been recommended.

Think about the policy. Okay. Readiness. It comes from the Department of Defense regulations. Who can argue with that? Who can complain about that? Who can argue, saying we are micromanaging?

No, not micromanaging. We are just saying if you have rules and regulations that have been set forth for the men and women in uniform, follow them, period, dot.

Being a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have watched individuals sit at a table testifying before Congress in committee, saying that the troops have what they need, and, yes, they all have body armor, and, yes, they all have up-armed vehicles, and, yes, they have the jammers to stop the improvised explosive devices; and better yet, you go to Iraq and you talk to the men and women in uniform, and they say they don't have it.

So what should we do? Should we just say we trust the bureaucrats over at the Department of Defense because they say they have what they need? Or do we come to this Congress and put in a language of legislation that not may or if you get around to it, or if you think about it, that you make sure that you live by your own standards. No. We say ''shall'' in this bill. We say, yes, readiness is important. Yes, we say that what General Schoomaker has asked for as it relates to additional soldiers, we said yes to it in this supplemental. You will be voting against readiness if you vote against the emergency supplemental.

The Commandant of the Marines asked for three new brigades. That is in this supplemental bill. If you vote against this supplemental, you are voting against the readiness of the U.S. Marines.

There are a number of issues that are in this bill that I think are important. But I think when you look at House amendment 302 by Representative BUYER, Republican from Indiana, and the timeline of December 15 of 1997, President Clinton was required to report to Congress on the political and military conditions in Bosnia and by a date certain, by June 30 of 1998, all troops to be withdrawn. Mr. Speaker, that actually came to the floor. And the Republican leadership that was here at that time voted in the affirmative for the amendment. And so for Members to come here and start talking about it as though this is some new idea like ''never before.''

I heard that today. I was sitting in my office. I could not believe that Members on the Republican side of the aisle were saying never before, that this never happened, that we have micromanaged generals and commanders and all the men and women that are in uniform and from this Congress we have 135 generals. Here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD right here.

One guy once said, ''I am not talking about anybody. I am just talking about what I am talking about.'' And the bottom line is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, just as clear as I am speaking now, 20 years, 200 years from now, someone can unearth what I have said here tonight. And we have unearthed, to my colleagues on the Republican side, what took place, and guess what? Only four Republicans voted ''no.'' Here is the voting record right here. I have it. Of all the Republican Members that voted at that time, only four Republicans voted ''no'' when it came down to a timeline for Bosnia.

Now, this is not something that came from the Democratic National Committee or from the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee or from my office because it sounded good. This came out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

So I want to make sure that the Members know and their constituents know that when Members come to the floor and give inaccurate information to the American people and to Members of the House, it is a disservice. And I am not calling any names. I am just saying that here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For those Members who said never before in the history of the House of Representatives, you have got to know what you are saying before you say it, and if you said it, you should come to the floor and correct yourself so that individuals are not misled.

This is 18 months in Bosnia, let alone going into a 5th year in Iraq. No matter how you feel about the war, whether you voted against it or voted for it, I am not going to editorialize or have an opinion on how you voted when you voted. We are talking about right now. We are talking about tomorrow, less than 12 hours from now, you are going to have an opportunity to say if you are with the troops or you are not with the troops. And it is not going to be a floor speech, and it is not going to be a press release. It has to be if you vote ''yes'' or ''no'' tomorrow.

And I am speaking to every Member of the House. This is something that you have to live with. You cannot go to Iraq or Afghanistan or even write a letter or answer an e-mail from a troop if you found yourself in a situation where you said, no, I don't agree with what you are doing; that is fine, but to defund the mission while it is ongoing, our men and women that are in harm's way right now, is something that you are going to have to answer to your constituents. You don't have to answer to me, you just have to answer to your constituents. And I think that it is something you should take into consideration. And one of the great reasons why we come to the floor is to make sure that the Members know exactly what they're voting for.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I can, and Members, if they will indulge me, I would just like to talk a little bit about what is in this bill, what is in the emergency supplemental, because I want to make sure that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects it when you have some voters that may go into the archives of what took place at this time right now. Mr. Speaker, I used to see all the time in 109th Congress where we had some rough, rocky water, in the 109th Congress.

□ 2215

We had Members that are no longer Members of this House, not by vote but by the fact they had to leave the Congress because of unethical behavior, not unethical, criminal behavior, and we never once called the names of those individuals. But we said we have to do away with the K Street Project and other projects like it, because once upon a time this House, when the other side was in control, you had to pay to play. Either you were on a list or you didn't get access to this House.

Now we have returned this House to the people of the United States of America. We are going to continue to move in that direction, and I think it is important that we make sure that every Member of the House has the opportunity to vote on good legislation.

We are going to consider H.R. 1591, which is the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act of 2007.

I am sorry, I was just corrected, not only four Republicans will vote against it, only two Republicans will vote against it. We are checking while we are on the floor. I want to make sure the RECORD reflects the accurate information.

I think it is important that Members understand the defense healthcare is $1.7 billion more than what the President has requested. I want to just outline that. The President put forth his recommendations which should be in this emergency supplemental. We have on top of that, as it relates to the Appropriations Committee, which I commend not only the chairman but the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the Appropriations Committee giving us an opportunity to vote on $1.7 billion more for healthcare, defense healthcare, above what the President has called for.

$450 million for posttraumatic stress, which is going to happen. This vote is going to come up tomorrow. That is very, very important. And counseling. We talk about families, you have to remember that there are men and women that have seen a lot, an awful lot, some things that we would never see. Members of this House, a few Members serve in the Reserves, some have served in the Guard, some have seen some of this. But the majority of Members of the Congress has not seen what these men and women have seen or gone through what they have gone through, seeing someone in the mess hall one day and not seeing them the next day, and hearing about what took place with them, that happened to them.

Sniper fire, improvised explosive devices, we could never understand that. But they come home with those real issues, and we have a number of members of our armed services that have admitted that they have issues mentally that they need help with. Now, let's think about it. We are talking about men and women of the armed services that admitted they have issues. How many of those have not?

We talk about preparation for when our troops come home. It is not just when you are in harm's way that some Members may say well, you know, it is important we take care of them. No, when they get home, we need to be there for them. $450 million in traumatic brain injury care and research.

$730 million for prevention healthcare.

$20 million to address the problems at Walter Reed Hospital. I think it is important, and I think we have that chart here dealing with Walter Reed, that is so very, very important. The Washington Post broke the story saying that Walter Reed wasn't up to par.

Then you had U.S. News and World Report. We have a specialist here. We have troops, men and women in need, and I think it is important that you look at this Newsweek cover. If you have this at home, take a look at it. It just came out March 5, 2007. I think it is important that everyone pays attention and focuses on this.

We have to make sure we are here for them. $14.8 million for burn care. For veterans care, $1.7 billion more than what the President requested.

I want to stop there to say we put I believe $3.7 billion in the continuing resolution. What do we mean when we say continuing resolution? We mean that the Republican Congress did not finish their work in passing all of their appropriations bills on time. The fact that they weren't able to do so, we were able to meet that shortfall.

Let me correct myself. $2.7 billion that was a shortfall for that. We were able to put $3.6 billion in January 31. The Democrats increased the veterans healthcare budget by $3.6 billion. And that was prior to the story coming out about Walter Reed. We had several amendments on the floor where we tried to increase veterans healthcare because we knew already there were issues in VA hospitals, VA clinics, our veterans getting what they need, leave alone the number of troops and soldiers and also their families that we are going to put into the system of active and those that have left the military, the strain on it. That is when it comes down to planning, and that is already there.

But when you look at the $1.7 billion more than the President asked for, we are talking about $550 million to address the backlog of maintaining VA health care facilities that were intended to prevent veterans from experiencing a situation similar that they found at Walter Reed.

$250 million for medical administration to be able to bring on sufficient personnel to support the growing number of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans and to maintain the level of service at all VA facilities and for veterans.

$229 million for treatment for a growing number of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans.

$100 million for contracting mental healthcare, with the funding to allow the VA to contract with private mental healthcare providers to ensure that Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are seen in a timely manner. I think this is an important point.

We have veterans now, Members, that are waiting, not hours, not weeks, but months, and it is real really unfortunate they have to do so. I told the story about a friend of mine that was in a VA hospital that had my cellular number in his cell phone, and he called me and said, ''Kendrick, things are not going the way they are supposed to go. I am waiting to see a specialist, and I have been here for some time and I haven't seen one and I don't think I am going to see one.'' He was admitted.

Of course, my office called. We were in a truck moving around. My office called the administrator of the hospital, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure not only did he have the specialist, he had the head of the department of the area that he needed assistance in, and he got what he needed.

But, guess what? Every American, every American, every family member of a veteran, doesn't have the cell number of a Member of Congress. That shouldn't be the requirement for service, and that is why we are trying to respond to it.

It is also important, as I talk about readiness and support for our troops, $2.5 billion more to address the current readiness crisis that is the situation on stateside for our troops, including those that are better equipped and trained.

It is important that we make sure that our National Guard units are equipped. Mr. MURTHA, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, has said there is not a National Guard unit that is at a point of readiness right now, Mr. Speaker. They are not ready? Why? Because half of their equipment is in Iraq. Why? Because the training has not been taking place because of the lack of funding to be able to allow them to be battle ready. I think it is a disservice for those who have volunteered to serve our country.

You have $1.4 billion more for military housing allowance, $311 million more to make sure that you have the mine resistant ambush protection, which we call MRAP, for the vehicles in Iraq at this time. Everything that the military has asked for to make sure that our men and women don't come back in a way that this specialist had to come back.

She didn't have a choice, Mr. Speaker. Members, by voting for this supplemental, you are going to give her and many other people like her an opportunity to know that we have done everything possible that we can do here in the Congress to avoid what has happened to so many of our men and women that are going in for treatment, physical therapy, to make sure that we can avoid misfortune from happening to them, even though they keep the spirit that we ask them to keep, and these are the most resilient men and women in our society that are citizens.

I think it is important also to look, when I talked about the size of the military, $2.3 billion for the full cost of fielding an additional 36,000 Army troops and 9,000 Marines, and also $720 million as it relates to military construction costs. I think it is important that we look at this.

This is exactly what I was stating earlier. Members want to talk about readiness for voting against this bill? You are saying you are fine with the status quo. We don't know when the next conflict is going to take place. We don't know when. We asked the Army, why do you have soldiers rotating in in 120 days when they just served several months, almost a year, and beyond a year in Iraq?

We don't have the troops. That is what the Army is saying. The Marines are saying we are stretched thin. They are asking for help, and we are saying we are there to help them, and it is in this bill, and I think it is important that Members understand that.

I could not go to Iraq, which I am going to be going again for the third time, and look a marine, soldier, sailor, airman, Coast Guard person, in the face and say that I am there for you if I voted against the supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, I go back to say that I voted for the Republican version of the supplemental. I believe we should have redeployment, but the last thing that I want to do as a Member of Congress, the last thing that I want to do is vote against our men and women having what they need when they are in harm's way. That is the last thing I want to do. There has to be a really rough day for me not to vote to support these troops.

I know that there are some Members that are going to do what they need to do, but I just want to make sure, especially for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, those conversations that I have had with many of my friends, they say, ''Our leadership tells us that we need to vote against it.'' In the Appropriations Committee, some of my good friends on the other side of the aisle, the leadership said that.

Well, what about what our troops are saying? What about what their families are saying? What about our responsibility as men and women of the U.S. Congress?

Of course, I am not a general. I am not even a sergeant. I am not even a specialist in the Army. But I have been elected and federalized by my constituents to come here and represent them and the United States of America and make sure that we carry out our responsibility as Members of Congress to have oversight.

It is not making decisions here in the Chamber. It is oversight. What is wrong with the Iraqi government having to meet benchmarks? Let's just put it this way, Members. How long have we been talking about, and I do mean talking, about the training of Iraqi troops to secure their own country? How long? I just want to know how long. We have been talking about it I know for at least 3 years, which this is a war in its fifth year.

For at least 3 years there has been a strong conversation about training Iraqi troops, taking over patrols. They have a brigade now taking over a city. We look the next couple of months, U.S. troops are riding side-by-side with Iraqi troops, and in some cases it is a U.S. patrol, because that is what we are down to. A coalition of the few. Great Britain has already said, you know, guess what, folks? We are out of here. We have done our mission. Saddam Hussein is gone, has gone on to

another place. His two sons are gone. And they know it is a civil war going on right now in Iraq and they know full well that the key to Iraq, using the Iraq Study Group, I must add, and also every other expert as it relates to Iraq, will not be solved militarily.

□ 2230

It will not be solved militarily. Diplomacy is going to play a big role. Unless we start to endorse diplomacy, and Members are coming to the floor and saying, by passing this bill, we are saying we are surrendering.

Let me go back to what President Bush said. He was asked during the last campaign when would there be a victory. Well, there won't be a victory.

What he meant by that by saying there will not be a time when someone will go and hand a flag over to the United States and say ''you won.'' That is not going to happen. That is not going to happen. So for Members thinking there is going to be some big conversation at Little Big Horn or whatever the case may be for those historians that are around, that is not going to happen.

If you are waiting for an insurgent to come up and say let's sign an agreement and say, let me borrow this pen. This pen is fine. I will sign right here to say we surrender to the great U.S. military. That is not going to happen, ladies and gentlemen, and every Member of Congress has to know that. So to say we are going to hang around officiating a U.S. war, and losing two to three troops on average to sniper fire and IEDs, just to say we are tough and we are going to keep riding until we can't ride any more, we are moving into $525 billion-plus, with a B, in spending in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Afghanistan is a worthy cause because they had everything to do with 9/11. Because of Iraq, the Taliban and al Qaeda still live in Afghanistan, and they are getting stronger because of the lack of oversight by this Congress and the White House saying we need to send more troops because we have the coalition of the few who are leaving Iraq. So we have to continue to send brigades and troops into Iraq. This supplemental is moving in a new direction. It is moving in the direction of oversight saying that the President of the United States put benchmarks on the Iraqi Government, and in this bill it addresses that. If they don't meet those benchmarks, we start reversing our troops out. If we have an unwilling government in Iraq saying we can continue to do what we are doing because the Americans are going to be here, that is not so. The American people are far beyond several Members of Congress on this issue. Democrats and Republicans and Independents know full well that the reaction in Iraq of saying we are going to continue to send military in and some bureaucrat over at the Department of Defense saying, well, regardless of the fact that they had enough downtime, we are going to send them anyway because we have to keep over 140,000 troops in harm's way, just in Iraq. In this bill it goes against that theory.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me just clarify. Does it tie the hands of the administration? No, it doesn't. It says if it is within the national interest of national security, you have to come before Congress and justify stepping out of what we want to pass here in this House. It doesn't do anything to the President. It doesn't tie the hands of the military. It says if you are going to do something outside of the rules that you have already set, you have to come before Congress and let us know what you are doing. What's wrong with that?

Newsweek, Time, and other periodicals that are weekly, and some daily, have asked, Is the President listening? What is the President thinking?

The American people are saying they want to do certain things as it relates to Iraq, but they don't want to be in the middle of a civil war.

The Department of Defense 2 weeks ago admitted there is a civil war in Iraq. They said that 2 weeks ago, and it has been going on for over a year. The media 6 months ago said we are now calling it a civil war. And the Department of Defense just came to grips with that.

I am going to tell you, there are four star generals that are friends of mine that know full well and have told me, Just between you and I, Congressman, we are in a civil war.

But the administration had to give the okay. So, you know, things are getting tough now, and you go ahead. You can say it, yeah.

That is the kind of DOD that we have right now. When I say DOD, the Department of Defense. This bill unearthed that kind of philosophy. We want the Department of Defense to be professionals. We want our three and four star generals and our people in harm's way to make the decisions and come before Congress and tell us the truth, not because someone in the White House or someone in the Department of Defense said if you tell it, there is going to be a price to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I have a list of generals that have paid that price that have said otherwise than what the Department of Defense wanted them to share.

One thing that is good, Secretary Rumsfeld is gone, and that is good. I am glad he is gone from the Department of Defense. I asked him politely, Maybe you want to consider retiring after Abu Ghraib. When you have the kind of power over DOD, it smothers other ideas. This is not something in DOD. This was printed in newspapers. If you disagreed with the Secretary of Defense, you had a problem. We want to fight against that.

I want to talk about my colleagues on the other side. My good friend who used to be the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he said he never felt stronger against what was going on as relates to the surge. They are going to have an opportunity to vote on the supplemental.

You had Senator HAGEL who is also a Republican and I consider a good person. He said: ''I think the speech that was given last night,'' and this was after the President presented his plan for the surge, ''by the President represents the most dangerous foreign policy blunder in this country since Vietnam. If it is carried out, it will be resisted.'' That is Senate Foreign Relations Committee testimony of 1–11–07. It goes on and on. Senator SNOWE, Senator COLLINS, Senator COLEMAN, Senator SMITH, Senator BROWNBACK, Senator SPECTER, Senator BUNNING, and on and on and on. Senator SUNUNU.

So we can go on and on talking about the justification of third-party validators that are here. And then we have generals, Mr. Speaker, that have said otherwise against what this administration is proposing. The President has threatened to veto this supplemental. I wonder why. It is his words that he said here at that podium that the Iraqi Government has to be held accountable because we will not be there.

We used his words and put it on paper, put it into law. Here is the bill. It is on the Internet. Folks can read it. Every Member has a copy. There is no secret. It is not in some back room, it is not like, I have not seen the bill yet. H.R. 1591. You can read about all of the good things that are in here that are already Department of Defense regulations. That is what the President said when he made his surge speech and the accountability that is being placed on the Iraqi Government.

The Iraq Study Group, it is in here. Their recommendations are in here. It is nothing new. They were bipartisan, appointed by the President of the United States.

All we are saying is we are going to hold you to your word. What is wrong with that? Whatever happened to those good old days, if you say it, you are going to do it? What is wrong with that?

I don't know what the problem is, Members, but the only problem I can find with holding you to your word is probably politics, partisan politics. When we look at national security, there is no room for that.

Let's talk about some of these military leaders that have raised a concern about the escalation.

General Colin Powell, can't say enough about him, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, former Secretary of State. That is some resume. ''I am not persuaded that another surge of troops in Baghdad for the purpose of suppressing this continued violence, this civil war will work.''

That is General Colin Powell. It is not Kendrick Meek. And he is a Republican. He is just being an American when he said this. I know General Powell, and he is a friend.

General Wesley Clark, retired, former Supreme Allied Commander of

Europe of NATO. This is a man who led us in Bosnia. He said troops surge and accountability will be seen as rhetoric. The bottom line of what he is saying is that the accountability of what we say that we want to be accountable for in Iraq as it relates to security is not going to see itself through.

General McCaffrey, who is retired, he said: ''It is a foolish idea. Our allies will leave us.''

Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened.

''Make no mistake about that, most will be gone by the summer.'' This is what he said. And sure enough, they are going to be gone by the summer.

These are our decorated members of the military that are saying this. So when Members come to the floor and start calling Members names and calling the Speaker names and calling the Speaker ''general'' and carrying on and trying to make a point and trying to sensationalize the obvious, it is not serving our troops well and it is not serving our country well.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to close with this: we have a responsibility as Americans and also as Members of the House to make sure that we follow through on what we said and told our constituents that we would do, that we would come as thinkers to this process and that we would represent them in the best way possible.

For the men and women that allow us to salute one flag, for those who have served in the past, we thank them and honor them. Let's honor them tomorrow when we come to this floor and vote for this emergency supplemental. We had a nonbinding resolution a couple of weeks ago that said we were against the escalation of troops in Iraq. This bill and this emergency supplemental is binding, and it has meat and teeth on it on behalf of those in harm's way, and even those that have served. In this bill we are taking care of the needs of not only military but military families. We are providing homeland security with the necessary funding that they need. And so when you think about, when you pray about what you are going to do tomorrow, think about those that are counting on us to represent them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker and majority leader for allowing me to come to the floor tonight. I want to thank the Members of the House for listening. It is always a true honor to address the House.

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) for 2 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. First let me tell the gentleman from Georgia I appreciate him trying to save some money. I think his efforts, though, are a year late. If you want to look for Katrina fraud, look for Katrina fraud that was perpetrated by the Bush administration.

In south Mississippi we had 40,000 people at one point living in FEMA trailers. We are grateful for every one of them, but those trailers were delivered by a friend of the President, Riley Bechtel, a major contributor to the Bush administration. He got $16,000 to haul a trailer the last 70 miles from Purvis, Mississippi down to the gulf coast, hook it up to a garden hose, hook it up to a sewer tap and plug it in; $16,000.

So the gentleman never came to the floor once last year to talk about that fraud. But now little towns like Waveland, Bay Saint Louis, Pas Christian, that have no tax base because their stores were destroyed in the storm, a county like Hancock County where 90 percent of the residents lost everything, or at least substantial damage to their home, he wants to punish Bay Saint Louis, he wants to punish Waveland, he wants to punish Pas Christian.

* * *

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire as to whether or not those words are eligible to be taken down.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot render an advisory opinion on that point.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand that his words be taken down.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 4:30 p.m. on account of attending a memorial service.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEIN of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHWARTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today and March 23.

Mr. PEARCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, March 27.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 23, 2007, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

921. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2006, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 13218; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

922. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mariner Licensing and Documentation Program Restructuring and Centralization; Correction [USCG-2006-25535] (RIN: 1625-ZA09) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

923. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Amendments [USCG-2001-10881] (RIN: 1625-AA36) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

924. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Waters Surrounding M/V TONG CHENG, HI [COTP Honolulu 07-001] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

925. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rates for Pilotage on the Great Lakes [USCG-2006-24414] (RIN: 1625-AB05) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

926. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Amendments; Marine Safety Center Address Change [USCG-2007-26953] (RIN: 1625-ZA12) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

927. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area: Savannah River, Savannah, GA [CGD07-05-138] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

928. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Biscayne Bay, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Miami River, and Miami Beach Channel, Miami-Dade County, FL [CGD07-07-010] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

929. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-23734; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-174-AD; Amendment 39-14827; AD 2006-23-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

930. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT-502, AT-502A, AT-502B, AT-602, AT-802, and AT-802A Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25260; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-37-AD; Amendment 39-14826; AD 2006-23-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

931. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Turmo IV A and IV C Series Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-25970; Directorate Identifier 99-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-14829; AD 2006-23-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

932. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25437; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-136-AD; Amendment 39-14828; AD 2006-23-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

933. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce, plc RB211 Trent 768-60, 772-60, and 772B-60 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-26052; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-14823; AD 2006-23-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

934. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25388; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-086-AD; Amendment 39-14824; AD 2006-23-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

935. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25337; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-138-AD; Amendment 39-14825; AD 2006-23-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

936. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Model 750 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-26352; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-231-AD; Amendment 39-14830; AD 2006-24-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

937. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 Airplanes and Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22812; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-14811; AD 2006-22-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

938. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Trent 768-60, Trent 772-60, and Trent 772B-60 Turbofan Engines. [Docket No. FAA-2006-25855; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-29-AD; Amendment 39-14819; AD 2006-23-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

939. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-26388; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-234-AD; Amendment 39-14834; AD 2006-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

940. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A330-300, A340-200, and A340-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-381-AD; Amendment 39-14832; AD 2006-24-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

941. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, PHMSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Harmonization with the United Nations Recommendations, International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, and International Civil Aviation Organization's Technical Instructions [Docket No. PHMSA-06-25476(HM-2151)] (RIN: 2137-AE16) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

942. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2008; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

943. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's requested legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2008; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, Education and Labor, Veterans' Affairs, the Judiciary, Small Business, Natural Resources, Ways and Means, the Budget, and Foreign Affairs.

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:

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1401. A bill to improve the security of railroads, public transportation, and over-the-road buses in the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–65 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of the rule XII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1401 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H.R. 1638. A bill to extend and improve protections and services to individuals directly impacted by the terrorist attack in New York City on September 11, 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1639. A bill to provide that no entity performing lead system integrator functions in the acquisition of a major system by the Department of Homeland Security may have any direct financial interest in the development or construction of any individual system or element of any system of systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 1640. A bill to provide liability protection for individuals who report suspicious behavior to law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BUYER, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 1641. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recodify as part of that title certain educational assistance programs for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1642. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that, to the extent possible, an enhanced-use lease for a homeless housing project at the Department of Veterans Affairs facility known as the Sepulveda Ambulatory Care Center, located in North Hills, California, shall provide that such housing project shall be maintained as a sober living facility for veterans only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. KUHL of New York):

H.R. 1643. A bill to prohibit termination of employment of volunteers firefighters and emergency medical personnel responding to emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1644. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to clarify the definition of ''supervisor'' for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BACA, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. SOLIS):

H.R. 1645. A bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1646. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to implement procedures for tracking ballots which are transmitted by mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 1647. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to include podiatrists as physicians for purposes of covering physicians services under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODE:

H.R. 1648. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from closing Farm Service Agency offices in Appomattox, Virginia, and Lunenburg, Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. HERSETH:

H.R. 1649. A bill to prohibit the closure or relocation of any county office of the Farm Service Agency until at least one year after the enactment of an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs for fiscal years after 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 1650. A bill to amend the Federal antitrust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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 Ms. HERSETH (for herself, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 1651. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Rural Health Quality Advisory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1652. A bill to amend the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to issue new rules to establish a requirement to prohibit any telemarketing calls during the hours of 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WU, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 1653. A bill to provide for the reduction of adolescent pregnancy, HIV rates, and other sexually transmitted diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to require that the Secretary of the Interior determine that a gaming establishment on certain newly acquired Indian lands would be in the best interests of certain Indian tribes and not detrimental to the surrounding community before such lands would be eligible for certain exceptions to the general prohibition on gaming on such lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. COBLE, and Ms. HOOLEY):

H.R. 1655. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a minor child's congenital or developmental deformity or disorder due to trauma, infection, tumor, or disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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 Mr. POE (for himself and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H.R. 1656. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to permit access to databases maintained by the Federal Emergency Management Agency for purposes of complying with sex offender registry and notification laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 1657. A bill to establish a Science and Technology Scholarship Program to award scholarships to recruit and prepare students for careers in the National Weather Service and in National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration marine research, atmospheric research, and satellite programs; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. SALAZAR:

H.R. 1658. A bill to amend the Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve Act of 2000 to explain the purpose and provide for the administration of the Baca National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):

H.R. 1659. A bill to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SALAZAR:

H.R. 1660. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national cemetery for veterans in the southern Colorado region; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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 Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mrs. DRAKE):

H.R. 1661. A bill to amend the Law Enforcement Pay Equity Act of 2000 to permit certain annuitants of the retirement programs of the United States Park Police and United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to receive the adjustments in pension benefits to which such annuitants would otherwise be entitled as a result of the conversion of members of the United States Park Police and United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to a new salary schedule under the amendments made by such Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States should submit to the Government of Iraq a draft bilateral status-of-forces agreement by not later than September 1, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Mr. CALVERT):

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that provisions that provoke veto threats from the President should not be included on bills that appropriate funds for the implementation of recommendations of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Res. 262. A resolution honoring Ellen May Tower who, while an United States Army nurse during the Spanish-American War, became the first Army nurse to die on foreign soil; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 180: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 216: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 237: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 249: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WU, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 281: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 357: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 395: Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 402: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 411: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 493: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 511: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 518: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 526: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 549: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 551: Mr. BACA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 562: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 579: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ARCURI and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 592: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 620: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 634: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HERGER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MICA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RENZI, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 667: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 690: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 729: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 741: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 758: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 769: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 771: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 784: Mr. JINDAL, Mr. FORBES, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 819: Ms. CARSON and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 881: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 887: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 960: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1022: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASTOR, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1034: Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1061: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1076: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 1102: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CARSON, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1108: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 1119: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 1142: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HILL, Mrs. DRAKE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1147: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1152: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 1172: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1187: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1188: Mr. GOODE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1192: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1211: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1225: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1228: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 1229: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1232: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1261: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 1289: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1307: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1330: Ms. HOOLEY.

H.R. 1335: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 1350: Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1353: Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 1355: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 1363: Ms. HOOLEY.

H.R. 1365: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1366: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1371: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1415: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 1416: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 1429: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. STARK, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1456: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1467: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1491: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1533: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1539: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1551: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1560: Mrs. CUBIN and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1576: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 1586: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MACK, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. POE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1595: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 1600: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1609: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HARE, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1636: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 37: Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Res. 37: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H. Res. 100: Mr. JINDAL.

H. Res. 121: Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 137: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 179: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H. Res. 208: Mr. WATT.

H. Res. 224: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 233: Ms. WATSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H. Res. 257: Mr. DENT.