



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 22, 2007

No. 84

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISRAEL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 22, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE ISRAEL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

FARM BILL/FOOD BILL

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The farm bill is described as the most important legislation that most of America ignores. It's big, complex and involves lots of money all over the country, but the details are not well known. One of the reasons might be the name. We call it a farm bill. But it could and perhaps should be called a food bill, because that is what it is.

Many people do not understand that the farm bill isn't just about farmers. It is a bill that funds food stamps, nutritional programs and farmers' markets. The programs we're talking about all impact rural, urban and suburban families alike.

Currently, our farm programs provide too little help to the majority of American farmers and ranchers. The majority of commodity payments go to a few large-scale farm operations with only 40 percent of the farmers receiving any commodity payments at all. My State of Oregon is an example. Even though it is a major agricultural producer, it really doesn't benefit that much from the farm bill.

With the 2007 farm bill reauthorization, we have a chance to make dramatic reforms in American agricultural policy by crafting forward-looking policies to help farmers manage the transition to a new farm economy. I would suggest some basic principles for strengthening the farm bill so that we ensure the future of American agriculture by giving small farmers the increased markets they need, a dependable workforce, the ability to pass their farms and heritage on to the next generation, and be protected from urban sprawl.

Farm workers also need safe, family wage jobs, and rural communities need a stronger economy. We need to provide safe access to nutrition and reliable foods to all Americans, especially the most vulnerable members of our communities; children, the elderly and the poor.

We need to increase the health and safety of our communities by improving access to local markets that can improve farmers' revenues, improve rural economies, and strengthen the vital connections between urban and rural communities. We can have programs to reimburse farmers for providing environmental services such as flood control, carbon sinks and wildlife

habitat. This can help reduce global warming, increase communities' resilience to natural events, and give farmers the opportunity to diversify their revenue stream.

In short, we can move American agriculture into the 21st century by not being devoted to policies from the last 200 years.

To that end, I have recently introduced the Local Food and Farm Support Act to connect local farms to schools to provide healthy food choices for children and promoting a stronger local farm economy by providing funding and programs that connect farmers with local markets, including school to cafeteria programs, and the promotion of farmers' markets. This legislation would provide grants to farmers to explore innovative new ways to connect to local markets and increase food assistance for senior and low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, I could just as easily talk about the farm bill as being the most important piece of environmental legislation we will consider in this Congress, because the potential for energy with biomass and wind, greenhouse gas reduction and energy conservation all enable us to reduce the carbon and energy footprint of America's vast agricultural landscape. In the area of water, a sound farm bill is the best and most cost-effective way to improve the quality and quantity of water across America, and of course it is essential to land preservation.

This is why we all need to pay attention to this critical legislation. Every Member of Congress should deal with the challenge to work with America's farmers and ranchers to produce agricultural legislation that meets the needs of America in the 21st century.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H5535

FOOD STAMP CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized during morning-hour debate for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last week I accepted the Food Stamp Challenge, living for the past week on the average food stamp benefit of \$1 per meal or \$21 for the entire week.

I did it in order to draw attention to the persistent problem of hunger in America. I didn't realize just how hard it would be, but on my first shopping trip to Safeway, I quickly found out. It was hard enough to buy basic staples, but once I got to the produce section, it was impossible to buy much of anything. There was no way to eat a nutritious diet. Fruits and vegetables were simply out of my price range.

For me, it was a learning experience. For 26 million Americans and 1.2 million Illinoisans, it is a way of life. I wonder how parents on food stamps can stretch their budgets so their children have enough to eat or how seniors with chronic illness afford both eating nutritious meals and purchasing adequate medication. The answer for many is they simply can't.

In the richest country in the world, the fact that families face these sort of trade-offs is unjust and I would say it's immoral. The United States is spending merely \$3 billion each week in Iraq, yet we expect hungry Americans to eat on \$3 a day?

We need to pass Representatives JIM MCGOVERN's and JO ANN EMERSON's Feeding America's Families Act which would strengthen America's anti-hunger safety net programs, including food stamps, at a reasonable and affordable cost of about \$4 billion per year. These are the kinds of provisions that ought to be part of the farm bill which includes the food stamp program.

I just ended this challenge yesterday. I am looking forward to a big salad for lunch where I include all kinds of vegetables at the salad bar that's in the cafeteria, adding whatever I want to that salad rather than having to carefully pick and choose what I had last week, which was one head of lettuce and one tomato and a few carrots, and that was about it. My snacks were water and, on a good moment, ice water.

It was an interesting and instructive week for me, but imagining my children and grandchildren having to live that way made it very, very clear to me that this really ought not to be a forced option for so many millions of Americans.

We can do better. This is a matter of priorities. We can change those priorities. We can make sure that with pride we say that no one in this country goes hungry, that everyone in this country at least has the opportunity to make healthy choices about the food that they eat and the food that they serve their children.

How can a child learn in school when they come without an adequate breakfast? How can they achieve in life without the nutrition that they need as their bones are growing and as their minds are growing? I am very hopeful that the experiment that I did with Congressmen MCGOVERN and EMERSON and TIM RYAN will prove to be helpful in making sure that we are able to pass more humane, and important to all Americans, legislation that will provide nutritious and affordable food for all of our residents in the United States.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CLEAVER) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, guardian of our freedom and provider for all, as we approach Memorial Day, let us not forget the true meaning of this Nation's moment of memory. We shall not be mindless of all our blessings as Your people. Rather, in the leisure of the holiday weekend, we shall demonstrate our indebtedness to our brothers and sisters who serve in the military. With reverence, we shall call to mind those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in serving this Nation and protecting human freedom around the world.

Thus Your Holy Scriptures, Lord, shall be fulfilled in us as this holiday unfolds and names to be memorialized are brought on to our attention. The Bible says, "Every living person appreciates generosity. Do not withhold your gratitude, even when someone is dead. Do not turn your back on those who weep, but mourn with those who mourn." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 254. An act to award posthumously a Congressional gold medal to Constantino Brumidi.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE TIED TO FUNDING IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press reports that the latest Iraq supplemental funding plan incredibly will tie an increase in the minimum wage to funding the war through October. If this is true, and I hope it is not, it tells American workers that the only way they will get an increase in wages is to continue funding a war which is taking the lives of their sons and daughters. First, blood for oil; now a minimum wage for maximum blood? Aren't the American people giving enough blood for this war without having to give more to have a wage increase? What's happened to our country? We are losing our moral compass. We are losing our sense of justice. We are losing touch with the difference between right and wrong.

We do not have to fund this war. We must leave Iraq now. Support our troops. Bring them home. H.R. 1234 is a plan to end the war and stabilize Iraq and give Iraqis control of their oil. We must take a new path. We must take a path of truth and justice.

TAX REDUCTIONS BENEFIT FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's The Hill features an advertisement by Merrill Lynch that praised the 2003 tax cuts, proclaiming, "Lower capital gains and dividend tax rates have produced major economic gains."

I was present 4 years ago this week when President Bush signed the tax reduction legislation. The results are some of the most successful ever. The economy has expanded \$1.6 trillion; 7.8 million new jobs have been created; unemployment rates are near historic lows. The stock market is at a record high, soaring 40 percent. Tax revenues are the highest ever because of private sector growth. Twenty-four million

families have received an average tax cut of \$950. The lower rate on savings and investments has helped our economy grow to benefit American families.

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

DEMOCRATS COMPLETE A BUDGET, SOMETHING THAT ELUDED PAST REPUBLICAN CONGRESSES

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last week, congressional Democrats accomplished something the Republican "do-nothing" Congress could not do. We passed a final budget through both the House and Senate.

Over 3 of the last 5 years, the Republican-led Congress failed to reach agreement on a final budget resolution, leading to unparalleled deficit spending. Unlike our Republican predecessors, this new Democratic Congress has produced a fiscally responsible budget that serves as a blueprint for investing in America's priorities, providing tax cuts to middle-class families, and balances the budget in just 5 years without raising taxes. Not even the President's proposed budget comes out of the red after 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, budgets serve as a blueprint of a Congress' priorities. Our final budget strengthens our military readiness and invests in our troops and veterans. It also spurs innovation to boost our economy and expands investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency to reduce global warming and our dangerous dependence on foreign oil.

Democrats vowed to run this Congress differently, and we have, by producing a final budget agreement.

SECOND VERSE SAME AS THE FIRST

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the new, reformed, inclusive, repackaged, politically motivated Senate immigration proposal is more of the same lip service we have heard for years about protecting our borders.

In the 1980s, the American public was promised, and Congress passed, legislation that was supposed to beef up the border, reform the troublesome immigration service, and grant amnesty to 3 million people. The result? Our borders are less secure now. The immigration service is overwhelmed with mismanagement and lack of resources. But that amnesty deal, it did happen. Now 20 years later, the amnesty gift has only increased illegal entry, not slowed it down. We now have 12- to 20 million people here without permission.

Why doesn't the Federal Government enforce the existing law and secure the border? Because the Federal Govern-

ment doesn't have the moral will to enforce current law, and if Congress tries to pass a similar bill like the 1980s: we will get more of the same: lax border security and an immigration service that is in confusion. But we'll sure let those illegals stay in America. It's another case of second verse, same as the first.

And that's just the way it is.

GREEN JOBS—PATHWAYS FROM POVERTY

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to opportunities of job growth and hopefully eradicating poverty through a green economy.

A major national investment in renewable energy could create potentially 3.5 million green-collar jobs over the next 10 years.

We must say to America's workers, particularly those in urban and rural underserved communities, there is a place for you in the green economy. Investment should not only be improving infrastructure, but improving economic opportunities for all. That is why I am proud to be working with Congressman JOHN TIERNEY and others to create a green jobs bill that will create pathways out of poverty.

Job training can lead to self-sufficiency and prosperity through higher wages, access to benefits and more career choices. Other cities and States throughout the country have taken the lead to shape the new economy, which is creating demand for green products and services.

Under Speaker PELOSI's leadership, Congress has taken steps to ensure our Nation has a secure energy future. I hope that ensuring underserved communities achieve economic security can be a part of this green future.

GIVE THE TROOPS THE FUNDS THEY NEED

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over 100 days have passed since the President's first request of additional monies for our troops, and still no money. As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to ensure men and women in our military have the resources and tools necessary to succeed. Just 2 weeks ago, we heard from nearly 3,000 of those men and women asking for our support.

Mr. Speaker, politics should never interfere with wartime decisions. Unfortunately, some have taken this opportunity to score what they believe to be political points and undermine our Commander in Chief. Our troops deserve a clean supplemental that does not embolden the enemy with language of retreat and defeat.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrat leadership should stop the rhetoric of empty

promises of "we support our troops" by giving them the critical funds they need today so they can finish the mission we gave them and come home in victory.

PRESIDENT'S ENERGY PROPOSAL IS TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, it's that time of year again. Just as families are preparing to hit the road for their summer vacations, the gas prices are once again hitting record highs. Drivers are paying a heavy price for the Bush administration's failure to enact a comprehensive energy strategy. And just last week, the President attempted to show that he's taking action by announcing an Executive Order that doesn't call for any action until a few weeks before he leaves office. This is simply too little, too late. Where has he been for the last 6 years when prices were hitting record numbers each Memorial Day?

The Democratic Congress refuses to ignore this problem. We passed legislation that will roll back \$14 billion in taxpayer subsidies for Big Oil, and instead we would reinvest here at home in clean alternative fuels, renewable energy and energy efficiency.

In the coming weeks we will bring legislation to the House floor that will crack down on price gouging by the big oil companies so we can provide immediate relief to consumers. Unlike the Bush administration, the Democratic Congress is not simply going to ignore this problem.

HOW EXACTLY IS BUSH SUPPORTING OUR TROOPS WHEN HE THREATENS A VETO OF DOD?

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week Democrats and Republicans came together in a strong bipartisan fashion to approve a defense authorization that prioritizes the immediate needs of our military personnel.

While the President believed that a 3 percent pay raise was suitable for our troops in combat, Democrats and Republicans in this House said our military personnel deserved more, and approved a bill that gives them a 3.5 percent raise. The President's response, a threatened veto.

How exactly is the President supporting our troops when he threatens to veto a bill that he says gives our troops too large a pay raise? Has the President forgotten how much he's asked them to sacrifice over the last 4 years? Troops were initially told that their stays in Iraq would last a year, only to be informed at the end of that year that those stays were being extended by several months as a result of the President's troop escalation plan.

Mr. Speaker, if President Bush really wants to support our troops, he would reconsider his veto threat and help us give our troops a much deserved pay raise.

IN SUPPORT OF H. RES. 171

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I do want to take a moment today to thank my colleague from Missouri, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SKELTON, for providing this opportunity today to honor an American hero.

I rise today to discuss H. Res. 171, a bill to recognize the 250th anniversary of the birth of the Marquis de Lafayette.

On September 6, 2007, our Nation will celebrate the 250th birthday of one of the truly outstanding and extraordinary people in our country's history, the Marquis de Lafayette.

Born in the Auvergne section of France, Lafayette did not become an honorary American citizen until 2002, some 168 years after his death. He was commissioned with the rank of major general in the Continental Army just shy of his 20th birthday, and he soon became one of George Washington's closest confidants. The first foreign dignitary to address the House of Representatives, Lafayette was a steadfast supporter of liberty, loyalty and democracy.

You have heard many of my colleagues speak to Lafayette's legacy as a military leader. I rise today to offer a different perspective as to Lafayette's influence on our Nation's history.

Lafayette College, located in my district in eastern Pennsylvania, was founded in 1826 by the citizens of Easton. And I am here once again to commemorate this auspicious occasion and ask that my colleagues join me in this celebration.

□ 1015

DEMOCRATS WANT TO PROTECT THE HOMELAND BUT THE PRESIDENT IS FIGHTING POPULAR MEASURES

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, for the first 4 months of this year, the new Democratic-led House approved key legislation that will move us in a new direction and allow us better defense of our Nation and strengthen our military. Unfortunately, time and time again, the President has either vetoed our efforts or has threatened to veto.

During our first 100 hours, we passed a bill implementing the recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission, including improvements in secur-

ing our ports, our border and our infrastructure. The administration currently opposes this legislation.

This House also approved the Rail and Mass Transit Security Act, which requires the Homeland Security Department to develop plans to protect our rail and mass transit. Despite strong bipartisan support here in the House, President Bush has threatened to veto it.

Mr. Speaker, protecting our homeland is not a partisan issue. This House approved both of these critical homeland security bills with the votes of both Republicans and Democrats. I would hope the President would stop being an obstructionist and instead support our important bills.

THE DEMOCRATIC TRAIL OF BROKEN PROMISES

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk just a little bit about some of my encounters with my constituents over the weekend. What they are saying when I meet them is, what is going on in Washington? What is happening up there? We thought we were going to see a different type of environment. But you know what, it seems like nothing is getting done.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, they are right on the mark, because we are zero in '07 on the six for '06 that the leadership had promised that they were going to do.

More importantly to my constituents, and especially to some of those at Fort Campbell that I had the opportunity to spend time with on Sunday evening as they had their Normandy barbecue, the number one question was, what is going on with the Iraq supplemental? It is truly a disservice to our men and women in uniform for this not to be passed. Our troops in the field need that funding.

Other constituents were saying, what is this we are hearing about this budget? My goodness, the single largest tax increase in history?

Yes, indeed. And I can guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, many of us will stand in the gap to keep that from becoming law.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS STILL WANT TO PROVIDE THE PRESIDENT A BLANK CHECK ON IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to addressing the most important issues currently facing our Nation, the Republicans in this body are once again all talk and no action. Despite overwhelming public opposition to President Bush's open-ended commitment in Iraq, despite thousands of lives lost and hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayers money spent, Re-

publicans still won't actually take action to end this war.

Oh, they talk a good game. They say they are listening to the retired generals, the soldiers and the American people who want our troops brought home. A few of them even went to the White House a few weeks ago to vent their frustration over the war in Iraq and the President's leadership.

But when it comes to actually moving to send President Bush a message that this Congress is moving the war in the right direction, my colleagues on the other side the aisle do what they always do; they line up and vote with their leadership and with President Bush.

Mr. Speaker, despite their claims, Republicans still want to write blank checks and rubber-stamp the President's policy. While they wait, Democrats are moving forward with our commitment to making serious changes in Iraq.

THE GRAND BARGAIN IS NO BARGAIN FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, I have worked with colleagues in the House and Senate to achieve border security and comprehensive immigration reform without amnesty. I believe illegal immigration is a crisis that demands a national response, but amnesty is not that response.

From what we know about the recent compromise announced in the Senate, there are many commendable elements of the plan, including stronger border security measures and a shift to a merit-based immigration system. However, ultimately what has been dubbed a "grand bargain" is no bargain for the American people.

By permitting illegal immigrants to get right with the law without leaving the country, the Senate compromise amounts to amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants, and I cannot support it.

I do hope to continue to work with colleagues in both parties in the House and Senate to craft final legislation that puts border security first, creates a temporary worker program without amnesty, that requires illegal immigrants to leave the country to apply, and, when they come, to learn English and live under the law when they are here.

PROVIDING FOR AMERICAN SOLDIERS, VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, last week this House passed a bipartisan defense authorization bill. The legislation includes two provisions to which

President Bush objected. One gives our military a well-deserved pay raise, and the other offers surviving spouses of fallen armed servicemembers an additional \$40 per month.

Our men and women in uniform and their family members have sacrificed enormously. They have earned honor, and they deserve the benefits that would be provided to them in this bill.

While the President has repeatedly called for supporting our troops and their families, it appears that his words do not match his deeds. On the other hand, this Congress has committed to providing our troops the equipment, training and benefits they need and deserve, ensuring our veterans get the care to which they are entitled and caring for our military families who endure many issues when their loved ones serve overseas and when they return home.

Our Nation owes our soldiers, our veterans and our families more than just empty talk.

SUPPORTING THE TROOPS WITH A FAIR PAY RAISE

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was a military spouse and I lived on military pay. It is very difficult to do that. But we do that with honor and with gratitude for the chance to serve this country.

The House of Representatives recognizes that service and called for a 3.5 percent increase in pay for the military. The President, who talks about supporting the troops, does not want that. He is strongly opposed to raising the pay of military families.

How much does that really mean? For an E-4, it means \$200 a year. \$200 a year. The President provides \$536 billion of tax breaks for the top 1 percent, and is unwilling to give \$200 a year to an E-4. Seventy times what we are asking, seventy times, goes to the rich.

It is time for the President to start supporting the troops instead of supporting the rich. I hope before Veterans' Day, the President changes his mind and agrees with the House of Representatives that our men and women in uniform deserve this pay.

BEING HONEST ABOUT PLANS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, many of my friends ask me as we struggle to fund this war, why are the Iraqi Parliamentarians going on a 2-month vacation? The answer is very simple: Self-preservation. The AP reported that "a few shells" fell in the Green Zone last weekend. Well, my sources in Amman and in Baghdad told me that 47 mortar rounds landed in the Green Zone on Sunday, and on Monday

they hit the parliament building, destroying the office of Dr. Mashhadani 5 minutes after he left it.

The AP also reports that the Defense Minister, Mr. Obeidi, has told reporters that Iraq's military was drawing up plans in case U.S. forces left the country quickly. "The army plans on the basis of a worst case scenario so as not to allow any security vacuum. There are meetings with political leaders on how we can deal with the sudden pull-out."

It sounds to me like we are looking at off-the-hotel-roof in Vietnam, or maybe it was the pullout from Beirut.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, we could make the President be honest with us about what he is actually planning. The world can't figure it out.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Recorded votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

HONORING THE MARQUIS DE LAFAYETTE ON THE OCCASION OF THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 171) honoring the Marquis de Lafayette on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of his birth, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 171

Whereas Marie-Joseph-Paul-Yves-Roch-Gilbert Du Motier, commonly known as the Marquis de Lafayette, was born on September 6, 1757, and occupies a considerable place in the history of the United States;

Whereas Lafayette was a man of considerable military skill who expressed sympathy for American revolutionary fighters, decided to aid colonists in their struggle for independence, and was voted by Congress the rank and commission of major general in the Continental Army;

Whereas Lafayette's military service was invaluable to General George Washington during many Revolutionary War battles, earning him the reputation as "the soldier's friend";

Whereas Lafayette's strategic thinking, military skill, and dedication as a general officer serve as a model for present day American military officers;

Whereas Congress appropriated awards and honors in honor of Lafayette's service to the American people, including the commissioning of a portrait that hangs in the House Chamber;

Whereas because of Lafayette's strong belief in freedom, he advocated the abolition of slavery in the Americas, favored equal legal

rights for religious minorities in France, and became a prominent figure in the French Revolution;

Whereas, in 1824, at the invitation of President Monroe, Lafayette embarked upon a triumphant, 13-month tour of all 24 States of the then-United States, during which he became the first foreign dignitary to address the House of Representatives, and visited many Masonic bodies;

Whereas because of America's affection for Lafayette, many United States cities, towns, and counties have been named for him;

Whereas Lafayette symbolizes the assistance America received from Europe in the struggle for independence;

Whereas United States aid to France during the world wars of 1917-1918 and 1941-1945 stemmed in part from shared values of democracy and freedom, which Lafayette strongly supported;

Whereas the friendship between the people of the United States and France has not diminished; and

Whereas continued relationships between the United States and France are important to the success of our global partnerships: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors Marquis de Lafayette on the 250th anniversary of his birth; and

(2) urges the cadets of the United States military academies and military officers participating in various professional military education courses to study Lafayette's impact on the creation of the United States and on the United States military.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I hail from Lafayette County, Missouri. Its county seat is Lexington, my home. A few miles west-bound on Highway 224 are the small towns of Napoleon, Wellington and Waterloo. These communities, which are nestled into the fertile farmland and rolling hills south of the Missouri River, are named after prominent figures or places in French history. They are a very long way from France. But their names and the namesake of my home county, Marquis de Lafayette, reflect a friendship that has existed between the United States and France since the early days of the American Revolution.

No one person better symbolizes that friendship and the assistance American colonists received from Europe in our struggle for independence than the Marquis de Lafayette. He occupies a considerable place in the history of the United States, which is why I was

pleased to author H. Res. 171, a resolution honoring the life of the Marquis de Lafayette on the occasion of his 250th birthday on September 6, 2007.

Lafayette was a man of considerable military skill who sympathized with the American revolutionary fighters. After withdrawing from the French army and traveling across the ocean at his own expense, the Congress voted Lafayette the rank and commission of major general in the Continental Army. His military service during the Revolutionary War was invaluable to George Washington, earning him the reputation as "the soldier's friend." Lafayette's strategic thinking and dedication as a general officer serve as a model for our present day military personnel.

After achieving military victory, Lafayette returned to France, helping the U.S. secure trade agreements and critical loans with European nations. He also became a prominent figure in the French Revolution, speaking out in support of universal freedom and human rights.

Because of Lafayette's commitment to America, Congress honored him with awards of money and land. Congress was also presented a life-size portrait of Lafayette that hangs here in the Chamber of the House of Representatives. The other large portrait is of President George Washington, Lafayette's closest friend and role model.

At the invitation of President James Monroe, Lafayette returned to the United States in 1824. He embarked upon a triumphant tour, during which he visited 24 States, including Missouri, and he became the first foreign dignitary to address the House of Representatives. Lafayette also visited many Masonic bodies across America.

During this visit and thereafter, various American leaders honored Lafayette by naming cities, towns and counties for him or for his French estate, known as LaGrange. Schools, monuments and parks were named for him throughout the United States. One of the most prominent is Lafayette Park in Washington D.C., which is located directly across from the White House.

As we take a moment this year to honor the Marquis de Lafayette on the occasion of his 250th birthday, let us remember how he helped secure American independence and helped establish the United States as an international presence. The values of democracy espoused by our Founding Fathers and by Lafayette have been the bedrock of U.S. domestic and international policy-making for generations. I urge all Americans, and especially those wearing the American military uniform, to study Lafayette as America pays tribute to him this year.

As we take to the floor today to honor a respected Frenchman, I would be remiss if I did not also take the opportunity to say a word of appreciation to the current French Ambassador to the United States, Jean-David Levitte.

□ 1030

Through his time in Washington, I have come to know Ambassador Levitte as a fine person and an outstanding representative of the people of France. Last week, I learned that the newly elected French President, Nicolas Sarkozy, has appointed Ambassador Levitte to be his chief diplomatic adviser. Let me take this means to wish him well as he takes on more responsibilities. But more importantly, let me thank him for his friendship.

I ask Members to support H. Res. 171. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 171, a resolution that honors Marie-Joseph-Paul-Yves-Roch-Gilbert Du Motier, commonly known as the Marquis de Lafayette, on the occasion of his 250th birthday.

Lafayette is honored here in the House Chamber with a greater-than-life-size portrait, only joined by a portrait of George Washington. This is a reminder also that France was America's first ally.

H. Res. 171 was introduced by a man I admire greatly, the Armed Services Committee chairman, IKE SKELTON, a leader in promoting the study of history.

My family has a strong French heritage. My home State of South Carolina is proud of the French Huguenot settlers highlighted by General Francis Marion, the Swamp Fox of the American Revolution, and I am grateful to have cosponsored this resolution.

The Lafayette family was one of ancient nobility. Lafayette was merely 2 years old when his father was killed in the Seven Years War. At the age of 16, he inherited his title, although he later renounced the "marquis," and a large fortune was received from his grandfather.

In keeping with his family tradition, Lafayette joined the French Army at the age of 14, and was a junior officer in the French army when he defied the orders of King Louis the Sixteenth and sailed to the American Colonies from Spain. In speaking of the colonists' Declaration of Independence, he stated in his memoirs, "My heart was enrolled in it."

At age 20, after volunteering to serve in the American Army at his own expense, he received the rank of major general from the United States Congress.

My home State of South Carolina is particularly appreciative of Lafayette in that he landed in America near the South Carolina city of Georgetown on June 13, 1777, at the young age of 19.

Lafayette commanded members of the American Army during several conflicts, faced off against Benedict Arnold, and ultimately faced off against Lord Cornwallis where he commanded the brigade at the siege of Yorktown in Virginia.

Throughout his time in America, Lafayette became close friends with General George Washington. They were so close that Lafayette named his son Georges Washington-Lafayette, and asked General Washington to be his son's godfather. He also was very close with young Alexander Hamilton, Washington's chief aide-de-camp.

Because of Lafayette's service to the American people, he was made an honorary U.S. citizen in 2002. Many U.S. towns and cities have been named after him, and three U.S. naval vessels bear his name.

I am proud that Lafayette's dedication, military skill and strategic thinking as an officer now serve as a model for our officers in uniform. General Lafayette symbolizes the assistance America received from Europe during our dynamic struggle for independence. And because of our shared values for democracy and human rights, a deep, long-lasting friendship between the United States and France continues and flourishes to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this resolution has been brought to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the resolution.

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the former judge and gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. SKELTON for sponsoring this legislation, and I appreciate Mr. WILSON yielding me time to speak on this important individual.

It is true in this House of Representatives, what we call the People's House, there are only two portraits. There could be more, but there are only two. We honor George Washington and we honor Lafayette. And there are reasons for that; because both of these men were not only friends, but they were resilient in their quest for American liberty many, many years ago.

One evening in 1776, at the dinner table with King George III's relatives, the Marquis de Lafayette got wind of America's Declaration of Independence written by Thomas Jefferson and the trouble the colonists were making for the British—all in the name of liberty.

Facing disapproval from his Noble family and arrest by his own French people, young Lafayette sailed to America. He volunteered to serve at his own expense in the Continental Army with General George Washington. Lafayette was a superior military tactician, and he was fearless. Only in his late 20s, Major General Lafayette went to war with the American colonists.

He was wounded in the battle at Brandywine, he defeated the Hessians alongside General Greene at Gloucester Point, and he stayed faithful to Washington when even some American discontented generals thought they could do a better job than George Washington.

It was Lafayette who persuaded the French to help the Americans in their fight for freedom. And Lafayette never lost his place alongside Washington and his ragged Continental Army. That is one reason we have his portrait in this House.

Lafayette remained a passionate advocate for the cause of freedom until his death, and stood firm in the French Revolution. So much so that at one point he suffered imprisonment for 5 years in Austria and Prussia because of his quest for liberty in France.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor a man who paid both blood and money on two continents for the sake of liberty. As loyal as he remained to Washington and the United States throughout his life, so the people of our great Nation remain indebted to his sacrifice, his courage and his loyalty, and to the example of his unwavering commitment to freedom.

In troubled times, America could always count on Marquis de Lafayette.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that we are able to take this resolution up today honoring the Marquis de Lafayette. Those of us who grew up in Lafayette County knew that there was some special meaning to the name of our county.

It was Lillard County once upon a time, and after Lafayette's visit to the State of Missouri, St. Louis to be exact, the General Assembly of our State named the western county which borders Jackson County, which now encompasses Kansas City, named it after Marquis de Lafayette and called it Lafayette County. We in Lafayette County are very proud of the reason and the heritage that this county has been so named.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, a noted physician, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from South Carolina for giving me time.

I also want to pay tribute and thank my colleague, friend and student of history, the distinguished Armed Services Committee chairman, Mr. SKELTON, for bringing this very important resolution to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a native of Lafayette, Louisiana, to pay tribute to the Marquis de Lafayette and the French culture that continues to leave an indelible mark on south Louisiana. It is not by coincidence that my hometown is named after this French hero of America's Revolutionary War.

During the Acadian deportation of 1755, thousands of men, women and children were expelled from Nova Scotia. Some returned to France, but many sailed through to the French colony of Louisiana, where, over the centuries, they have established their own unique French-Acadian or what we now call Cajun culture.

It is now estimated that there are over 450,000 Acadian descendants in Louisiana alone, and nearly 250,000 claimed French to be their principal language.

Last week, I introduced House Resolution 398 to congratulate newly elected French President Nicolas Sarkozy on his recent victory, as well as to recognize the long-standing relationship between the United States and our friends in France.

Clearly, nowhere is this relationship between our two countries displayed more than right here in this Chamber where each day we face the portraits of America's first President, George Washington, but also America's adopted son, Marquis de Lafayette.

It is clearly fitting that we recognize the Marquis de Lafayette's accomplishments on the 250th anniversary of his birth today. I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) outlined the history of the Marquis de Lafayette's accomplishments, and I am not going to repeat all of that at this time. But suffice it to say, clearly the Marquis de Lafayette was a great patriot and a great friend of America, and the relationship between Marquis de Lafayette and our first President is emblematic of the relationship between our two great countries.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, but at this time I want to commend the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for recognizing the Marquis de Lafayette, and to recognize the strong relationship that has been so firm, so important, and that is the alliance with our first ally, the Republic of France.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me give a special thanks to my friend from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) who, among other assets, has a sense of history which has been exhibited this morning. I appreciate him speaking, as well as the gentleman from Louisiana speaking of his hometown of Lafayette. It was very kind of you to do so, as well as my friend from Texas coming here to discuss the Marquis de Lafayette.

As the gentleman from South Carolina has pointed out, Marquis de Lafayette was a very unusual man. Doing what he did at such an early age and making such a great impact upon this country, it is fitting and proper that we, as a body, honor him, honor his memory, and honor the fact that he was of such great assistance and help to General George Washington in those very difficult days.

As one leaves Lexington, my hometown, on the Missouri River and travels on Highway 224 towards Kansas City, one goes through Wellington, Missouri; Waterloo, Missouri; and Napoleon, Missouri, in that order, and it is rather interesting that part of French history between Lexington and

Kansas City is reflected in the names of those communities.

History has not borne out who named them such. There is no way for us to record or learn the genesis of those three names except they do exist, Wellington, Napoleon, and in between, Waterloo. But whoever did it did us all a favor so we can discuss and learn more of history; and today we are learning more about the Marquis de Lafayette and honoring his memory.

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Marquis de La Fayette on the 250th anniversary of his birth. General Lafayette dedicated his life to the creation of democracy in America and France. Revered by many in both the new world and the old, La

Fayette became known as the "Hero of Two Worlds."

At the age of 19, La Fayette invested his own funds and outfitted a frigate, sailing for America in 1777, where he joined the forces of General George Washington, with whom he established a lifelong friendship.

In 1781, the Battle of Yorktown, Virginia was a crucial victory by the combined American and French force led by General George Washington and the Marquis de La Fayette, over the British army commanded by General Lord Charles Cornwallis. The surrender of Cornwallis' army caused the British government to negotiate an end to the American Revolutionary War.

In my home state of Louisiana, the Marquis de Lafayette has an enduring legacy by having a leading parish and city named in his honor. Lafayette, Louisiana is one of the fastest growing communities in the South. Lafayette's energy, telecommunications and agriculture industries are of national importance.

The parish of Lafayette Louisiana is the site of a year-long commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of the Marquis de La Fayette throughout 2007. The 2007 commemoration includes exhibitions, festivals, music, conferences and lectures.

Known for its unique cuisine, music, outstanding hospitality, Cajun and Creole language and traditions, Lafayette welcomes visitors of all ages to this full year of events devoted to Louisiana's French heritage, and focusing on La Fayette, the "Hero of Two Worlds."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker I would like to thank Lafayette, Louisiana's City Parish President Joey Durel and his wife Lynne for their leadership of the 2007 commemoration. May La Fayette's vision of democracy and freedom we enjoy today—be cherished always.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 171, honoring Marquis de Lafayette on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of his birth. Marquis de Lafayette certainly holds a special place in the history of our country. It was his support for the ideals of our Revolutionary warriors that helped give birth to the greatest nation in the world. In fact, due to his support for the revolution, and the aid he provided to the colonist in their struggle for independence, Marquis de Lafayette was voted by Congress the rank and commission of major general in the Continental Army. Lafayette offered his services as an unpaid volunteer. On July 31, 1777 Congress passed a resolution, "that his services be accepted, and that, in consideration of his zeal, illustrious family, and connections, he

have the rank and commission of major-general of the United States.”

He was a man that was admired by our first President George Washington and that affection was mutual. In fact Marquis de Lafayette even named his son after our first President, and Washington was the godfather to Lafayette's child.

This is a gentleman that is so revered in American history that in 2002, he was posthumously made an honorary citizen of the United States; one of only six persons so honored. Likewise, a portrait of Lafayette hangs in the House Chamber.

Marquis de Lafayette, held a strong belief in freedom, he advocated the abolition of slavery in the Americas, he favored equal legal rights for religious minorities in France, and he was a prominent figure in the French Revolution. Now some will cite the fact that Lafayette himself owned slaves as a sign of hypocrisy, but he encouraged George Washington to free his own slaves as an example to others. Lafayette would subsequently purchase an estate in French Guinea and settle his slaves there and offered a place for Washington's slaves to live also. Lafayette was famously quoted as saying, “I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America if I could have conceived thereby that I was founding a land of slavery.”

The fact that Lafayette was the first foreign dignitary to address the House of Representatives symbolizes the wonderful relationship between France and the United States. In light of the recent elections in France, I hope that our leaders in Congress, the Senate, and the White House will maintain our strong ties with the newly elected leader of France, Nicolas Sarkozy. France is a nation that the United States has shared the same values with since its inception. Lafayette symbolized the assistance America received from Europe in the struggle for independence, just like United States aid to France during World Wars I and II stemmed in part from shared values of democracy and freedom, values that Lafayette held. I am confident that the administration of President Sarkozy will work earnestly with our leaders and continue in the great tradition of not only a French hero, but a true American hero, Marquis de Lafayette.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 171, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1045

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY TO THE CITIZENS OF GREENSBURG, KANSAS

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 400) expressing the sympathy of the House of Representa-

tives to the citizens of Greensburg, Kansas, over the devastating tornado of May 4, 2007.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 400

Whereas on the evening of Friday, May 4, 2007, a tornado struck the community of Greensburg, Kansas;

Whereas this tornado was classified as an EF-5, the strongest possible type, with winds estimated at 205 miles per hour;

Whereas 9 lives were lost;

Whereas approximately 95 percent of Greensburg was destroyed, causing over 1,500 residents to be displaced from their homes; and

Whereas the strength, courage, and determination of the citizens of Greensburg, Kansas, have been evident following the tornado: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its deepest sympathies to the citizens of Greensburg, Kansas, over the devastation caused by the powerful tornado that struck the community on May 4, 2007; and

(2) expresses its support as the citizens of Greensburg continue their efforts to rebuild their community and their lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 400.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 2007, life in the close-knit community of Greensburg, Kansas, changed forever. At approximately 9:45 p.m. central time, a massive tornado all but destroyed the Kansas town of Greensburg, Kansas, located in south central Kansas, east of Dodge City, Kansas. The tornado was classified as an EF-5, a large and extremely dangerous mile-wide tornado with winds up to 205 miles per hour.

The 20-minute warning time was reasonable, but the tornado was so destructive that nine people in Greensburg unfortunately died, and 95 percent of the town was damaged or destroyed. While the infrastructure damage is crushing, citizens of Greensburg have refused to let this incident crush their spirit, hope and determination. Resilience is the watchword, and rebuilding is the daily driving force.

We're here today as representatives of all the citizens of this great Nation to express our sympathy to the residents of Greensburg for this tragedy of historic proportions. More importantly, we stand in support for the citi-

zens of Greensburg as they heal their families and rebuild their community.

I stand here in support of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Maryland, I'm very grateful for his support and for his help in bringing this legislation to the House floor today.

I rise in support of H. Res. 400, which I introduced along with my fellow colleagues from Kansas. It does express the sympathy of the House of Representatives for the loss of life and the tremendous property damage to a community in my district of a population of about 1,500.

The tornado occurred at about 10 p.m. on Friday evening, May 4, now a little more than 2 weeks ago. It was an F-5 tornado, one of the most powerful tornados to strike the United States in more than 8 years. It was fortunate that the people of Greensburg had a 20-minute warning, that the National Weather Service performed its function. An emergency was declared, and people had 20 minutes to try to save their families' lives and to move to safety.

My guess is that that 20 minutes went by in a flash. Mr. Speaker, while 20 minutes may go by in a flash, I'm sure that the 2 minutes that the tornado was on the ground went by very, very slowly. It was an eternity. In that 20 minutes of warning, people did what they could do. In that 2 minutes, at least the buildings of the community were destroyed; 205-mile-an-hour winds can do great damage.

Mr. Speaker, we in Kansas are accustomed from time to time to tornados, but never have I seen the devastation and destruction that occurs to one community. The losses are significant. Certainly our prayers and support are with the families of those 10 individuals who died that night, but 95 percent of the town is gone. There is no high school. There is no grade school. There is no city hall. There is no hospital. There is no library. The entire business district, six or seven blocks of a business district in the county seat town, not a business remains.

Sixty-three people were injured, and while faced with such destruction, I've been to Greensburg seven times in the last 2 weeks, I have seen nothing but the sense of spirit about rebuilding lives. You can stand in front of a home that is totally destroyed and listen to the people there sorting through the rubble, trying to find something of value, and when you have a conversation with them, it doesn't take long before a smile appears on their face and they talk about how things could be worse than they are, how we're better off than our neighbors, how we'll get through this.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in what is truly a time of devastation, it's also truly a

time of hope. And what we saw in Kansas that night and every day since reaffirms my belief in the value of caring for your family, love and compassion for your neighbor, that your community matters, and a sense that together we can get through this.

I'm proud, Mr. Speaker, to see the tremendous support that comes from across the country. Many Members of the House of Representatives have stopped to visit with me. Many ambassadors and Presidents of foreign countries have sent notes of condolences and concern. And I appreciate that President Bush came to Greensburg, Kansas, last Wednesday and spent 4 hours commiserating with the people of that community.

There is a sense in America that we're all in this together, and in this case the sense is more than just a feeling. It's been a reality.

An example, the nearby community of Haviland, population about 450, the grocery store there was open last Sunday. It's a typical grocery store in a small town. My guess is it makes no money. It's more of a community service than it is a business. It has the old wooden floors and the tin ceiling that is very traditional, very common in communities I represent. And I watched as the owner of the grocery store stood behind the counter, and people brought groceries to the counter and placed them there, ready to pay, and he would ask the question, "Where are you from?" And if the answer was, Greensburg, his answer was, "No charge."

We've seen this exhibited time and time again by friends and family, but even as important as that, we've seen it demonstrated time and time again by people who know no one in Greensburg, Kansas.

So, Mr. Speaker, the tragedy was tremendous, the destruction was great, but in reality, people have the faith in their future and are willing to take the steps necessary to see that their community is rebuilt and that their children and grandchildren have a future in Greensburg.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution commending these people of Greensburg, Kansas, for their spirit, their bravery, their compassion, their love for friends and family, and I also say thank you to the Members of the House of Representatives and to Americans around the country who also have taken the steps to make sure that good things happen in the future of Greensburg.

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

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

Just very briefly before I yield to my good friend Mr. SKELTON, let me just say this, that I was very pleased and very moved by the statement of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and it reminds me that this country, our influence in the world is largely based on our moral authority, and that

moral authority is one that says that we will leave no American behind.

That's basically what you're saying. It's about the business of all of us lifting each other and being there and underlining under that United States, united.

And so I appreciate what you've said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland and compliment him on the wisdom in his reflection of the character of our people of our country. Strength of character is the message today.

I compliment my friend from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) for introducing this legislation. All of us, of course, express sympathy to the people of Greensburg, Kansas. We rise in solidarity, and you are an excellent reflection of the character of those brave and solid people. We thank you for bringing this to our attention.

A community was destroyed by a massive tornado, and those of us from the Midwest are used to severe weather, thunderstorms, winter winds, ice. Weather conditions are just a part of life for us.

In Missouri, tornadoes have been prevalent during my 30 years that I have served here, and, in fact, I was here just a few weeks in May of 1977 when tornadoes ravaged Pleasant Hill and Sedalia, Missouri.

More recently in 2003, the city of Stockton was decimated by a large tornado. The storm damaged or destroyed over 250 homes, killing three residents and injuring numerous others. Since then, the city's been working with residents and both Federal and State authorities to rebuild the downtown and improve upon the public facilities.

As the people of Kansas deal with the aftermath of Mother Nature's fury, we in Missouri stand with our neighbors to the west.

And again, we thank the gentleman from Maryland for his words. We thank the gentleman from Kansas for introducing this resolution.

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

Beside me I have a photograph of Greensburg, Kansas, taken shortly after the tornado that perhaps gives Members of the House of Representatives and really America a sense of the extent of the destruction.

And there are Members of Congress, I suppose, who come from places different than the middle of America, and let me describe Greensburg, Kansas, to you.

Greensburg, Kansas, is a community of about 1,500 people. It's the county seat town of Kiowa County. It is the hub of activity for that county. It's in many ways a typical community that I represent. Its downtown consists of four or five blocks on both sides of the street of businesses, the hardware store, a drugstore, a grocery store.

There's the seats of government, the city hall, the library, the hospital, the courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, it's a community in which people have lived there, in many instances, for four and five generations, and it's a community that welcomes newcomers. In fact, that's the plea of every Kansas community: We'd like to grow and see some prosperity, see new people in our town.

And so this is a community that has a combination of people who are senior citizens and young folks, a community that has folks who have lived there generation after generation, generally involved in agriculture, farming and ranching; but it's also a community that embraces new ideas and new people, a look toward the future. It's a community that has numerous churches, and yet today, as we talk about Greensburg, those structures, those buildings are gone.

But in many ways, what's happened in Greensburg only reinforces who the people who call Greensburg home are. The fact that the buildings are gone is something they will live with. In fact, their response was how quickly can we get back into town so we can begin the process of rebuilding our homes, our businesses and our lives.

On Saturday, I was in Greensburg for high school graduation. As I indicated, Greensburg is a town of about 1,500 people. Twenty-five seniors from Greensburg High School graduated on Saturday morning. Graduation was held under a tent on the golf course, the golf course because it's the only place in town that has no debris and rubble. Population 1,500, there were 1,800 people at graduation. They were there to tell the students, congratulations and best wishes.

□ 1100

They were also there to reinforce the importance of community, that life revolves around what goes on in the town, and life revolves around its future based upon its young people. Once again we saw the demonstration of how friends and family and neighbors and people who don't even know anybody in Greensburg came together in one more instance to make certain that there was love and compassion and care and concern demonstrated for the people of this community. I am so grateful again for the opportunity to represent the people of a community like Greensburg, Kansas.

The question particularly by the national media has been, Congressman, do you believe they will rebuild their community? I can tell you that effort is ongoing today, and it began on Saturday, Saturday morning the day after the tornado, and it continues each and every moment.

The city administrator, the mayor, the sheriff, the police chief, the county commissioners, the city council members all lost their homes. Yet Saturday morning, they were all gathered there to try to restore the services for electricity and gas and power and water to

the community. They lost everything, but yet, as community leaders, they were there.

My friend, Dennis McKinney, the Democrat leader of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, announced on Sunday, a week ago, "I have already hired the contractor to rebuild the house on the same foundation where I lived before the tornado, because leaders have to be leaders." Again, we see the determination of people.

What I answered to the national media who asked me if they think Greensburg will be rebuilt, I don't know a lot of people in other communities, but I know the people of Greensburg, Kansas. In Kansas and in Greensburg, Kansas, we all have a place we love. It's called "home."

There is a great attraction to make certain that we do everything in this Congress, that the Federal Government responds appropriately to help the folks of Greensburg. I can tell you that the love of home is sufficient, that the people of Greensburg, Kansas, are rebuilding today.

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

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

Again, I want to thank Mr. MORAN for his statements. There was one scene that I am sure most Americans saw on TV. Right after the storm and the tornado, and people were looking through their belongings, there was one lady who said, "You know, if I could just find my wedding ring, if I could just find my wedding ring."

Her house was totally demolished. Apparently she had said that early in the day. Then later in the day, they showed her again, saying, "You won't believe this. I found my wedding ring."

For some reason, that was a very telling statement on her part, because what she was basically saying is that while the buildings may fall, while so much may seem so dim, the fact is that I still have family. I want that wedding ring, that band, that symbol of unity, that symbol of togetherness, that symbol of generations yet unborn, and those who have come before me; that's what I am looking for.

Just as she found her wedding ring, I know the citizens of Greensburg will make it. Just as Mr. MORAN said, they will rebuild.

Then there was another scene, just yesterday on the news, where the commentators were talking about how a bank or two had kind of a temporary building, and other buildings were slowly coming up just to keep things rolling and doing business. Then to hear about the graduation of 25 students and 1,800 guests appearing, I think that sends a very powerful message to our Nation, and such a powerful message to so many people.

Throughout life, we all fall down, but the question is whether we will get up. I think that as people watch the citizens of Greensburg, they realize that

there will always, in the words of Martin Luther King, be interruptions in our lives. The question is whether we will continue our lives after the interruptions.

On behalf of all of our Members, and I know there will be a unanimous vote from all of our Members, we want to say to the citizens of Greensburg that we stand with you, that our prayers are with you, and just know that as we remind you, God holds you in the palm of His hand.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Maryland. He has touched me by his personal interest, not only in this resolution, but in his awareness and concern for the people of Greensburg, Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, once again, it's good to see in this House of Representatives where people from across the country recognize the value of working together to see that good happens.

I also wish to express my appreciation to all the volunteers from across the country. Sunday, the two Sundays since the tornado, collection plates have been passed in our churches, the prayers have been said. The Red Cross has arrived, the Salvation Army is there, the National Guard, our soldiers away from home, again, helping in time of need. Our law enforcement officers from across the State and FEMA have performed admirably in this very difficult circumstance.

I am pleased by the spirit exhibited today by the gentleman from Maryland and look forward to that spirit continuing as we work to rebuild Greensburg and all of America.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, I hope that many people from Greensburg observe this small session that we are going through right now. I hope that they know that we are with them.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 400, which expresses the sympathy of the House of Representatives to the citizens of Greensburg, KS, over the devastating tornado of May 4, 2007.

Just over 2 weeks ago, a devastating week-end of storms left at least 9 people dead and much of the farm town of Greensburg, KS, destroyed. Mile-wide tornadoes with winds of up to 205 miles per hour were recorded, leveling the town and destroying much of the equipment used by first-responders, including city and county trucks. By the time the winds finally settled, approximately 95 percent had been destroyed, displacing over 1,500 residents from their homes.

The tragedy of this storm was compounded by the lack of available responders and equipment. Governor Kathleen Sebelius has lamented the deployment of much needed troops and resources to Iraq, stating "When the troops get deployed, the equipment goes with them. So here in Kansas about 50 percent of our trucks are gone. We need trucks.

We are missing Humvees, we're missing all kinds of equipment that could help us respond in this kind of emergency."

This storm illustrated precisely how rescue and recovery efforts here at home are being severely hampered by our ongoing involvement in Iraq. National Guard representatives have echoed this statement, with MG. Tod Bunting of the Kansas National Guard noting that first-responders lacked resources even before the war, which has subsequently "further depleted us."

Despite these shortages, Guard troops are to be commended for their efforts at providing much needed security and supplies.

Here in Congress, as hurricane season rapidly approaches, we are actively examining our Nation's response to natural disasters. Two years ago we learned, from Hurricane Katrina, the extent to which we were unprepared for, and unable to adequately respond to, a disaster of this magnitude.

I urge this Congress to continue to pursue this important issue; the tornadoes in Kansas serve to remind us all that nature's furies are varied and unpredictable.

Mr. Speaker, Greensburg, KS, remains in shambles. Homes are demolished, livelihoods lost, lives interrupted. I would like to join my colleague, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, the sponsor of this bill, in expressing my deep personal sympathy to the victims of this natural disaster. Similarly, I would like to express my strong support for this resolution, and I would urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 400.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE VETERANS

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 413) recognizing the service of United States Merchant Marine Veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the United States Merchant Marine served as the Nation's first Navy and helped George Washington's Continental Army defeat the British Navy;

Whereas since 1775, United States Merchant Mariners have served valiantly in times of peace and in every war;

Whereas after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, 29 United States Merchant Marine Academy cadets operated a fleet of boats in New York Harbor, transporting firefighters and other emergency equipment workers, medical supplies, and food;

Whereas today, more than 8,000 Merchant Mariners serve in the Military Sealift Command, most of them working in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom;

Whereas the United States Merchant Marine Academy is the only one of the five service academies that sends its cadets into war, and 142 undergraduates of the Academy were lost during World War II;

Whereas during World War II, Merchant Mariners served honorably in combat but were denied veterans benefits and recognition at the end of the war despite sustaining the highest rate of casualties of any of the armed services;

Whereas more than 95 percent of the Allied Forces and materiel that was transported during World War II was transported by Merchant Marine ships;

Whereas the Merchant Mariners of World War II were denied the unprecedented benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (known as the "GI Bill of 1944");

Whereas the story of the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II is one of patriotism, of youthful exuberance, of dedication to duty, of bravery in the midst of battle, and of a Nation that forgot these heroes after the end of the war for more than 40 years until 1988, when they were given veteran status;

Whereas by that time, over 125,000 of those Merchant Mariners had died and many had lost out on opportunities and benefits they greatly deserved; and

Whereas, on National Maritime Day, Congress recognizes the tremendous sacrifices and contributions of the Merchant Marine and its veterans and the entire maritime industry to the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on National Maritime Day, the House of Representatives recognizes the heroic and invaluable sacrifices that the United States Merchant Marine veterans have made to help ensure our Nation's prosperity and safety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 413.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, I am honored to take this opportunity afforded by National Maritime Day to pay tribute to our Nation's merchant mariners and to the entire maritime industry.

I also honor the tireless work of the men and women of the United States Coast Guard, who ensure the safety and security of our Nation's ports, who protect our economic interests in the maritime environment around the world and who, every year, save the lives of thousands of mariners in distress.

In 1933, the United States first honored our merchant mariners through the designation of May 22 as National Maritime Day. Seventy-four years later, we again pause to honor the service and sacrifices of our merchant

mariners by considering H. Res. 413, offered by my distinguished colleague, Congressman BOB FILNER, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. Res. 413 pays special tribute to the estimated 250,000 Americans who served in the War Shipping Administration, moving 95 percent of the goods and materiel used by the allies used during World War II.

The Congressional Research Service report said more than 50 percent of those who served in the Merchant Marine in World War II were under the age of 25, and some 20,000 of these men were killed or wounded in the war, yielding among the Merchant Marine the highest casualty rate of any service, according to the U.S. Maritime Service Veterans.

Despite their gallant service, World War II-era U.S. merchant mariners have still not received many of the benefits given to those who served in the other U.S. military forces engaged in World War II. U.S. merchant mariners have still never been made eligible for the GI Bill or for the housing, educational or unemployment benefits that the bill provided for other U.S. veterans.

Not until 1988 were World War II-era merchant mariners made eligible for services from the Veterans Administration. Not until 1998 were they made eligible for burial and cemetery benefits. While these are important benefits long overdue to World War II-era merchant mariners, many of these mariners were no longer with us when these benefits were extended. Even fewer of the World War II-era mariners are with us today. For many, therefore, any benefits granted now come too late.

Further, even for those who are still with us, it is too late to give them the opportunities that they might have had, had they been eligible for the benefits of the GI Bill at the conclusion of their service.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to honor all of those who served in our Nation's Merchant Marine during World War II, and I hope that the experience of these mariners will be a lesson to ensure that we never, never again deny any veteran who has served the United States any of the benefits he or she has earned.

As I close, I also honor the vital role that our merchant mariners continue to play in responding to our Nation's emergencies. Most recently, the U.S. merchant mariners help evacuate an estimated 160,000 people from Manhattan on September 11, 2001, and provided aid and emergency assistance along the gulf coast to the victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita.

Merchant mariners also continue to provide the sealift capacity that keeps our Armed Forces equipped to fight the global war on terrorism. More than 8,000 merchant mariners serve in the Military Sealift Command, and the Seafarers International Union has written that civilian crews and mili-

tary support ships have moved some 79 million square feet of cargo to United States troops in Iraq and throughout the world since 9/11. Without these highly trained men and women, we will likely be unable to equip our Armed Forces with the supplies they need to defend our Nation.

I honor all of the members, past and present, of the United States Merchant Marine. I urge the passage of H.R. 413 and again commend my colleague, Congressman FILNER, for his tireless efforts on behalf of our World War II-era merchant mariners.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Maryland in honoring the men and women who served in the United States Merchant Marine, and H. Res. 413 does just that. It recognizes the important role the Merchant Marine plays in ensuring our national security and strengthening our national economy.

The 465 U.S.-flag oceangoing commercial vessels and the approximately 69,000 men and women that comprise the U.S. Merchant Marine provide critical services to the United States, the transportation of maritime commerce to and from U.S. ports and their support for our armed services in times of national emergency.

It's appropriate that we do this today. This is National Maritime Day, which was designated by Congress to pay tribute to the merchant mariners, both current and past, and recognize their faithful service to the United States of America. Since 1933, the Nation has celebrated and commemorated the service of the merchant mariners on May 22 each year.

I, too, commend the resolution sponsored by my friend and colleague from California (Mr. FILNER) for introducing this legislation. I join him in urging all Members to support this bill and the United States Merchant Marine.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER). He is the author of this resolution, and, without a doubt, in this Congress, be it on whatever side, either side of the aisle, he has distinguished himself as being a fierce fighter for the rights and benefits of our veterans.

□ 1115

Mr. FILNER. I thank the chairman not only for his kind words, but for bringing this resolution to us on National Maritime Day, and for his making the connection between what we are doing today and the historical record that we as a Nation, I think, have to recognize and correct.

This resolution, H. Res. 413, does recognize the heroic and brave service of the Merchant Marine veterans who have gone unheralded by this country for far too long. Of course, this is the best time to do this, on National Maritime Day, which was first celebrated in

1933. It is intended to recognize the invaluable role that the maritime industry in general and the Merchant Marine in particular served to our Nation's economy and to our security.

Throughout our Nation's history, the Merchant Marine has played a crucial part in ensuring our freedom and security during war and in transporting our commerce during peace.

This day was conceptualized by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who firmly believed, as we continue to, that the Nation needed a strong Merchant Marine to serve as an auxiliary to our naval and other military forces during war. In fact, the Merchant Marine has participated in every war since serving as the Nation's first Navy, helping George Washington's Continental Army defeat the British.

After the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, 29 Merchant Marine Academy cadets operated a fleet of boats in New York Harbor, transporting the firefighters and other emergency equipment workers and medical supplies.

It is interesting to note that the United States Merchant Marine Academy is the only one of our five military academies that will send its cadets into war; and, in fact, we have lost 142 of those cadets since World War II.

Today, more than 8,000 merchant mariners serve in the Military Sealift Command, most working in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

I thank my colleague for bringing up the situation of our World War II veterans. As he said, it is too late to give them education benefits. But I have a bill, H.R. 23, that says we want to give you a belated thank you with a payment for the last years of their life, most of whom are over 80 right now.

During World War II, these merchant mariners traversed the dangerous U-boat-laden waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific, faced down fierce air attacks from kamikaze planes, and were instrumental in every theater of war by carrying 95 percent of all tank supplies and troops during the Great War. As a result, they suffered, as was pointed out, the highest casualty rate of any of the military branches.

It is indisputable that the allied forces would not have been able to begin, sustain, or finish World War II without their valiant and selfless service.

When I first heard of the plight of the merchant mariners of World War II, I could not believe the treatment that they have received. They did not receive any recognition as veterans that they deserved, or the benefits of the GI bill which they had earned. And their fight for equality continued for over 40 years, when they finally attained veteran status after a lengthy court battle. By then, over 125,000 of them had died.

I actually had the privilege of receiving the heart-wrenching testimony

during a hearing before the Veterans' Affairs Committee from one of the named parties in that suit, in the 1980s, a merchant mariner named Stanley Willner. He was captured, interned, beaten, starved, and tortured as a POW for 3 years. He actually was one of the unfortunate group of Allied Forces who was forced to build the infamous bridge on the River Kwai.

Upon release, he weighed a mere 74 pounds. When he returned home, even his wife couldn't recognize him. Well, neither did his country. The brave merchant mariner received just 2 weeks of medical care and little else for his incredible service and sacrifice. What a travesty of justice.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more stories like this that tell about the merchant mariners of World War II, of opportunities lost and dreams foreclosed. It is long overdue that we treat these veterans the same as we try to do with all other veterans: Do our best to make them whole again.

As such, in recognition of the 74th anniversary of National Maritime Day, I invite all of the country and my colleagues to join me in recognizing the brave men and women of the sea who, like the Merchant Marine veterans of World War II, serve selflessly to ensure our Nation's continued safety and prosperity by voting in favor of this resolution, and then taking action, hopefully in a few weeks, where we give a belated "thank you" to the merchant mariners of World War II and pass H.R. 23.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished lady from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) 4 minutes.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I thank the gentleman for bringing this to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of recognizing what our maritime men did for us during World War II. The danger that they lived through, the sinking of their ships, the efforts to protect our other soldiers and bring supplies to them was nothing short of heroic.

When I spoke to some of these brave men, I talked about how my father had joined the Navy, and one of the reasons he liked to say was because he always was fed, and he always had ice cream. I never really thought about where all that came from.

And then I met a constituent of mine in Wolfeboro, New Hampshire, who wrote a letter to me speaking about his father who was a merchant marine and what he had been deprived of after World War II. And here is what Larry Warren had to say.

"I am writing on behalf of all World War II Merchant Marine veterans, but one in particular, my father Fred Warren of Wolfeboro. They need help.

"My father served with the Merchant Marines during World War II. His hearing is damaged from working in the engine rooms, and his lungs are damaged from the asbestos used in the construction of the merchant ships. He survived typhoons in the Pacific, German U-boats in the Atlantic, and Axis torpedo

bombers in the Mediterranean. I don't know all the harrowing experiences. He doesn't talk about it.

"He was lucky to have made it home. Many didn't. The casualty rate for World War II merchant marines was one in 26, higher than any branch of the armed services. Merchant Marines fought and died with members of our Armed Forces; some were captured and held POWs. Merchant ships and the crews on them were considered expendable by the Allied leaders. Freedom is not free, and the merchant marines of World War II paid dearly.

"My father has never received help in any form from our government because merchant mariners were denied benefits under the GI bill; no low-interest loans, no unemployment pay, no free college training, no health or prescription drugs, nothing. World War II merchant mariners were not even considered veterans until an act of Congress in 1988.

"I respect all of our veterans and consider them heroes, but I am especially proud of my father. In my eyes, he is a hero, too. It is time to make amends."

It is time to make amends. It is time to reward these men and their widows for what they have gone through. And we thank them; and there is no better way to thank them first by recognizing through this resolution, and then by recognizing them with the next bill that hopefully will pass through Congress that will provide some financial support and say to them, as we have tried to say to all veterans, "Thank you very much for saving our country."

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the brave men and women who have served this country, in peace and in war, as Merchant Mariners. The United States Merchant Mariners have supported and served alongside our Armed Forces in every major seafaring conflict since the birth of this Nation.

In times of peace, Mariners make the seas their home, transporting American goods all over the world and bolstering our national economy. In times of war, from the Revolutionary War to the conflicts today in the Middle East, Merchant Mariners have served as a lifeline to our international military operations, transporting troops, equipment, and needed supplies to theaters of operation.

The dedication and sacrifice of our Merchant Mariners is unassailable. Despite higher casualty rates than any branch of regular military service in World War II, Merchant Mariners have continued to answer the call to war with unflinching patriotism and valor.

Today, National Maritime Day, we should take time to reflect on the devotion of all our Merchant Mariners and the deep and lasting debt owed them by a grateful Nation.

Therefore, it is with great pride that I honor the service and sacrifice that the brave men and women of the United States Merchant Marine exemplify, on this, the 75th celebration of National Maritime Day.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, 189 years ago, on May 22, 1819, the steamship Savannah departed Savannah, Georgia, on the first transatlantic voyage by a steamship. This voyage demonstrated the commercial viability of

steamships and meant that commercial shipping was no longer totally dependent upon the wind.

The U.S.-flag merchant marine has continued to promote international transportation and global trade. U.S.-flag shipping companies lead the way in the invention and development of containerized shipping and the double-stacked train system. If it were not for visionaries such as Malcolm McLean, cargo would still be transported in small boxes and loaded on a ship like you see in old movies. Today's modern containership can carry over 12,000 20-foot containers, equivalent to 6,000 semi-trailer trucks on our highways.

The merchant marine has also made significant contributions to the freedom and liberty that we enjoy in the United States. Civilian mariners served gallantly during World War II transporting arms and supplies in support of our military forces. More than 700 cargo ships and 6,000 mariners died in that war. U.S. mariners have continued to service during the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, and now in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, President Franklin D. Roosevelt first called on Americans to commemorate National Maritime Day in 1933. Today, it is fitting that the House of Representatives recognize National Maritime Day to honor the men and women that have served our Nation in the U.S. merchant marine. They have transformed our Nation from an island nation into the hub of the world's commerce. They have shown how U.S. technology can revolutionize the world.

Yet to many Americans, maritime transportation is the invisible component of our global transportation system. People have no idea how goods manufactured in China suddenly appear on store shelves in their neighborhood. This global logistics system is now vital to the U.S. economy. U.S. manufacturers no longer have large warehouses stocked full of spare parts for their factories. They are dependent on a "just in time" delivery system that will supply them with the components they need within days or hours of their being assembled. If this global trade were to be shut down for a few days, store shelves would begin to become empty and factory production lines would be shut down.

I hope that in the coming year we can help Americans understand the important contributions that the U.S. merchant marine makes to all of our lives and that we develop legislation to help increase the size of the U.S.-flag fleet competing in the world trade.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 413, recognizing the service of U.S. Merchant Marine veterans today on National Maritime Day.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding back, I just want to associate myself with the words of Ms. SHEAPORTER and Mr. FILNER, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 413.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—

**AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A
COMMEMORATIVE DOCUMENT IN
MEMORY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES,
GERALD RUDOLPH FORD**

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 128) authorizing the printing of a commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, Gerald Rudolph Ford.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 128

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. COMMEMORATIVE DOCUMENT AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, Gerald Rudolph Ford, shall be printed as a House document, with illustrations and suitable binding, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) CONTENTS.—The document shall consist of the eulogies and encomiums for Gerald Rudolph Ford, as expressed in the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with the texts of each of the following:

(1) The funeral ceremony at Palm Desert, California.

(2) The state funeral ceremony at the rotunda of the United States Capitol.

(3) The national funeral service held at the Washington National Cathedral in the District of Columbia.

(4) The interment ceremony at the Gerald Ford Presidential Museum, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

SEC. 2. PRINTING OF DOCUMENT.

In addition to the usual number of copies printed of the commemorative document under section 1, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 32,500 copies, of which 22,150 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 10,350 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; or

(2) such number of copies that does not exceed a production and printing cost of \$600,000, with distribution of the copies to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the printing of a memorial tribute to honor our late 38th President, Gerald R. Ford. A former minority leader of this House, President Ford died on December 26, 2006, at the age of 93. Our distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), who now represents Gerald Ford's former district, introduced this resolution. The measure takes the same form as that passed after President Reagan's death in 2004. I support the gentleman's resolution, and I thank him for sponsoring it.

Mr. Speaker, since President Ford's death, Americans have expressed their respect and gratitude for his remarkable career that took him into the Navy during World War II, to this House, to the Vice Presidency, and then to the White House. In the aftermath of the ordeal of Watergate, many consider President Ford, then and now, as the right man at the right time. It is fitting that Congress provide for this customary tribute, and I urge the House to adopt the concurrent resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 128, authorizing the printing of a commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, Gerald R. Ford.

It was an honor for me to serve as a scientific adviser to Congressman Ford in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and I then came to know President Ford in many capacities throughout the years. I now have the privilege of serving the people of Grand Rapids and western Michigan in the exact seat he held from 1949 until 1973, and I am now most pleased to recognize one of the great sons of the State of Michigan.

Although President Ford's life ambition was to become Speaker of this esteemed body, fate and the Lord had other plans for Jerry Ford. While he was not a man who sought the Presidency, Ford was a tireless public servant who did not shrink from duty when his country needed him most. He bore the mantle that had been thrust upon him with great humility, never forgetting the solid Michigan values that were his compass in the most trying of times.

When he ascended to the Presidency upon President Nixon's resignation in 1974, Ford served with honor and dignity, telling us that "our long national nightmare is over." He was recommended and approved for his position by people in Congress who knew him very well. In fact, I believe he is the only President of the past one and a half centuries who served as the choice of the Members of Congress. Their trust in him aided him in governing and leading our Nation out of that nightmare. In pardoning President Nixon, he essentially gave up any chance he had of a second term as

President; but, in doing so, he literally healed the Nation. And I recall a very personal discussion with him one time where he said he knew full well that he would likely lose the election, because of the pardon, but he saw no alternative but to pardon President Nixon in order to put the whole Watergate episode behind us and get the Nation moving again.

I am privileged, and I have always felt a sense of honor, to be serving in the same House seat that Congressman Ford served. By publishing this book, we will educate future generations about the contributions of a great man who came from ordinary beginnings yet found himself performing well in extraordinary circumstances. Jerry Ford personified the many good traits that west Michigan has to offer our Nation, with his honesty, his forthrightness, and his hard work. And I urge my colleagues to support the creation of this commemorative volume. I urge strong support of this resolution.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Michigan in support of this fitting tribute for our late President Ford. I urge the House to support the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 128.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1130

INTERNET SPYWARE (I-SPY) PREVENTION ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1525) to amend title 18, United States Code, to discourage spyware, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1525

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Internet Spyware (I-SPY) Prevention Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN UNAUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES RELATING TO COMPUTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1030 the following:

"§ 1030A. Illicit indirect use of protected computers

"(a) Whoever intentionally accesses a protected computer without authorization, or ex-

ceeds authorized access to a protected computer, by causing a computer program or code to be copied onto the protected computer, and intentionally uses that program or code in furtherance of another Federal criminal offense shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) Whoever intentionally accesses a protected computer without authorization, or exceeds authorized access to a protected computer, by causing a computer program or code to be copied onto the protected computer, and by means of that program or code—

"(1) intentionally obtains, or transmits to another, personal information with the intent to defraud or injure a person or cause damage to a protected computer; or

"(2) intentionally impairs the security protection of the protected computer with the intent to defraud or injure a person or damage a protected computer; shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

"(c) No person may bring a civil action under the law of any State if such action is premised in whole or in part upon the defendant's violating this section. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

"(d) As used in this section—

"(1) the terms 'protected computer' and 'exceeds authorized access' have, respectively, the meanings given those terms in section 1030; and

"(2) the term 'personal information' means—

"(A) a first and last name;

"(B) a home or other physical address, including street name;

"(C) an electronic mail address;

"(D) a telephone number;

"(E) a Social Security number, tax identification number, drivers license number, passport number, or any other government-issued identification number; or

"(F) a credit card or bank account number or any password or access code associated with a credit card or bank account.

"(e) This section does not prohibit any lawfully authorized investigative, protective, or intelligence activity of a law enforcement agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, or of an intelligence agency of the United States."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1030 the following new item:

"1030A. Illicit indirect use of protected computers."

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

In addition to any other sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated for this purpose, there are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, the sum of \$10,000,000 to the Attorney General for prosecutions needed to discourage the use of spyware and the practices commonly called phishing and pharming.

SEC. 4. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING THE ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN CYBERCRIMES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Software and electronic communications are increasingly being used by criminals to invade individuals' and businesses' computers without authorization.

(2) Two particularly egregious types of such schemes are the use of spyware and phishing scams.

(3) These schemes are often used to obtain personal information, such as bank account and credit card numbers, which can then be used as a means to commit other types of theft.

(4) In addition to the devastating damage that these heinous activities can inflict on individ-

uals and businesses, they also undermine the confidence that citizens have in using the Internet.

(5) The continued development of innovative technologies in response to consumer demand is crucial in the fight against spyware.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Because of the serious nature of these offenses, and the Internet's unique importance in the daily lives of citizens and in interstate commerce, it is the sense of Congress that the Department of Justice should use the amendments made by this Act, and all other available tools, vigorously to prosecute those who use spyware to commit crimes and those that conduct phishing and pharming scams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Software and electronic communications are increasingly being used by criminals to invade individuals and businesses' computers without authorization. These practices undermine consumer confidence in the integrity and security of the Internet itself. Two particularly egregious examples involve the use of spyware and phishing scams.

Spyware is a form of software that helps gather information about an individual or organization without their knowledge. It also can be used to take control of someone else's computer and surreptitiously send information stored in that computer, such as the individual's personal information and passwords, to another entity where it can then be redirected for criminal purposes, including fraud, larceny, theft or other cybercrimes.

According to a survey last year by the FBI, computer security practitioners say that spyware is among the most critical threats to the security of our Nation's computer systems.

Phishing is another form of cybercrime. It is a scheme by which a criminal creates a Web site or sends e-mails that copy a well-known, legitimate business in an attempt to deceive Internet users into revealing personal information. Through phishing, for example, a criminal can trick an Internet user into revealing his bank account numbers or passwords.

Pharming is a version of phishing, and that involves the fraudulent use of domain names. In pharming, hijackers hijack a legitimate Web site's domain site and redirect traffic intended for the Web site to their own Web site where users may unknowingly provide personal information to the hacker.

This measure before us, H.R. 1525, aims to put a stop to these kinds of crimes that invade our privacy. It amends title 18 of the United States Code to impose criminal penalties, including up to 5 years in prison, on those who intentionally engage in spyware-related behavior in furtherance of other Federal criminal offenses.

Another thing the bill does is impose fines and imprisonment up to 2 years for anyone who engages in such practices with the intent to defraud or injure a person.

Finally, this measure authorizes \$10 million per each fiscal year, 2008 through 2011, to help the Department of Justice combat these crimes.

I want to lift up the names of two of our Judiciary Committee members, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN of California, and of course, BOB GOODLATTE of Virginia, both of whom have put this legislation together and shepherded it through the hearing and the processes of the Judiciary Committee. I'd like to commend them for hard, effective work in developing and moving this bill on a bipartisan basis.

This is a targeted measure, ladies and gentlemen, that protects consumers by providing appropriately strong penalties for egregious behavior. I urge my colleagues to join us in support of it.

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

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, spyware is a serious and growing problem. This software allows criminals to hack into a computer to alter the user's security setting, collect personal information to steal a user's identity or commit other crimes.

H.R. 1525, the Internet Spyware Prevention Act of 2007, is bipartisan legislation that imposes criminal penalties on computer hacking intrusions and the use of spyware. A maximum term of 5 years imprisonment can be imposed for a hacking violation in which an unauthorized user accesses a computer.

In addition, a maximum of 2 years imprisonment can be imposed for anyone who uses spyware to break into a computer and alter the security settings or obtain the user's personal information.

This bill also authorizes \$10 million for fiscal years 2008 through 2011 for the Department of Justice to increase Federal prosecutions of these new offenses.

I congratulate Congresswoman LOFGREN and Congressman GOODLATTE for their leadership and dedication on this issue. I also thank Chairman CONYERS and Crime Subcommittee Chairman SCOTT for their support of this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentledady from California, ZOE LOFGREN, is the principal mover of this bill, and I'm pleased now to yield her as much time as she may consume.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1525, the Internet Spyware Prevention Act of 2007. I'm very pleased that my first stand-alone bill that will be passed in this House under the new Democratic majority is one that both protects

Americans on the Internet and fosters continued technological innovation. I thank my friend, Congressman BOB GOODLATTE, for working with me once again on this legislation to combat spyware.

Spyware is becoming one of the biggest threats to consumers on the Internet. Thieves are using spyware and key loggers are harvesting personal information from unsuspecting Americans. It also affects the business community that is forced to spend money to block and remove it from their systems.

Experts estimate that as many as 80 to 90 percent of all personal computers are infected with spyware. In short, it's a very real problem that's endangering consumers, damaging businesses and creating millions of dollars of additional costs.

This is a bipartisan measure that identifies the truly unscrupulous acts associated with spyware and subjects them to criminal punishment. This bill is the right approach because it focuses on behavior, not technology. It targets the worst forms of spyware without unduly burdening technological innovation.

The bill imposes tough criminal penalties on those who use spyware in furtherance of another Federal crime or to defraud or injure consumers. It also funds the Attorney General to find and prosecute spyware offenders and phishing scam artists.

Focusing on bad actors and criminal conduct is preferable to an approach that criminalizes technology or imposes notice-and-consent-type requirements. You know, bad actors don't comply with requirements. The more notices Internet users receive, in fact, the less likely they are to pay attention to any of them. Seventy-three percent of users don't read agreements, privacy statements or disclaimers on the Internet.

In 2005, the Pew Internet and American Life Project proved this point. A diagnostic site included a clause in one of its user agreements that promised \$1,000 to the first person to write in and request the money. The agreement was downloaded more than 3,000 times before someone finally claimed the reward.

We don't want to overregulate user experience. We must avoid interfering with increasingly seamless, intuitive and interactive online environments. Regulation of technology is almost always a bad idea because technology changes faster than Congress can legislate; and what we attempt to regulate will morph into something else and render useless the regulatory scheme we adopt.

Legislation that attempts to control technology can also have the pernicious effect of chilling innovation by chilling investment into prohibited technological arenas. H.R. 1525 avoids these pitfalls by focusing on bad conduct, and that's why it has the broad support in my district in Silicon Valley, California.

What we're doing here today is important for consumers, for businesses. It's also important for the future of our high-tech economy.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this crucial legislation.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who is the lead Republican cosponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1525, the Internet Spyware or I-SPY Prevention Act.

I was pleased to join with my colleague from California, Representative ZOE LOFGREN, to reintroduce this legislation. This bipartisan bill will impose tough criminal penalties on those that use software for nefarious purposes without imposing a broad regulatory regime on legitimate online businesses. I believe that this targeted approach is the best way to combat spyware.

Spyware is software that provides a tool for criminals to secretly crack into computers to conduct nefarious activities such as altering a user's security settings, collecting personal information to steal a user's identity or to commit other crimes. A recent study done by the National Cybersecurity Alliance revealed that over 90 percent of consumers had some form of spyware on their computers, and most consumers were not aware of it.

The I-SPY Prevention Act would impose criminal penalties on the most egregious behavior associated with spyware. Specifically, this legislation would impose up to a 5-year prison sentence on anyone who uses software to intentionally break into a computer and uses that spyware in furtherance of another Federal crime.

In addition, it would impose up to a 2-year prison sentence on anyone who uses spyware to intentionally break into a computer and either alter the computer's security settings or obtain personal information with the intent to defraud or injure a person, or with the intent to damage a computer. By imposing stiff penalties on these bad actors, this legislation will help deter the use of spyware and will thus help protect consumers from these aggressive attacks.

Enforcement is also crucial in combating spyware. The I-SPY Prevention Act authorizes \$10 million for fiscal years 2008 through 2011 to be devoted to prosecutions involving spyware, phishing and pharming scams, and expresses the sense of Congress that the Department of Justice should vigorously enforce the laws against these crimes.

Phishing scams occur when criminals send fake e-mail messages to consumers on behalf of famous companies and request account information that is later used to conduct criminal activities.

Pharming scams occur when hackers redirect Internet traffic to fake sites in

order to steal personal information such as credit card numbers, passwords and account information.

This form of online fraud is particularly egregious because it is not as easily discernible by consumers. With pharming scams, innocent Internet users simply type the domain name into their Web browsers and the signal is rerouted to the devious Web site.

The I-SPY Prevention Act is a targeted approach that protects consumers by imposing stiff penalties on the truly bad actors, while protecting the ability of legitimate companies to develop new and exciting products and services online for consumers.

The I-SPY Prevention Act also avoids excessive regulation and its repercussions, including the increased likelihood that an overly regulatory approach focusing on technology would have unintended consequences that could discourage consumer use of the Internet, as well as the creation of new technologies and services on the Internet. By encouraging innovation, the I-SPY Prevention Act will help ensure that consumers have access to cutting-edge products and services at lower prices.

In addition, the approach of the I-SPY Prevention Act does not interfere with the free market principle that a business should be free to react to consumer demand by providing consumers with easy access to the Internet's wealth of information and convenience. Increasingly, consumers want a seamless interaction with the Internet, and we must be careful to not interfere with businesses' ability to respond to this consumer demand with innovative services. The I-SPY Prevention Act will help ensure that consumers, not the Federal Government, define what their interaction with the Internet looks like.

□ 1145

Finally, by going after the criminal behavior associated with the use of spyware, the I-SPY Prevention Act recognizes that not all software is spyware and that the crime does not lie in the technology itself but rather in actually using the technology for criminal purposes. People commit crimes; software doesn't.

H.R. 1525 is an effective, targeted approach to combating spyware, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1525, the Internet Spyware (I-SPY) Prevention Act of 2007. I would like to commend Congresswoman LOFGREN and Congressman GOODLATTE for developing the legislation and moving the bill on a bipartisan basis. Earlier this

month the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a hearing and markup on the bill and reported it favorably to the full committee.

The bill amends title 18, U.S. Code, to impose criminal penalties on those who use spyware to perpetrate identity theft and numerous other privacy intrusions on innocent Internet users. The bill also provides resources and guidance to the Department of Justice for the prosecution of these offenses.

The bill is narrowly aimed at the practices of using "spyware" and "phishing" to harm consumers. Recent studies estimate that 80 percent of computers are infected with some form of spyware and that 89 percent of consumers are unaware of the fact that they have spyware. The greatest security and privacy challenges posed by spyware relate to technologies such as keystroke logging programs that capture a user's passwords, Social Security, or account numbers. This information can then be redirected for criminal purposes including fraud, larceny, identity theft, or other cyber crimes.

This bill combats spyware by clarifying that it is a crime, punishable for up to 5 years in prison, to intentionally access a computer without authorization by causing a computer program or code to be copied onto a computer and then using that program or code in furtherance of another Federal criminal offense. The bill also provides fines or imprisonment up to 2 years for anyone who, through means of that program or code, intentionally obtains, or transmits to another, personal information with the intent to defraud or injure a person.

The bill also authorizes funds to combat "phishing." Phishing is a general term for using what appears to others to be either the Web site of, or e-mails from, well-known, legitimate businesses in an attempt to deceive Internet users into revealing their personal information. Phishing is adequately covered by the criminal code under existing Federal wire fraud or identity theft statutes, but additional funds are needed to prosecute the crime. This bill would authorize \$10 million for each of the fiscal years 2008-2011 to combat phishing and spyware.

I would also like to note that the Energy and Commerce Committee is considering a bill on this subject as well. But that bill lacks the criminal penalty enforcement mechanism in this bill and in its place imposes a regulatory scheme which focuses on the uses of technology rather than the perpetrators of crimes. My concern is such a regulatory regime may unavoidably sweep in legitimate uses of the technology.

The I-SPY Prevention Act is a strong bill that protects consumers by providing criminal penalties for egregious behavior. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important measure. We are finally dealing with those spyware crimes that invade our financial privacy, and I commend all of the actors on the Judiciary Committee that played a role in bringing this to our attention. Mr. RIC KELLER has done an excellent job as well.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a proud original co-sponsor of the legislation before us, I speak in strong support of H.R. 1525, the "Internet Spyware (I-SPY) Prevention Act of 2007."

H.R. 1525 amends the federal computer fraud and abuse statute to make it unlawful to access a computer without authorization or to intentionally exceed authorized access by causing a computer program or code to be copied onto the computer and using that program or code to transmit or obtain personal information (for example, first and last names, addresses, e-mail addresses, telephone numbers, Social Security numbers, drivers license numbers, or bank or credit account numbers).

Further, H.R. 1525 discourages the practice of phishing, another scourge of the Internet. "Phishing" is a general term for using what appears to be either the Web sites of, or e-mails that appear to be sent from, readily identifiable and legitimate businesses. These fraudulent Web sites and e-mails are designed to deceive Internet users into revealing personal information that can then be used to defraud those same users. The 'phishers' take that information and use it for criminal purposes, like identity theft and fraud. Phishing is adequately covered by the criminal code, but additional funds are needed to prosecute the crime. This bill would authorize 10 million dollars for each of the fiscal years 2008 to 2011 to combat phishing and spyware.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know too well, spyware is quickly becoming one of the biggest threats to consumers on the information superhighway. Spyware encompasses several potential risks, including the promotion of identity theft by harvesting personal information from consumer's computers. Additionally, it can adversely affect businesses, as they are forced to sustain costs to block and remove spyware from employees' computers, in addition to the potential impact on productivity.

Spyware has been defined as "software that aids in gathering information about a person or organization without their knowledge and which may send such information to another entity with the consumer's consent, or asserts control over a computer with the consumer's knowledge." Among other things, criminals can use spyware to track every keystroke an individual makes, including credit card and social security numbers.

Some estimates suggest 25 percent of all personal computers contain some kind of spyware while other estimates show that spyware afflicts as many as 80-90 percent of all personal computers. Businesses are reporting several negative effects of spyware. Microsoft says evidence shows that spyware is "at least partially responsible for approximately one-half of all application crashes" reported to them, resulting in millions of dollars of unnecessary support calls.

The last point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that H.R. 1525 is substantially similar to the bipartisan H.R. 744, introduced in the 109th Congress, which passed the House by a vote

of 395-1 and H.R. 4661, which passed the House during the 108th Congress by a vote of 415-0. H.R. 1525 is supported by numerous industry groups and privacy coalitions, including the Business Software Alliance, the Software & Information Industry Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Center for Democracy and Technology.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1525 and urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1525, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECURING AIRCRAFT COCKPITS
AGAINST LASERS ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1615) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for aiming laser pointers at airplanes, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1615

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Securing Aircraft Cockpits Against Lasers Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AGAINST AIMING A LASER POINTER AT AN AIRCRAFT.

(a) OFFENSE.—Chapter 2 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§39A. Aiming a laser pointer at an aircraft

"(a) Whoever knowingly aims the beam of a laser pointer at an aircraft in the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States, or at the flight path of such an aircraft, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'laser pointer' means any device designed or used to amplify electromagnetic radiation by stimulated emission that emits a beam designed to be used by the operator as a pointer or highlighter to indicate, mark, or identify a specific position, place, item, or object.

"(c) This section does not prohibit aiming a beam of a laser pointer at an aircraft, or the flight path of such an aircraft, by—

"(1) an authorized individual in the conduct of research and development or flight test operations conducted by an aircraft manufacturer, the Federal Aviation Administration, or any

other person authorized by the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct such research and development or flight test operations;

"(2) members or elements of the Department of Defense or Department of Homeland Security acting in an official capacity for the purpose of research, development, operations, testing or training; or

"(3) by an individual using a laser emergency signaling device to send an emergency distress signal.

"(d) The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, may provide by regulation, after public notice and comment, such additional exceptions to this section, as may be necessary and appropriate. The Attorney General shall provide written notification of any proposed regulations under this section to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House and Senate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the House, and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation in the Senate not less than 90 days before such regulations become final."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 2 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"39A. Aiming a laser pointer at an aircraft."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Members of the House, when a laser is aimed at an aircraft cockpit, particularly at the critical stage of take-off or landing, it presents an imminent threat to aviation security and passenger safety. This has now been increasingly recognized, and we propose to do something about it today.

According to the Federal Aviation Administration, laser illuminations can temporarily disorient or even disable a pilot during critical stages of flight. And in some cases, a laser might also cause permanent physical injury to the pilot.

Since 1990 the FAA has reported more than 400 of these kinds of incidents. The rash of incidents involving laser beams is compounded by the concern that the low cost of hand-held laser devices could lead to even more incidents of these kinds happening in the future.

So the measure before us today responds to the problem by amending title 18 of our United States Code to impose criminal penalties on someone who knowingly aims a laser pointer at an aircraft or in its flight path within the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States. The criminal penalties include imprisonment of up to 5 years and fines.

So I again extend a hand of thanks to Chairman BOBBY SCOTT of the Crime Subcommittee for expeditiously moving this bill forward. And I also commend the sponsor of this legislation, Ric Keller, who is floor manager today, the gentleman from Florida, for his leadership on addressing the danger that lasers can pose to aircraft.

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

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

Aiming a laser beam into the cockpit of an airplane is a clear and present danger to the safety of all those on board the aircraft.

This legislation is simple and straightforward. It makes it illegal to knowingly aim a laser pointer at an aircraft. Those who intentionally engage in such misconduct shall be fined or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, in the discretion of the judge.

This legislation was unanimously approved by all Republicans and Democrats on the House Judiciary Committee in this Congress and in the last Congress. It was also approved by the full House by a voice vote, and the Senate also approved this legislation by unanimous consent after slightly amending the legislation to provide for limited exceptions for testing and training by the Department of Defense and FAA, as well as using the laser to send an emergency distress signal. This bill represents the negotiated compromise between the House and Senate on these limited exceptions.

The problems caused by laser beam pranksters are more widespread than one might think. According to the FAA and the Congressional Research Service, there have been over 500 incidents reported since 1990 where pilots have been disoriented or temporarily blinded by laser exposure. The problem is on the rise, and there were over 90 incidents in 2005 alone.

These easily available laser pin pointers, like the one I purchased here at the Staples Office Supply Store for \$12, have enough power to cause vision problems in pilots from a distance of 2 miles. It is only a matter of time before one of these laser beam pranksters ends up killing over 200 people in a commercial airline crash.

Surprisingly, there is currently no Federal statute on the books making it illegal to shine a laser beam into an aircraft cockpit, unless one attempts to use the PATRIOT Act to claim that the action was a "terrorist attack or other attack of violence against a mass transportation system."

So far none of the more than 500 incidents involving flight crew exposure to lasers have been linked to terrorism. Rather, it is often a case of pranksters making stupid choices to put pilots and their passengers at risk of dying. It is imperative that we send a message to the public that flight security is a serious issue. These acts of mischief will not be tolerated.

I wanted to learn what it was like to be in an aircraft cockpit hit by a laser beam; so I spoke with Lieutenant Barry Smith from my hometown of Orlando, Florida, who was actually in the cockpit of a helicopter that was hit by a laser beam.

Lieutenant Smith is with the Seminole County Sheriff's Office. He and his partner were in a police helicopter searching for burglary suspects at

night in a suburb of Orlando when a red laser beam hit the aircraft twice. Lieutenant Smith said the Plexiglas windshield of the helicopter spread out the light to the size of a basketball. It shocked them. They were flying near a large tower with a red light, and they mistakenly thought they may have flown too close to the tower. They were disoriented, and they immediately jerked the helicopter back. When they realized that they weren't near the tower after all, Lieutenant Smith began to worry that the light could have come from a laser sight on a rifle. He wondered if they were about to be shot out of the sky. He told me, "It scared the heck out of us."

In reality, it was just a 31-year-old man with a small, pen-sized laser light, standing in his yard.

In conclusion, I authored this bipartisan legislation because it is needed to ensure the safety of pilots and passengers. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1615.

I want to especially thank Chairman CONYERS and Chairman SCOTT for their bipartisanship in moving this bill forward after having hearings and mark-ups.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1615, the Securing Aircraft Cockpits Against Lasers Act of 2007. And I want to thank Chairman CONYERS for holding a markup and moving the bill through the full committee. I would also like to thank our colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), who has been instrumental in bringing attention to this issue. Congressman KELLER introduced this bill in the 109th Congress. I joined him in cosponsoring the bill then, and I continue to support the legislation now.

The purpose of the bill is to address the problem of individuals aiming lasers at cockpits of aircraft, and this is particularly troublesome since it will usually occur at the critical stages of take-off and landing. This practice obviously constitutes a threat to aviation security and passenger safety. The bill adds a section following title 18, U.S. Code, section 38, to impose criminal penalties upon any individual who knowingly aims a laser pointer at an aircraft within the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States.

□ 1200

The penalties impose imprisonment up to 5 years in prison.

Research from the FAA has shown that laser illuminations can temporarily disorient or disable a pilot during critical stages of flight, such as taking off and landing, and in some cases may cause permanent injury to the pilot. For example, in 2004, a laser

aimed at an airplane flying over Salt Lake City injured the eye of one of the plane's pilots. In January, 2005, responding to concerns regarding this escalating problem, the FAA issued an advisory to pilots instructing them to immediately report laser beams directed at their aircraft.

The House passed similar legislation in the 109th Congress. The Senate did, also. The legislation placed a provision in title 49, the Transportation title, and included a different level of intent. The House and Senate were unable to agree on a compromise version before the end of the 109th Congress. This version represents a compromise between the House and the Senate from the last Congress.

Although I have some concern that when the bill is applied it might involve some misguided young person fooling around with a laser beam, I realize that the conduct the bill prohibits can be dangerous, so it must be strongly discouraged. Since the bill does not have mandatory minimum sentencing, the Sentencing Commission and the courts can apply appropriate punishment for violators based on the facts and circumstances of the individual case.

After the bill is passed, as a further precautionary step, the appropriate committee of jurisdiction should consider requiring manufacturers of laser products to issue strong notices and warnings on the items and packaging regarding the provision of this law to put users on notice.

Mr. Speaker, I think passing this bill is an appropriate step for Congress to address this potentially dangerous problem. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume merely to thank the leaders of this measure, Messrs. SCOTT and KELLER, for moving. For once we've got in front of a problem before something has gone wrong and have a tragedy in the air that would send us rushing back to the floor to pass this very measure that we are passing today, I hope.

Mr. Speaker, it is out of that pride that I thank everyone on the Judiciary Committee that played a role in this matter. And as has been pointed out, it doesn't matter whether it is a prank or whether it is sabotage, this prospective law gets the word out to everybody that these laser beams are dangerous when being flashed on planes or pilots in the air. The catastrophe is unthinkable.

I congratulate my colleagues, and I ask the Members to join all of us in support of this legislation.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1615, Securing Aircraft Cockpits Against Lasers Act of 2007.

The bill amends the Federal criminal code to prohibit aiming a laser pointer at an aircraft or at the flight of an aircraft in the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States.

In the last 15 years, the FAA reports over 500 incidents where people have aimed lasers into airplane cockpits. FAA research has shown that laser illuminations can temporarily disorient or disable a pilot during critical stages of a flight such as landing or take-off, and in some cases, may cause permanent damage.

This type of interference cannot be tolerated. This is a good, commonsense measure aimed at deterring and prosecuting those who commit a senseless act of potential sabotage.

I congratulate Congressman KELLER, the sponsor of this legislation, for his leadership and dedication to this issue. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1615, Securing Aircraft Cockpits Against Lasers Act of 2007. I commend my colleague from Florida who serves on the Judiciary Committee for bringing this bill forward from that committee.

This is an important step in furthering aviation security. We have already taken a number of steps since 9/11 to make our skies safer for the flying public and this is one more important step in that direction.

This bill establishes a new Federal crime for anyone who aims a laser pointer at an aircraft or the flight path of an aircraft. This new statute will enable Federal law enforcement officials to pursue cases that it would not otherwise be able to pursue. Those prosecuted under this new law would face fines and time in prison.

Establishing these penalties will help address an issue that threatens public safety, pilots, and aviation security. When aimed at aircraft, lasers can cause not only discomfort, but they can also cause temporary or permanent visual impairment at critical stages of take-off and landing. The National Transportation Safety Board has already documented instances in which pilots sustained eye injuries and were incapacitated during critical times of flight. Furthermore, the Judiciary Committee report on H.R. 1615 highlights the findings of a report from the U.S. Department of Transportation that since 1990 there have been over 400 reports of lasers being pointed at aircraft.

In the aftermath of 9/11, the FAA took steps to require that air traffic controllers immediately notify pilots about laser events. The FAA is also to immediately notify local law enforcement and security agencies. This will enable police to act in a more timely manner to identify and prosecute those shining lasers at aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is a good step in helping protect the flying public and pilots.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1615, the "Securing Aircraft Cockpits Against Lasers Act of 2007." While the goal of this legislation—to keep our air passengers safe and to effect better "homeland security"—I must point out that initially I was very concerned that this penal legislation was not tailored narrowly enough to exclude only the evil sought to be prohibited.

That is why I offered an amendment during markup of this bill. My amendment was designed to limit the scope of the bill so that it fulfills its intended purposes, which is to protect aircraft crew, and through them passengers, by prohibiting the aiming of the beam of a laser pointer at an aircraft, or the flight

path of such an aircraft. My amendment clarified that the significant penal provisions in the bill are directed at conduct that is harmful to the aircraft or crew. Specifically, my amendment adds an important and useful qualification to the bill's definition of a "laser pointer" to mean:

1. Any device designed or used to amplify electromagnetic radiation by stimulated emission that emits a beam designed to be used by the operator as a pointer or highlighter to indicate, mark, or identify a specific position, place, item, or object; and

2. Is capable of inflicting serious bodily injury if aimed at an airplane cockpit from a minimum distance of 500 yards.

But after consulting with the bill's managers, I am satisfied that it is not necessary to require that the offending laser pointer be capable of inflicting "serious bodily harm" from a minimum distance of 500 yards. I am persuaded that the language used in the bill implies a standard of at least "significant risk" to airplane pilots, crew, and passengers.

I agree, for example, that using a laser pointing device capable of temporarily blinding or causing a pilot to become disoriented is clearly a "significant risk." My major concern with the definition of laser pointers was that it did not distinguish between the kind you can buy at a dollar store that runs on a couple of AAA batteries and has a range of about 25 feet and a high powered laser scope that has a range 100 times as far. But based on my discussions with the bill's managers, Mr. SCOTT and Mr. KELLER, I am satisfied that the legislation anticipates that investigative and prosecutorial resources will not be used to prosecute and punish the use of laser pointers that do not pose any safety risk to airplane pilots, their crew, or airline passengers.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I have determined that I can and will support the bill and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1615, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESERVING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 214) to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 214

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Preserving United States Attorney Independence Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. VACANCIES.

Section 546 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"(c) A person appointed as United States attorney under this section may serve until the earlier of—

"(1) the qualification of a United States attorney for such district appointed by the President under section 541 of this title; or

"(2) the expiration of 120 days after appointment by the Attorney General under this section.

"(d) If an appointment expires under subsection (c)(2), the district court for such district may appoint a United States attorney to serve until the vacancy is filled. The order of appointment by the court shall be filed with the clerk of the court."

SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person serving as a United States attorney on the day before the date of enactment of this Act who was appointed under section 546 of title 28, United States Code, may serve until the earlier of—

(A) the qualification of a United States attorney for such district appointed by the President under section 541 of that title; or

(B) 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXPIRED APPOINTMENTS.—If an appointment expires under paragraph (1), the district court for that district may appoint a United States attorney for that district under section 546(d) of title 28, United States Code, as added by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to give all Members 5 legislative days to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to describe this measure, Senate bill 214, as an important one that will restore historical checks and balances to the process by which interim U.S. attorneys are appointed. It will repair a breach in the law that has been a major contributing factor to the recent termination of at least nine talented and experienced United States attorneys and their replacement with interim appointments.

The full circumstances surrounding these terminations are still coming to light. It is a process being given much attention by the Committee on the Judiciary. But much of the information is well known, and is also considerably troubling. One U.S. attorney was fired

to make way for a political operative who endeared himself to Mr. Karl Rove doing opposition research in the Republican National Committee. Others were apparently fired because they were not sufficiently partisan in the way they used these powers to investigate and prosecute alleged voting fraud. Now, I don't need to tell anybody in this body how important voting is to the democratic process.

These reports are particularly troubling because of the awesome power the United States attorneys, 93 of them in total, are entrusted with. They seek convictions. They negotiate plea agreements. They can send citizens to prison for years. They can tarnish reputations. They can destroy careers with the mere disclosure that a person is under criminal investigation. We, in this country, must have full confidence that these powers are exercised with complete integrity and free from improper political influence. Unfortunately, sometimes this is not the case.

These troubling circumstances that have been revealed were made possible by an obscure provision, quietly and secretly slipped into the PATRIOT reauthorization conference report in March of last year at the behest of the Justice Department's top political appointments, to enable them to appoint interim temporary U.S. attorneys without the customary safeguard of Senate confirmation.

Mr. Speaker, what this measure does is restore the checks and balances that have historically provided a critical safeguard against politicization of the Department of Justice and the United States attorneys, limiting the Attorney General's interim appointments to 120 days only, then allowing the district court for that district to appoint a U.S. attorney until the vacancy is filled, with Senate confirmation required, as historically has been the case.

Now, Members of the House, we have already passed similar legislation. While I would prefer to see our version enacted into law, we are taking up the Senate-passed version in order to expedite the enactment of this important step in restoring legal safeguards against the abuse of executive power to politicize the Federal prosecutorial function in the Department of Justice. I wanted to single out my colleague from California, HOWARD BERMAN, a senior member of the committee, for his role in fashioning not only the original version, but the one that we have before you to agree upon.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, prior to 1986, the district court appointed interim U.S. attorneys to fill vacancies until a replacement could be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In 1986, the process was changed to authorize the Attorney General to appoint an interim U.S. attorney for 120

days. After 120 days, the district court would appoint an interim to serve until the Senate confirmed a permanent replacement.

Last year, Congress addressed concerns that allowing the judiciary to appoint the prosecutors before their court created a conflict of interest. The PATRIOT Act reauthorization eliminated the 120-day time limit for an executive-appointed interim to serve, and eliminated the authority for the district court to appoint an interim. S. 214 returns the authority of the judiciary to appoint interim U.S. attorneys if a permanent replacement is not confirmed within 120 days.

Mr. Speaker, it is fairly obvious that the motivation behind this legislation was the dismissal of several U.S. attorneys earlier this year. Congress has been investigating the circumstances surrounding those dismissals for several months now. Notwithstanding the heated political rhetoric from some of my colleagues, this investigation has turned up no evidence of criminal wrongdoing or obstruction of justice.

Let me just try to lay this issue out as fairly as I can. Some of my colleagues still have concerns about allowing a judge to appoint the prosecutors before their court because they feel that is a conflict of interest. On the other hand, some of my equally smart colleagues have suggested that we should return to the way interim U.S. attorneys were appointed for 20 years, from 1986 to 2006, before the recent PATRIOT Act changes, to ensure that the process is not used to circumvent the Senate confirmation process.

The House Judiciary Committee has held hearings on this matter. We held a markup on the companion legislation, H.R. 580. The Justice Department does not object to this legislation, and I will be supporting it myself personally.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce and give as much time as he may consume to the chairman of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. HOWARD BERMAN.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank my chairman for helping to bring this bill and this issue to the floor twice now, and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, last month, the House passed H.R. 580 to restore the checks and balances to the U.S. attorney appointment process. The bill we are considering today takes a slightly different path to nearly the same end.

Last year, during the conference process on reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act, a provision was added to the report authorizing the Attorney General to unilaterally appoint interim U.S. attorneys for indefinite periods of time, making it possible for the administration to circumvent the Senate confirmation process.

The only disagreement I would have with my friend from Florida's com-

ments was the notion that the Congress considered that change. This was put in in a conference committee, unbeknownst to, I think, just about every Senator on that conference committee, certainly all House Members, other than perhaps the chairman of the committee; and the Congress didn't consider that change.

When the Judiciary Committee began its investigation into the U.S. attorney firings early this year, DOJ representatives were quick to assure members of the committee that getting around the confirmation process was never their intent in pushing for this proposal.

As the Department began producing e-mails and other materials in response to the Judiciary Committee's inquiry, it became clear that whether or not it was the original intent of the administration, DOJ and White House employees quickly figured out that the provision created the possibility of circumventing the Senate and decided to exploit that authority.

As I said when we passed H.R. 580 last month, the ongoing investigation may uncover many issues within the Department that we want to examine. In the meantime, we should quickly address the problem we know about.

□ 1215

The bill we are considering today would reinstate a system that encourages politics to be left at the door during the appointment process and creates a check on the system if the executive branch cannot bring itself to do that.

The reason we are considering a second bill on this topic is that Republicans in the other body have blocked the House-passed bill from progressing. The only difference between these two bills is that the House bill specifically precluded the administration from using the Vacancy Reform Act to extend interim appointments for another 210 days. This is a provision that the Bush administration used nearly 30 times in its first 5 years to replace U.S. attorneys. If this avenue remains open, we are permitting the practice of circumventing Senate confirmation to continue. A temporary appointee could serve for nearly a year without a Presidential nomination or going through the confirmation process.

It's ironic, isn't it? We hear the arguments all the time about the Senate not acting fast enough to confirm judicial appointments. There is rarely an emergency to get a district judge confirmed. U.S. attorneys are different. In any given district, there is only one U.S. attorney. If the administration can simply use extended temporary appointments, the problem will continue.

This bill shouldn't be our last word on the matter. In the progress of the investigation in the Judiciary Committee, we have learned that a second provision removing residency requirements for U.S. attorneys was likely put into the PATRIOT Act reauthorization to make way for certain particular in-

terim appointees. We should repeal that provision, and I intend to introduce legislation to do so.

Communities in this country should feel assured that their U.S. attorney wasn't put in for purely political purposes. These positions shouldn't be used to "develop the bench" or to send in someone who had no connection to the community whatsoever just because he needed a job.

We should fix the system completely, and we will, but because of threatened holds in the other body, we are only doing a partial fix today.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) a subcommittee chair of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, last year, during the conference process on reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act, a check on executive power simply disappeared. In its place, the Republican majority overseeing the conference put in a provision removing the court from the process of appointment and authorizing the Attorney General to appoint interim U.S. attorneys indefinitely.

The Senator who was chairman of the Judiciary Committee at the time said recently that he did not realize the provision was in the bill passed last year until a colleague alerted him to it last month. I don't think anyone was surprised to learn that after the investigation, the former chairman learned that the language had been requested by the Department of Justice. The language was apparently presented by a DOJ employee who is now the U.S. attorney in Utah. Before Senator SPECTER made these comments, the only legislative history of this amendment was one sentence in the conference report that said the new section "addresses an inconsistency in the appointment process of U.S. attorneys."

As we receive more information about the Department of Justice and White House interaction leading up to the dismissal of eight, now nine, U.S. attorneys, the appearance of a political basis for the removals becomes more clear. U.S. attorneys are the chief Federal law enforcement officers in their districts. We rely on them to enforce the law without political prejudice.

One of the former U.S. attorneys who testified before our Judiciary subcommittee recently said that former Attorney General Ashcroft made a point in their first conversation to say that U.S. attorneys have to leave politics at the door. This bill that is before the House today would reinstate a system that encourages politics to be left at the door during the appointment process and creates a check on the system if the executive branch cannot bring itself to do that.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have to add that I have been dismayed in reviewing some of the terms provided to the Judiciary Committee relative to communications between the DOJ. Historically the American people have been able to rely on the Department of Justice to stay above the political fray, especially when it comes to prosecutors. Watergate should have indelibly impressed this lesson upon future administrations, but clearly in this case it did not.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation and to refute Kyle Sampson's statement when he said, "The only thing at risk here is a repeal of the AG's appointment authority. House Members won't care about this at all. All we need is for one Senator to object to the language."

The House of Representatives does care about political independence. We do believe that the executive branch should not ignore legislative branch authority. We should refute the Department's slow march to cooperating with our oversight efforts, and we need to reinstate this important check on the executive branch authority to appoint U.S. attorneys.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that our colleague from the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ARTUR DAVIS, would be able to join us in this debate because he worked very diligently with Mr. BERMAN and Ms. LOFGREN.

Mr. Speaker, while United States attorneys owe their appointments to the President, once they are appointed, their enforcement decisions must be unquestionably above politics. This is an irony that exists, but it is something that must be zealously complied with if we are to have a law enforcement system that can be regarded as faithful to the Constitution and to the laws of the land and to protect the American people.

The Senate confirmation in an open and public process is one way we safeguard against politicizing the prosecutors in the Department of Justice. That safeguard was severely compromised by the secret change in section 546. What we will do now is restore that safeguard and honor the system of checks and balances.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this important consideration.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 214, a bill that will revoke the Attorney General's unfettered authority to appoint U.S. Attorneys indefinitely.

During the USA PATRIOT Act Reauthorization conference, Republicans slipped a small provision into the conference report with enormous repercussions. That provision removed the 120-day limit for interim appointments of U.S. Attorneys, thereby allowing interim appointees to serve indefinitely and without confirmation.

After months of investigation by the House Judiciary Committee, we have learned that the

Bush administration exploited this newly created loophole to purge high-performing Federal prosecutors while they were in the midst of high-profile public corruption investigations involving Republican officials. And while the administration has insisted it never intended to use this loophole to bypass Senate confirmation for appointing U.S. Attorneys, our investigation has uncovered communications and testimony that suggest otherwise.

We also learned, for example, that in an e-mail to former White House Counsel, Harriet Miers, former Attorney General Chief of Staff, Kyle Sampson wrote: "I strongly recommend that, as a matter of administration policy, we utilize the new statutory provisions that authorize the Attorney General to make U.S. Attorney appointments." Mr. Sampson further said that by using the new provision, the Justice Department could "give far less deference to home-State Senators and thereby get (1) our preferred person appointed and (2) do it far faster and more efficiently, at less political cost to the White House."

Referring to the new authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys indefinitely, Mr. Sampson also said, "If we don't ever exercise it then what's the point of having it?"

The Preserving United States Attorney Independence Act of 2007 provides the necessary legislative response to restore checks and balances in the U.S. Attorney appointment process by reinstating the 120-day limit on the interim appointment. Additionally, the bill would apply retroactively to all U.S. Attorneys currently serving in an interim capacity. This would ensure that interim U.S. Attorneys appointed since the purge scheme was hatched are not permitted to serve indefinitely and without Senate confirmation.

This is a common sense solution that has received strong support from the President of the National Association of Former U.S. Attorneys as well as from a former Republican-appointed U.S. Attorney who testified before the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law. It is also important to note that the Attorney General himself has expressed that he is not opposed to rolling back this provision of the USA PATRIOT Act.

I want to be clear that the consideration of S. 214 will not stop the Judiciary Committee's ongoing investigation of the U.S. Attorney purge scheme and the politicization of the Justice Department. After months of investigations, it is clear that the answers can only be found in the White House. We have spoken to every senior Justice Department official involved in the firing process and we still have not gotten the answers to two critical questions: Who made the decision to mass fire U.S. Attorneys, and why were these particular U.S. Attorneys targeted?

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to be assured that political calculations do not determine whether an individual is arrested or prosecuted. We must ensure that the integrity and honor of the Justice Department will be reinstated. I hope my colleagues will join me in the first critical step in this process by closing the loophole in the USA PATRIOT Act that this administration has improperly exploited for political purposes and supporting S. 214.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support S. 214, which is the Senate version of H.R. 580, which the Judiciary Committee favorably reported on March 15, 2007. This much needed and timely legislation

amends chapter 35 of title 28 of the United States Code to restore the 120-day limit on the term of a United States Attorney appointed on an interim basis by the Attorney General. The shocking revelations regarding the unprecedented firings of several United States Attorneys provide all the justification needed to adopt this salutary measure promptly and by an overwhelming margin.

United States Attorneys are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each United States Attorney so appointed is authorized to serve a 4-year term but is subject to removal by the President without cause. The Senate's advise and consent process formally checks the power of the President by requiring the United States Attorney nominee to go through a confirmation process.

In addition, Senators also play a particularly influential informal role in the nomination of United States Attorneys. Typically, a President, prior to appointing a new United States Attorney, consults with the Senators from the State where the vacancy exists if they are members of the President's political party. The President usually accepts the nominee recommended by the Senator or other official. This tradition, called "Senatorial courtesy," serves as an informal check on the President's appointment power.

Since the Civil War, the judiciary has been empowered to fill vacancies in the office of the United States Attorney. In 1966, that authority was codified at 28 U.S.C. §546. When a United States Attorney position became vacant, the district court in the district where the vacancy occurred named a temporary replacement to serve until the vacancy was filled. In 1986, in response to a request by the Attorney General that its office be vested with authority to appoint interim United States Attorneys, Congress amended the statute to add former section 546(d).

Pursuant to this authority, the Attorney General was authorized to appoint an interim United States Attorney for 120 days and, if the Senate did not confirm a new United States Attorney within such period, the district court was then authorized to appoint an interim United States Attorney to serve until a permanent replacement was confirmed. By having the district court play a role in the selection of an interim United States Attorney, former section 546(d) allowed the judicial branch to act as a check on executive power. In practice, if a vacancy was expected, the Attorney General would solicit the opinion of the chief judge of the relevant district regarding possible temporary appointments.

Twenty years later, section 546 was amended again in the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005. This legislation amended section 546(c) to provide that "[a] person appointed as United States attorney under this section may serve until the qualification of a United States Attorney for such district appointed by the President" under 28 U.S.C. §541. The extent of the legislative history of this provision is one sentence appearing in the conference report accompanying the Act: "Section 502 [effecting the amendments to section 546] is a new section and addresses an inconsistency in the appointment process of United States Attorneys."

Although the legislative purpose is unclear, the practical effect is not. The Act amended

section 546 in two critical respects. First, it effectively removed district court judges from the interim appointment process and vested the Attorney General with the sole power to appoint interim United States Attorneys. Second, the Act eliminated the 120-day limit on the term of an interim United States Attorney appointed by the Attorney General. As a result, judicial input in the interim appointment process was eliminated. Even more problematic, it created a possible loophole that permit United States Attorneys appointed on an interim basis to serve indefinitely without ever being subjected to Senate confirmation process, which is plainly a result not contemplated by the Framers.

Mr. Speaker, excluding changes in administration, it is rare for a United States Attorney to not complete his or her 4-year term of appointment. According to the Congressional Research Service, only 54 United States Attorneys between 1981 and 2006 did not complete their 4-year terms. Of these, 30 obtained other public sector positions or sought elective office, 15 entered or returned to private practice, and one died. Of the remaining eight United States Attorneys, two were apparently dismissed by the President, and three apparently resigned after news reports indicated they had engaged in questionable personal actions.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few months disturbing stories appeared in the news media reporting that several United States Attorneys had been asked to resign by the Justice Department. It has now been confirmed that at least seven United States Attorneys were asked to resign on December 7, 2006. An eighth United States Attorney was subsequently asked to resign. And we learned on May 10, the day the Attorney General testified before the House Judiciary Committee, we learned that a ninth United States Attorney had been asked to resign as part of the purge. The names of the fired United States Attorneys are as follows:

H.E. ("Bud") Cummins, III, U.S. Attorney (E.D. Ark.); John McKay, U.S. Attorney (W.D. Wash.); David Iglesias, U.S. Attorney (D. N.M.); Paul K. Charlton, U.S. Attorney (D. Ariz.); Carol Lam, U.S. Attorney (S.D. Calif.); Daniel Bogden, U.S. Attorney (D. Nev.); Kevin Ryan, U.S. Attorney (N.D. Calif.); Margaret Chiara, U.S. Attorney (W.D. Mich.); and Todd P. Graves, U.S. Attorney (W.D. Mo.).

Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 2007, the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing entitled, "Restoring Checks and Balances in the Confirmation Process of United States Attorneys." Witnesses at the hearing included six of the eight former United States Attorneys and William Moschella, Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General, among other witnesses.

Six of the eight former United States Attorneys testified at the hearing and each testified that he or she was not told in advance why he or she was being asked to resign. Upon further inquiry, however, Messrs. Charlton and Bogden were advised by the then Acting Assistant Attorney General William Mercer that they were terminated essentially to make way for other Republicans to enhance their credential and pad their resumes. In addition, Messrs. Iglesias and McKay testified about inappropriate inquiries they received from Members of Congress concerning pending inves-

tigation, which they surmised may have led to their forced resignations.

Mr. Speaker, the USA PATRIOT Act Reauthorization provision on interim United States Attorneys should be repealed for two reasons. First, Members of Congress did not get an opportunity to vet or debate the provision that is current law. Rather, the Republican leadership of the 109th Congress slipped the provision into the Conference Report at the request of the Department of Justice. Not even Senate Judiciary Chairman ARLEN SPECTER, whose chief of staff was responsible for inserting the provision, knew about its existence.

Second, it is now clear that the manifest intention of the provision was to allow interim appointees to serve indefinitely and to circumvent Senate confirmation. We know now, for example, that in a September 13, 2006 e-mail to former White House Counsel, Harriet Miers, Attorney General Chief of Staff, Kyle Sampson wrote:

I strongly recommend that, as a matter of Administration policy, we utilize the new statutory provisions that authorize the Attorney General to make U.S. Attorney appointments.

Mr. Sampson further said that by using the new provision, DOJ could "give far less deference to home-State Senators and thereby get (1) our preferred person appointed and (2) do it far faster and more efficiently, at less political cost to the White House."

Regarding the interim appointment of Tim Griffin at the request of Karl Rove and Harriet Miers, Mr. Sampson wrote to Monica Goodling, Senior Counsel to the White House and Liaison to the White House on December 19, 2006 the following:

I think we should gum this to death: ask the Senators to give Tim a chance, meet with him, give him some time in office to see how he performs, etc. If they ultimately say, 'no never' (and the longer we can forestall that, the better), then we can tell them we'll look for other candidates, and otherwise run out the clock. All of this should be done in 'good faith,' of course.

Finally, we now know that after gaining this increased authority to appoint interim United States Attorneys indefinitely, the administration has exploited the provision to fire United States Attorneys for political reasons. A mass purge of this sort is unprecedented in recent history. The Department of Justice and the White House coordinated this purge. According to an administration "hit list" released in March of this year, United States Attorneys were targets for the purge based on their rankings. The ranking relied in large part on whether the United States Attorneys "exhibit[ed] loyalty to the President and Attorney General."

Mr. Speaker, until exposed by this unfortunate episode, United States Attorneys were expected to, and in fact did exercise, wide discretion in the use of resources to further the priorities of their districts. Largely a result of its origins as a distinct prosecutorial branch of the Federal Government, the office of the United States Attorney traditionally operated with an unusual level of independence from the Justice Department in a broad range of daily activities. That practice served the Nation well for more than 200 years. The practice that has been in place for less than 2 years has served the Nation poorly. It needs to end. That is why I vote to report H.R. 580 favorably to the House. That is why I will vote for S. 214. I urge all Members to do likewise.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 214.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NO OIL PRODUCING AND EXPORTING CARTELS ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2264) to amend the Sherman Act to make oil-producing and exporting cartels illegal, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2264

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act of 2007" or "NOPEC".

SEC. 2. SHERMAN ACT.

The Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 7 the following:

"SEC. 7A. (a) It shall be illegal and a violation of this Act for any foreign state, or any instrumentality or agent of any foreign state, to act collectively or in combination with any other foreign state, any instrumentality or agent of any other foreign state, or any other person, whether by cartel or any other association or form of cooperation or joint action—

"(1) to limit the production or distribution of oil, natural gas, or any other petroleum product;

"(2) to set or maintain the price of oil, natural gas, or any petroleum product; or

"(3) to otherwise take any action in restraint of trade for oil, natural gas, or any petroleum product;

when such action, combination, or collective action has a direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect on the market, supply, price, or distribution of oil, natural gas, or other petroleum product in the United States.

"(b) A foreign state engaged in conduct in violation of subsection (a) shall not be immune under the doctrine of sovereign immunity from the jurisdiction or judgments of the courts of the United States in any action brought to enforce this section.

"(c) No court of the United States shall decline, based on the act of state doctrine, to make a determination on the merits in an action brought under this section.

"(d) The Attorney General of the United States may bring an action to enforce this section in any district court of the United States as provided under the antitrust laws."

SEC. 3. SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.

Section 1605(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking "or" after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:
“(B) in which the action is brought under section 7A of the Sherman Act.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, gas prices have now reached an all-time record high, topping even the 1981 spike in price that had stood as the record high for 26 years. According to the Energy Information Administration, the nationwide price of unleaded regular gas hit \$3.22 a gallon, 11.5 cents higher than last week's price. In Michigan, it is even higher than that.

Today's record-breaking price, one in an unending series of continuous price hikes over the past month, is hurting Americans in their pocketbooks, and we have got to do something about it. Retailers across the Nation are saying that soaring gas prices are prompting consumers to cut back on their shopping trips and their purchases.

We are told this won't be the end of these skyrocketing price hikes either. The AAA forecasts that more record prices are probably on the way, especially as the summer begins, which is usually the busiest driving season of the year.

In Michigan, gas prices have reached their highest levels ever at \$3.27 a gallon. Michigan is now the third most expensive State for gasoline in the country, behind California and the State of Illinois.

Last week, in an effort to help address this crisis, the House Judiciary Committee's Antitrust Task Force examined the OPEC cartel and its impact on the price of gas. OPEC accounts for two-thirds of the world's oil reserves and more than 40 percent of the world's oil production, but, even more significantly, OPEC oil exports represent 70 percent of all the oil traded internationally.

You know what that means. This affords OPEC, obviously, considerable control over the global market. Its net oil export revenues should reach nearly \$395 billion in this year alone, and its influence on the oil market is dominant, especially when it decides to increase or reduce the levels of production.

For years now, OPEC's price-fixing conspiracy, and that is what I call it, a

conspiracy, has unfairly driven up the price and cost of imported crude oil to satisfy the greed of oil exporters. We have long decried OPEC, but, sadly, the administration has done little or nothing to stop this.

So now the time has come. It is time for us to do something to point them in the right direction. We have got to get ahold of this economic crisis. The cries are rising up in every congressional district in the Nation, so your Committee on the Judiciary has produced H.R. 2264, with the help of Mr. CHABOT and Mr. KELLER and other Members, to make clear that the oil cartel nations that are colluding to limit crude oil production as a means of fixing its price is illegal under United States law, just as it would be for any company engaging in the same conduct.

□ 1230

It clarifies and reaffirms the law in several critical respects:

First, it exempts OPEC and other nations from the provisions of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act to the extent those governments are engaged in price fixing and other anticompetitive activities.

Second, H.R. 2264 makes clear that the so-called “act of state” doctrine does not in any way prevent courts from ruling on antitrust charges brought against foreign governments, and that foreign governments are “persons” subject to suit under the antitrust laws.

Third, it explicitly authorizes the Department of Justice to bring lawsuits in Federal court against oil cartel members.

Ladies and gentlemen, we, on behalf of the American people, have had enough. These price rises are not something that we have to merely humbly drive into the gas station and look at the new, increased cost. We don't have to stand by and watch OPEC dictate the price of our gas without any recourse whatsoever. We can do something about it to combat this blatantly anticompetitive, anticonsumer behavior, and we are.

I urge Members to carefully consider the legislation that is now being debated on the House floor.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is painfully obvious to the American people that the price of gasoline is going up. The nationwide average for regular, unleaded gas is at a record \$3.20 a gallon, according to AAA, up almost 34 cents from a month ago, and the peak summer driving season hasn't even started yet. The American people are mad as heck, and they don't want to take it anymore.

To heck with OPEC. How about NOPEC? That's what this legislation is all about.

Last week, the Antitrust Task Force of the House Judiciary Committee, on

which I serve, held a hearing on prices at the pump, market failure, and the oil industry. The experts at this hearing, including the Connecticut attorney general, Mr. Blumenthal, insisted we do something about the OPEC cartel.

The price of gasoline at the pump closely tracks the price of a barrel of oil on the world oil market. That is because the price of crude oil comprises 56 percent of the cost of a gallon of gasoline. American refineries, which import over 60 percent of their oil from foreign countries, compete for those oil resources with China and India. Demand for oil in those two countries has dramatically increased in recent years. As the demand has increased at home and abroad, supplies have not kept up and the price of oil has gone up.

Complicating this problem is the fact that we haven't built a refinery in this country in 30 years. And recent, unexpected refinery shutdowns have constricted supply. Of course, there are also anticompetitive forces in play that manipulate the law of supply and demand to their selfish benefit and our detriment.

For example, the world oil price is dictated mainly by the quantity of oil that the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, or OPEC, is willing to supply. The 11 current OPEC members account for 40 percent of the world oil production and about two-thirds of the world's proven oil reserves. Most would argue that the presence of this cartel, controlled in large part by totalitarian or hostile regimes like Iran and Venezuela, is not helpful.

The question is: What can Congress do about it? NOPEC is one possible solution to this problem. Because of the “act of state” doctrine and the concept of sovereign immunity, Americans are precluded from suing the cartel that controls a good portion of the world's oil supply. This bill would change that.

Under this NOPEC legislation, the U.S. Attorney General would be allowed to bring an antitrust lawsuit against the oil cartel members for collusion, price fixing, and other anticompetitive activities designed to gouge American consumers.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) for their leadership on this NOPEC legislation.

I would point out, in the interest of straight talk, that the White House this morning issued a statement saying that the President will veto the NOPEC legislation. I would point out that they misspelled the word “President” in this release; President is spelled P-R-E-S-E-N-T. Apparently, the White House cares even less about spell-check than they do about OPEC with regard to this matter.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do something about OPEC's price fixing misbehavior and vote “yes” on H.R. 2264.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) whose State has been most affected by the subject matter we are here on the floor considering.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this important bill and believe it is sound legislation that the House should adopt today.

If private actors collusively controlled supply and prices in the manner that OPEC member nations do, there is no question that their conduct would be illegal as a per se violation of the Sherman Act, and they would be subject to criminal and civil liability. Typically, however, foreign states are immune from suit in Federal court. Section 1604 of title 28 of the United States Code provides that a foreign state shall be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States and of the States, with some specific exceptions. One exception is where the suit is based upon a commercial activity carried on in the United States by the foreign state, or upon an act performed in the United States in connection with a commercial activity of the foreign state elsewhere, or upon an act outside of the territory of the United States in connection with a commercial activity of the foreign state elsewhere and that causes a direct effect in the United States.

I think it is quite clear that the OPEC collusion falls within the current exception.

So why is this bill, this law, necessary? A district court has held otherwise, and it is important that the Congress reaffirm that the antitrust laws do indeed apply to OPEC nations in their role as commercial actors engaging in such collusion where such conduct impacts the United States.

Another obstacle to antitrust lawsuits against OPEC is the so-called "act of state" doctrine which has been used by the Ninth Circuit in affirming the dismissal of the case that was wrongly decided.

H.R. 2264 minimizes any "act of state" doctrine concerns by making sure and entrusting to the executive branch the discretion whether to bring charges under this provision. A court's concern about any insinuation of itself into matters properly within the bailiwick of the political branches is mitigated when Congress, by this legislation, and the executive branch, by bringing the action, explicitly authorize judicial involvement.

Much has been said about the price of gas today. It is high, and I think we all hear from our constituents about it. But there is another reason why manipulation of the market is bad for America. We know that for our long-term future we have to develop energy alternatives. We cannot continue to drill and continue to be dependent upon the Middle East for oil.

So long as it is possible for OPEC to manipulate rapidly the price of crude, they have it within their power to really destroy markets for alternative energy, and therefore, make it even harder for us to escape from the oily grasp of OPEC.

We need to make sure that these misdeeds are prevented by adopting this legislation. This is a good bill for consumers, for people in California that are complaining about the cost of gas. It is a good bill for those who want to move away from oil to alternative energies and who need to avoid the manipulation of the market by OPEC that for many years has kept us from that goal.

I hope that this bill, which is an important first step, will not be vetoed by the President. I think it would be a shame if he were to prevent this relief for the traveling public, and also this hope for those of us who want to fight global climate change through the use and development of alternative energy sources.

I thank the gentleman for recognizing me.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) who is the lead Republican cosponsor of NOPEC and has worked hard on this legislation for 3 years.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2264, the No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act of 2007.

First, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Chairman CONYERS, for his hard work and his leadership on this bill. We have worked together in previous Congresses to move this bill, and I am very pleased to see it moving on the floor here today.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) for their leadership in supporting the passage of this legislation as well.

Since last week when we first considered this bill, gas prices have increased another 10 cents to a record level in this country of over \$3.27 a gallon. Before heading to the airport to come back here from my district in Cincinnati, just yesterday, I filled up in my 1993 Buick and it was \$3.19 in Cincinnati by the University of Cincinnati, \$32. And my constituents back home in Cincinnati are very concerned, and rightly so, particularly as we enter the peak summer driving season, which begins this weekend.

I happen to have a tele-town hall meeting where hundreds and hundreds, probably thousands of people in my district were on the line and we were talking about a range of issues, this issue, high gas prices in my district. And as Chairman CONYERS mentioned, the State of Michigan has the highest in the whole country. People are really concerned about this; this is really hit-

ting hard and it is something that we need to deal with in this Congress.

I am very disappointed in the President that this message indicates, whether or not they know how to spell the word "President," that they are going to veto this bill if it is passed. I think we ought to send it to the President and let the chips fall where they may. This is long overdue legislation. I urge its passage.

The other issue, by the way, which was of great interest to my constituents last night in the tele-town hall meeting was, not surprisingly, the immigration issue. We heard the Senate reached an agreement just recently on, in my view, an extremely flawed agreement which is going to be debated over there and then debated over here. Those are the two principal issues my people back in Cincinnati are concerned about.

These continued price hikes take their toll on consumers directly at the gas pump, as well as impacting their everyday lives and raising the cost of things like going to the grocery store or going to work or even planning a vacation. I mean, this is the time when people are deciding whether they are going to take the kids to King's Island up the road from my district in Cincinnati, or if they are going to go to Disney World down in Florida in Mr. KELLER's area. But when you have gas prices at \$3.20-plus per gallon, this is not only going to put a damper on vacation and disappointing our kids, but it is significantly going to weigh down this economy.

I think there is no question that if gas prices remain this high, it is going to have a significant impact on the economy. Jobs and other things are at risk.

Passing H.R. 2264 would be a positive first step to allaying concerns that the American public has expressed about these uncontrollable price surges. Over the last decade, it has become alarmingly clear that America is far too dependent on foreign oil to meet our energy needs. Disturbingly, we import, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, more than two-thirds of the oil we consume, much of it from OPEC, and much of it from some of the more unstable areas of the world—Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, and of course we get some from Nigeria and Venezuela. As Mr. KELLER mentioned, we have down there Mr. Chavez who seems to be following in the footsteps of Fidel Castro. Those are the types of countries that we are depending on for our oil, and that has to change.

At the same time the number of refineries operating in the United States has decreased from over 300, 324 to be exact back in 1981, to fewer than 150, 148 to be exact. So we have cut the number of refineries available in half over that period of time, and we haven't built another oil refinery since 1976, over 30 years ago now.

There is no doubt that we need to focus on both short-term and long-term

strategies to address these issues. We need increased domestic production and refining capabilities, and we need to put a stronger emphasis on alternative energy and conservation efforts.

□ 1245

But this strategy to make us less oil-dependent and to put us on more sound footing also has to include breaking up the cartels that play a primary role in manipulating, and I emphasize manipulating, the market. We talk about supply and demand and all that, but OPEC countries are manipulating the supply of oil in the world.

For decades, OPEC nations have conspired, and again I emphasize that, conspired to limit supplies and to drive up prices of imported crude oil, gouging American consumers, in violation of our Nation's antitrust laws. OPEC accounts for more than two-thirds of the global oil production and exports more than 65 percent of the oil traded internationally. Thus, it's abundantly clear that OPEC's influence in the market dominates.

H.R. 2264, as some of my colleagues have already mentioned, attempts to break up this cartel and subject these colluders and their anticompetitive practices to the antitrust scrutiny that they so richly deserve. Specifically, this bill would amend the Sherman Act to make it illegal for foreign countries to collude, to restrain output or fix prices of oil, gas or any petroleum product. In addition, this bill gives the Attorney General the authority to enforce the antitrust provisions against these nations.

Importantly, the bill also anticipates any protected nation defense or immunity that OPEC nations may proffer, specifically exempting them from the Foreign Sovereignty Immunities Act if they are engaged in price fixing, which they clearly are, or other anticompetitive activities with regard to pricing or production or distribution.

This bill is a necessary and appropriate response to deal with those who are not willing to deal fairly with the American consumer. I urge my colleagues to support competition and consumers by supporting H.R. 2264.

And I want to again thank Mr. CONYERS for his leadership in this area. It's far overdue that we pass this act.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished Judiciary member from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Chairman CONYERS for doing something and looking at this from a perspective that is thoughtful, that is embracing and that recognizes the largeness of this issue.

Might I just recount for my colleagues that this is a bipartisan bill. Many people have come to the floor of the House or in the Judiciary Committee, some are on Science, some are on Energy and Commerce, but all of them have faced what I face, being

stopped in the airport by airport workers, individuals who are hourly wages, and they simply say, we can't take it anymore. As I got on the plane, their last word was, can you do something about the gasoline prices? Today in America, gasoline prices are over \$3.20 a gallon—enough is enough!

As we enter into the summer, we are being told that it's going to get worse, higher and higher and higher. The distinguished Speaker said the gentlewoman from Texas. I represent what is known as the energy capital of the world, and what I would encourage the particular companies that I have the privilege of representing, and I have in essence probably voted differently from many in this House in supporting the Energy Policy Act and a number of initiatives that were supposed to help us diversify or help enhance the capacity of our particular companies. They were supposed to help build refinery capacity, which I will tell you is an issue. I was supposed to applaud offshore development in certain areas if it was environmentally safe. We've tried to do everything in order to ensure that we have a strong industry, but that we provide for those who are in need.

This legislation simply gives the Attorney General the authority to find out about an organization. Many of us have friends that happen to be from these particular nations. We are supportive of the engagement of these particular nations in the Mideast. We work with them. We've traveled there. We encourage engagement on the State Department level. We want to be friends, but there has to be a question of whether or not OPEC provides itself insulated against antitrust violations such that they can gouge or raise prices without any recrimination.

This is a thoughtful legislative initiative that gives the Attorney General of the United States the ability to review whether or not this entity violates the antitrust laws.

You must understand that when the oil comes to the United States, even though we may be operators in those foreign countries, some of the named companies that you know, some of the ones that you pull up to the station, the OPEC sets the prices, and therefore, they look at the marketplace to determine how much money they can get out of a suffering Nation or suffering world.

As you well know, one of our trade deficit partners, China, is consuming more oil than one might imagine. That bumps the price up. And who is the victim? The hardworking citizens in this country, whether they live in Houston, Detroit or New York, or whether they are simply trying to get little ones to soccer teams, to after-school programs or to their religious institution. Nobody can get anywhere because of the price.

So I simply, as I draw to a close, want to be able to cite from the report language of this bill: "With control of 40 percent of the world's production,

OPEC has substantial influences over the price of oil. OPEC member nations have extensive oil reserves and therefore can readily increase supply and lower prices." That means the OPEC can act for the greater good if they desire to do so.

I think that's simple enough to understand. They can increase supply, they can lower prices, but they're not doing it.

So I would ask my colleagues from all parts of the country to be sympathetic to vacationers, people trying to get to hospitals, mothers and fathers taking children to various places, elderly trying to get to the places of worship, where they go. Just the sheer operation of America is dependent on what we do here today. I can't go home, and I imagine none of you can, without saying we tried to do something.

I close simply by an oral letter to my constituents. You might think that you can ride this out, those of you who are the named and successful operators of our energy industry in the United States. We encourage you, you are American, you have jobs, you are the engine of the economy. We're not your enemy. We are your supporters, but we have to work for the consumers. Come out in the open. Encourage a roundtable of discussion. Let the CEOs of the major companies sit in a roundtable discussion and discuss with the American people why we have this increasing and burdensome cost of gasoline.

Look closely at the legislation that is before us and recognize that it is a valuable piece of legislation that gives authority just for the thoughtful review of how we can do better.

I ask my colleagues to support this particular legislation, H.R. 2264, that, in fact, is an answer to this constant question, what are we going to do about gasoline prices? As Members of the United States Congress, it is imperative that we act. We have to do more. This is a thoughtful piece of legislation that frames the question whether or not a sovereign nation is protected against antitrust violations that impact negatively on the consumer in the United States of America. We have to do this, and we have to do more.

I thank the gentleman from Detroit, from Michigan, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for yielding to this grounded representative of the energy industry in Houston, Texas, who wants to work collectively to get something done for the people of the United States.

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

Mr. CONYERS. How much time remains, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERMAN). The gentleman from Michigan has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 2264. As I drive around eastern Long Island, an area that is heavily dependent on its economic stability on travel and tourism, it is all too common to see gas prices as high as \$3.30 a gallon. I'm reminded of how few influences beyond our shores affect our economic prosperity as much as the supply of oil.

The disappointment we share after 6½ years of failed foreign and energy policies is matched by our frustration that price gouging by oil and gas companies, as well as collusion among foreign governments to restrict the flow of oil to the United States, continue unchecked.

As Thomas Friedman has written in the *New York Times*, we can't have an effective, forward-looking foreign policy toward the Middle East without a serious energy policy to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. This bill, which empowers the U.S. to legally challenge foreign collusion resulting in price spikes, is a good first step towards that goal.

One of the first resolutions I introduced called on the President to demand OPEC boost oil production, which was also included in the Democratic substitute I was proud to offer to the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Despite a wave of record gas prices that summer, President Bush and the then-majority ignored that call.

Consequently, the surging price of gas continues to hit middle-class families hard while we wait for the administration to produce a foreign and energy policy that finally shrinks our reliance on foreign oil and vulnerability to the whims of oil cartels.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to close.

Let me just say this. Gas prices are at a record high, and Hugo Chavez is laughing all the way to the bank. Codling and jawboning leaders like Mr. Chavez of Venezuela has not worked. If you are serious about doing something about OPEC's price-fixing misbehavior, then please vote "yes" on NOPEC and allow us to bring antitrust lawsuits against these oil cartel members for collusion, price fixing and other anti-competitive activities that continue to gouge American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on NOPEC.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, may I close with this observation. It was in 1978 that the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers sued OPEC under the Sherman Antitrust Act, but the case was rejected because the Court said that OPEC could not be prosecuted under the Sherman Act due to the foreign sovereign immunity protection clause it claimed for its member states.

I'm here to announce on the floor, as modestly as I can, that that decision was in error. Government-owned companies that engage in purely business activities do not warrant sovereign im-

munity protection according to prevailing legal doctrines, and so what we do in this measure is that we don't start a lawsuit against OPEC. We merely authorize for the first time by law the Department of Justice to, when in their good judgment they choose to be able to do that.

These high prices facilitated by OPEC serve to transfer wealth from Western consumers to petroleum producers, and I have this on the very conservative words of the Heritage Foundation itself. I will insert this in the RECORD at this point.

[From The Heritage Foundation, May 21, 2007]

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO LIFT OPEC'S
IMMUNITY
(By Ariel Cohen)

This week, the House is likely to pass the No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act of 2007 (NOPEC, H.R. 2264). This bill, sponsored by Representatives John Conyers (D-MI) and Steve Chabot (R-OH), would allow the federal government to sue the Organization for Petroleum Exporting States (OPEC) for antitrust violations. Similar legislation (S. 879) is pending in the Senate, sponsored by Senators Herb Kohl (D-WI) and Arlen Specter (R-PA). At a time when oil prices are climbing to ever-higher levels, fighting OPEC's anticompetitive practices would be a welcome first step towards reestablishing the free market in this strategically important sector. This is long overdue and points the way toward a second step: allowing private antitrust suits against OPEC.

The Intolerable Status Quo. Since its inception in 1960, OPEC, which is dominated by Persian Gulf producers, has successfully restricted its member states' petroleum production, artificially distorting the world's oil supply to line its members' pockets. Member states' production quotas are determined at semi-annual meetings of members' petroleum ministers and are at times changed through telephone consultations. Several times, this supply-fixing strategy has brought devastation to the U.S. and global economies:

In 1973, OPEC's actions in response to U.S. support for Israel, which was attacked in the Yom Kippur War, resulted in a worldwide economic recession that lasted from 1974 to 1980.

In 1980, OPEC's failure to increase production in the face of the Iranian revolution resulted in historically high oil prices of \$81 per barrel (in 2005 dollars).

In 1990, OPEC refused to increase production sufficiently to keep prices stable as Saddam Hussein occupied Kuwait.

Lately, OPEC's resistance to add productive capacity has sent oil prices to \$70 a barrel, once again endangering economic growth worldwide.

The cartel's operations ensure that its members' oil and gas economies remain insulated from foreign investment flows. Members of OPEC have not worked to enhance the rule of law and property rights and have imposed severe restrictions to prevent foreign investors from owning upstream production assets (oil fields and pipelines). This is a testament to the cartel's de facto monopoly over the petroleum market. Indeed, the only serious challenge to the organization came in 1978 when a U.S. non-profit labor association, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM), sued OPEC under the Sherman Antitrust Act, in *IAM v. OPEC*. But the case was rejected in 1981 by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. OPEC, the court af-

firmed, could not be prosecuted under the Sherman Act due to the foreign sovereign immunity protection it claimed for its member states.

That decision was wrong. Government-owned companies that engage in purely business activities do not warrant sovereign immunity protection according to prevailing legal doctrines.

High oil prices, which OPEC facilitates, serve to transfer wealth from Western consumers to petroleum producers. This wealth transfer funds terrorism through individual oil wealth and government-controlled "non-profit" foundations. It also permits hundreds of millions of dollars to be spent on radical Islamist education in madrassahs (Islamic religious academies).

Furthermore, the oil-cash glut in the Gulf states and elsewhere empowers resistance to much-needed economic reform in oil-producing countries. State subsidies for everything from health care to industry to bloated bureaucracy continue unabated, funded by Western consumers.

Congress Gets Into Action. Growing concerns over energy prices have prompted Congress to examine the legal hurdles that prevent the United States from defending its economic and national security interests.

In the early part of 2005, a group of senators led by Senator Mike DeWine (R-OH) introduced the "No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act" (S. 555), known as NOPEC, to amend the Sherman Act to make oil-producing and exporting cartels illegal.

The bill has now returned the Senate calendar. The House and Senate now have a unique opportunity to:

Join forces in defending American businesses and consumers. NOPEC would send a strong and long-overdue signal to OPEC oil barons that they must stop limiting production and investment access.

Allow private suits against OPEC. If OPEC is to be reined in, individuals and companies that it has damaged must also be allowed to bring suits against the cartel. As the International Association of Machinists (IAM) v. OPEC made clear, Congress must amend the Sherman Act to allow these suits. Reform should not begin and with the DeWine-Kohl legislation.

Conclusion. The No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act of 2007 would place much needed pressure on OPEC. It is time for the cartel to cease its monopolistic practices. Otherwise the American People can expect more of the same from OPEC—insufficient production and higher energy bills.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2264, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE
REFORM ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 404 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1427.

□ 1300

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1427) to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes, with Mr. PASTOR (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 2007, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. FEENEY of Florida.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

Amendment No. 34 by Mr. BRADY of Texas.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 19 by Mr. DOOLITTLE of California.

Amendment No. 30 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. NEUGEBAUER of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. FEENEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. FEENEY of Florida:

Line 16 on page 127, strike the dash and all that follows through line 10 on page 128 and insert the following: "to provide housing assistance, in 2007, for areas affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita of 2005 and, after 2007, to provide housing assistance for supported rental housing for disabled homeless veterans."

Page 130, lines 23 and 24, strike "establish a formula to allocate" and insert the following: "provide for the allocation".

Page 131, line, 1 insert "of" before "the".

Strike line 4 on page 131 and all that follows through line 2 on page 132 and insert the following: "The funding shall be distributed

to public entities and allocated based on the formula used for the Continuum of Care competition of the Department of Housing and Urban Development."

Page 136, lines 7 through 9, strike "For each year that a grantee receives affordable housing fund grant amounts, the grantee" and insert "Each grantee for 2007 that receives affordable housing fund grant amounts".

Page 138, line 1, strike "the" and insert "any".

Page 138, line 5, before the period insert ", if applicable".

Page 138, line 7, after "grantee" insert "for 2007".

Page 140, after line 6 insert the following: "Affordable housing fund grant amounts of a grantee for any year after 2007 shall be eligible for use, or for commitment for use, only for rental housing voucher assistance in accordance with paragraph (19) of section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19))."

Page 140, line 22, strike "or".

Page 140, line 25, after the semicolon insert "or".

Page 140, after line 25, insert the following: "(E) administer voucher assistance described in the matter in subsection (g) after and below paragraph (3);".

Page 142, line 3, strike "each year" and insert "2007".

Page 142, line 10, strike "each year" and insert "2007".

Page 147, line 20, before "the manner" insert "for each grantee in 2007,".

Page 151, line 15, before "requirements" insert "with respect to affordable housing fund grant amounts for 2007,".

Page 153, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

"(F) for the grantees for 2007, requirements and standards for establishment, by the grantees, of per-"

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 246, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—174

- Aderholt, Akin, Alexander, Bachmann, Bachus, Baker, Barrett (SC), Bartlett (MD), Barton (TX), Biggert, Bilbray, Bilirakis, Blackburn, Blunt, Boehner, Bonner, Bono, Boozman, Boustany, Brady (TX), Brown (SC), Brown-Waite, Brown-Waite, Ginny, Buchanan, Burgess, Burton (IN), Buyer, Calvert, Camp (MI), Campbell (CA), Cannon, Cantor, Capito, Carter, Chabot, Coble, Cole (OK), Conaway, Crenshaw, Cubin, Culberson, Davis (KY), Davis, David, Davis, Jo Ann, Deal (GA), Dent, Diaz-Balart, L., Doolittle, Drake, Dreier, Emerson, English (PA), Everrett, Fallin, Feeney, Ferguson, Flake, Fortenberry, Fortuño, Fossella, Foxx, Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Gallegly, Garrett (NJ), Gerlach, Gillmor, Gingrey, Gohmert, Goode, Goodlatte, Granger, Graves, Hall (TX), Hall (TX), Hastings (WA), Hayes, Heller, Hensarling, Hergert, Hill, Hobson, Hoekstra, Hulshof, Inglis (SC), Issa, Jindal, Johnson, Sam, Jones (NC), Jordan, Keller, King (IA), King (NY), Kingston, Kline (MN), Knollenberg, LaHood, Lamborn, Latham, Lewis (CA), Lewis (KY), Linder, LoBiondo, Lucas, Mack, Manzullo, Marchant, McCarthy (CA), McCaul (TX), McCotter, McCrery, McHenry, McKeon, Mica, Miller (FL), Miller, Gary, Moran (KS), Musgrave, Myrick, Neugebauer, Nunes, Paul, Pearce, Pence, Peterson (PA), Petri, Pitts, Platts, Poe, Porter, Price (GA), Pryce (OH), Radanovich, Regula, Rehberg, Reichert, Reynolds, Rogers (AL), Rogers (KY), Rogers (MI), Rohrbacher, Ros-Lehtinen, Roskam, Royce, Ryan (WI), Sali, Saxton, Schmidt, Sensenbrenner, Sessions, Frank (MA), Giffords, Gilchrest, Gillibrand, Gonzalez, Gordon, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Grijalva, Gutierrez, Hall (NY), Hare, Harman, Hastert, Hastings (FL), Herseth Sandlin, Higgins, Hinchey, Hinojosa, Hirono, Hodes, Holden, Holt, Honda, Hooley, Hoyer, Inslee, Israel, Jackson (IL), Jackson-Lee, (TX), Jefferson, Johnson (GA), Johnson, E. B., Kagen, Kanjorski, Kaptur, Kennedy, Kildee, Kilpatrick, Kind, Klein (FL), Kucinich, Kuhl (NY), Lampson, Langevin, Lantos, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), LaTourette, Lee, Levin, Lewis (GA), Lipinski, Loeb sack, Lofgren, Zoe, Lowey, Lynch, Mahoney (FL), Maloney (NY), Markey, Marshall, Matheson, Matsui, McCarthy (NY), McCollum (MN), McDermott, McGovern, McHugh, McIntyre, McNerney, McNulty, Meehan, Meek (FL), Meeks (NY), Melancon, Michaud, Miller (MI), Miller (NC), Miller, George, Mitchell, Mollohan, Moore (KS), Moore (WI), Moran (VA), Murphy (CT), Murphy, Patrick, Murphy, Tim, Murtha, Nadler, Napolitano, Neal (MA), Norton, Oberstar, Obey, Oliver, Ortiz, Pallone, Pascrell, Pastor, Payne, Perlmutter, Peterson (MN), Pickering, Pomeroy, Price (NC), Rahall, Ramstad, Rangel, Renzi, Reyes, Rodriguez, Ross, Rothman, Roybal-Allard, Ruppersberger, Rush, Ryan (OH), Salazar, Sanchez, Linda T., Sanchez, Loretta, Sarbanes, Schakowsky, Schiff, Schwartz, Scott (GA), Scott (VA), Serrano, Sestak, Shea-Porter, Sherman, Shuler, Simpson, Sires, Skelton, Slaughter, Smith (WA), Snyder, Solis, Space, Spratt, Stark, Stupak, Sutton, Tanner

- Lungren, Daniel E., Mack, Manzullo, Marchant, McCarthy (CA), McCaul (TX), McCotter, McCrery, McHenry, McKeon, Mica, Miller (FL), Miller, Gary, Moran (KS), Musgrave, Myrick, Neugebauer, Nunes, Paul, Pearce, Pence, Peterson (PA), Petri

- Pitts, Platts, Poe, Porter, Price (GA), Pryce (OH), Radanovich, Regula, Rehberg, Reichert, Reynolds, Rogers (AL), Rogers (KY), Rogers (MI), Rohrbacher, Ros-Lehtinen, Roskam, Royce, Ryan (WI), Sali, Saxton, Schmidt, Sensenbrenner, Sessions

NOES—246

- Abercrombie, Ackerman, Allen, Altmire, Arcuri, Baca, Baldwin, Barrow, Bean, Becerra, Berkley, Berman, Berry, Bishop (GA), Bishop (NY), Blumenauer, Boren, Boswell, Boucher, Boyd (FL), Boyda (KS), Brady (PA), Braley (IA), Butterfield, Capps, Capuano, Cardoza, Carnahan, Carney, Carson, Castle, Castor, Chandler, Christensen, Clarke, Clay, Cleaver, Clyburn, Cohen, Conyers, Cooper, Costa, Costello, Courtney, Cramer, Crowley, Cuellar, Cummings, Davis (AL), Davis (CA), Davis (IL), Davis, Lincoln, Davis, Tom, DeFazio, Delahunt, DeLauro, Dicks, Dingell, Doggett, Donnelly, Doyle, Duncan, Edwards, Ehlers, Ellison, Ellsworth, Emanuel, Engel, Eshoo, Etheridge, Farr, Fattah, Filner, Frank (MA), Giffords, Gilchrest, Gillibrand, Gonzalez, Gordon, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Grijalva, Gutierrez, Hall (NY), Hare, Harman, Hastert, Hastings (FL), Herseth Sandlin, Higgins, Hinchey, Hinojosa, Hirono, Hodes, Holden, Holt, Honda, Hooley, Hoyer, Inslee, Israel, Jackson (IL), Jackson-Lee, (TX), Jefferson, Johnson (GA), Johnson, E. B., Kagen, Kanjorski, Kaptur, Kennedy, Kildee, Kilpatrick, Kind, Klein (FL), Kucinich, Kuhl (NY), Lampson, Langevin, Lantos, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), LaTourette, Lee, Levin, Lewis (GA), Lipinski, Loeb sack, Lofgren, Zoe, Lowey, Lynch, Mahoney (FL), Maloney (NY), Markey, Marshall, Matheson, Matsui, McCarthy (NY), McCollum (MN), McDermott, McGovern, McHugh, McIntyre, McNerney, McNulty, Meehan, Meek (FL), Meeks (NY), Melancon, Michaud, Miller (MI), Miller (NC), Miller, George, Mitchell, Mollohan, Moore (KS), Moore (WI), Moran (VA), Murphy (CT), Murphy, Patrick, Murphy, Tim, Murtha, Nadler, Napolitano, Neal (MA), Norton, Oberstar, Obey, Oliver, Ortiz, Pallone, Pascrell, Pastor, Payne, Perlmutter, Peterson (MN), Pickering, Pomeroy, Price (NC), Rahall, Ramstad, Rangel, Renzi, Reyes, Rodriguez, Ross, Rothman, Roybal-Allard, Ruppersberger, Rush, Ryan (OH), Salazar, Sanchez, Linda T., Sanchez, Loretta, Sarbanes, Schakowsky, Schiff, Schwartz, Scott (GA), Scott (VA), Serrano, Sestak, Shea-Porter, Sherman, Shuler, Simpson, Sires, Skelton, Slaughter, Smith (WA), Snyder, Solis, Space, Spratt, Stark, Stupak, Sutton, Tanner

Tauscher	Velázquez	Weiner
Taylor	Visclosky	Welch (VT)
Thompson (CA)	Walden (OR)	Wexler
Thompson (MS)	Walz (MN)	Whitfield
Tierney	Wasserman	Wicker
Towns	Schultz	Wilson (OH)
Turner	Waters	Woolsey
Udall (CO)	Watson	Wu
Udall (NM)	Watt	Wynn
Van Hollen	Waxman	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Diaz-Balart, M.	McMorris
Baird	Faleomavaega	Rodgers
Bishop (UT)	Hunter	Putnam
Bordallo	Johnson (IL)	Shays
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Souder
DeGette	Kirk	Walsh (NY)

□ 1325

Ms. WATSON and Messrs. CASTLE, PICKERING, BUTTERFIELD, and WICKER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico and Mrs. MYRICK changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 386 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOREN was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRESSIONAL SPORTSMEN’S CAUCUS SHOOTOUT

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday an historic event occurred. Yesterday, in Prince George’s County, the Congressional Sportsmen’s Caucus held its annual shootout, and the Democrats were victorious. I want to congratulate my fellow caucus members: MIKE THOMPSON, who is our Top Gun. Overall, COLLIN PETERSON was the top Democrat.

I want to congratulate some Members on the other side of the aisle: Mr. JOHN KLINE, the top Republican.

I want to mention, Mr. Chairman, there was a little bit of confusion yesterday. At the trophy presentation, it was noted that the Republicans had beaten the Democrats by seven shots. It was later found out that there was a mysterious Member who did not actually shoot in the competition on the Republican side; so the trophy was then taken from Congressman RYAN’s office to my office, and the Republicans can come visit it and see it often.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue. There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

Page 144, after line 19, insert the following:
 “(8) ACCEPTABLE IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR OCCUPANCY OR ASSISTANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any assistance provided with any affordable housing grant amounts may not be made available to, or on behalf of, any individual or household unless the individual provides, or, in the case of a household, all adult members of the household provide, personal identification in one of the following forms:

“(i) SOCIAL SECURITY CARD WITH PHOTO IDENTIFICATION CARD OR REAL ID ACT IDENTIFICATION.—

“(I) A social security card accompanied by a photo identification card issued by the Federal Government or a State Government; or

“(II) A driver’s license or identification card issued by a State in the case of a State that is in compliance with title II of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (title II of division B of Public Law 109-13; 49 U.S.C. 30301 note).

“(ii) PASSPORT.—A passport issued by the United States or a foreign government.

“(iii) USCIS PHOTO IDENTIFICATION CARD.—A photo identification card issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security (acting through the Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services).

“(B) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall, by regulation, require that each grantee and recipient take such actions as the Director considers necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of subparagraph (A).”.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 188, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—235

Aderholt	Carney	Gillmor
Akin	Carter	Gingrey
Alexander	Castle	Gohmert
Altmiere	Chabot	Goode
Bachmann	Chandler	Goodlatte
Bachus	Coble	Granger
Baker	Cole (OK)	Graves
Barrett (SC)	Conaway	Hall (NY)
Barrow	Cramer	Hall (TX)
Bartlett (MD)	Crenshaw	Harman
Barton (TX)	Cubin	Hastert
Bean	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Berry	Davis (KY)	Hayes
Biggart	Davis, David	Heller
Bilbray	Davis, Jo Ann	Hensarling
Bilirakis	Davis, Tom	Henger
Bishop (UT)	Deal (GA)	Herseth Sandlin
Blackburn	Dent	Hill
Blunt	Donnelly	Hobson
Boehner	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bonner	Drake	Holden
Bono	Dreier	Hulshof
Boozman	Duncan	Inglis (SC)
Boren	Ehlers	Issa
Boswell	Ellsworth	Jindal
Boucher	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Boustany	English (PA)	Johnson, Sam
Boyd (FL)	Everett	Jones (NC)
Boya (KS)	Fallin	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Feeney	Kagen
Bralely (IA)	Ferguson	Keller
Brown (SC)	Flake	King (IA)
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	King (NY)
Ginny	Fortenberry	Kingston
Buchanan	Fossella	Kline (MN)
Burgess	Fox	Knollenberg
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Kuhl (NY)
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Calvert	Gallegly	Lamborn
Camp (MI)	Garrett (NJ)	Latham
Campbell (CA)	Gerlach	LaTourette
Cannon	Giffords	Lewis (CA)
Cantor	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Capito	Gillibrand	Linder

LoBiondo	Pearce	Shuler
Lucas	Pence	Shuster
Lungren, Daniel	Peterson (MN)	Simpson
E.	Peterson (PA)	Skelton
Lynch	Petri	Smith (NE)
Mack	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Mahoney (FL)	Platts	Smith (TX)
Manzullo	Poe	Souder
Marchant	Pomeroy	Space
Marshall	Porter	Stearns
Matheson	Price (GA)	Stupak
McCarthy (CA)	Pryce (OH)	Sullivan
McCaul (TX)	Radanovich	Tancredo
McCotter	Ramstad	Terry
McCrery	Regula	Thornberry
McHenry	Rehberg	Tiahrt
McHugh	Reichert	Tiberi
McIntyre	Renzi	Turner
McKeon	Reynolds	Udall (CO)
McNerney	Rogers (AL)	Upton
McNulty	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Melancon	Rogers (MI)	Walden (OR)
Mica	Rohrabacher	Walz (MN)
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Wamp
Miller (MI)	Ross	Weld (FL)
Miller, Gary	Royce	Weller
Mitchell	Ryan (OH)	Westmoreland
Moran (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield
Murphy (CT)	Salazar	Wicker
Murphy, Patrick	Saxton	Wilson (NM)
Murphy, Tim	Schmidt	Wilson (OH)
Musgrave	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Myrick	Sessions	Wolf
Neugebauer	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Nunes	Shimkus	Young (FL)

NOES—188

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Norton
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Allen	Hare	Obey
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Arcuri	Higgins	Pallone
Baca	Hinchee	Pascarell
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Pastor
Becerra	Hirono	Paul
Berkley	Hodes	Payne
Berman	Holt	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Honda	Pickering
Bishop (NY)	Hoolley	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Insee	Rangel
Butterfield	Israel	Reyes
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Rodriguez
Capuano	Jackson-Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Cardoza	(TX)	Rothman
Carnahan	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Carson	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castor	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Christensen	Kanjorski	Sali
Clarke	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kennedy	T.
Cleaver	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kind	Schakowsky
Conyers	Klein (FL)	Schiff
Cooper	Kucinich	Schwartz
Costa	Lampson	Scott (GA)
Costello	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lantos	Serrano
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lee	Sherman
Davis (AL)	Levin	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis, Lincoln	Loeb sack	Snyder
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	Solis
Delahunt	Lowey	Spratt
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Diaz-Balart, L.	Markey	Sutton
Diaz-Balart, M.	Matsui	Tanner
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Dingell	McCollum (MN)	Taylor
Doggett	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	Meehan	Tierney
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Towns
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Michaud	Van Hollen
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Farr	Miller, George	Visclosky
Fattah	Mollohan	Wasserman
Filner	Moore (KS)	Schultz
Fortuño	Moore (WI)	Waters
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Watson
Gonzalez	Murtha	Watt
Gordon	Nadler	Waxman
Green, Al	Napolitano	Weiner
Green, Gene	Neal (MA)	

Welch (VT) Woolsey Wynn
Wexler Wu Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Baird Hunter Putnam
Bordallo Jones (OH) Shays
Brown, Corrine Kirk Walsh (NY)
DeGette McMorris
Emanuel Rodgers
Faleomavaega Oliver

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 1333

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. SESSIONS:

Page 100, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 136. COST INCREASE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR MORTGAGES OF REGULATED ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part 2 of subtitle A of title XIII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4541 et seq.), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1330. COST INCREASE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR MORTGAGES OF REGULATED ENTITIES.

"(a) LIMITATION.—The Director shall by regulation establish standards, and shall enforce compliance with such standards, that—

"(1) prohibit the enterprises from the purchase, service, holding, selling, lending on the security of, or otherwise dealing with any mortgage on a one- to four-family residence that does not meet the requirements under subsection (b); and

"(2) prohibit the Federal home loan banks from providing any advances to a member for use in financing, and from accepting as collateral for any advance to a member, any mortgage on a one- to four-family residence that does not meet the requirements under subsection (b).

"(b) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements under this subsection with respect to a mortgage are that, before or at settlement on the mortgage, the mortgagor is provided a written disclosure in such form as the Director shall require, clearly stating the dollar amount by which the requirements on the enterprises to make allocations under section 1337(b) to the affordable housing fund established under section 1337(a), if borne by mortgagors on a pro rata basis, could have increased the amount to be paid under the mortgage by the mortgagor over the entire term of the mortgage (in comparison with such amount paid absent such requirements), as determined in accordance with the determination of the Director pur-

suant to section 1337(o) for the applicable year."

(b) FANNIE MAE.—Section 304 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1719) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) PROHIBITION REGARDING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize the corporation to purchase, service, hold, sell, lend on the security of, or otherwise deal with any mortgage that the corporation is prohibited from so dealing with under the standards issued under section 1330 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency."

(c) FREDDIE MAC.—Section 305 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) PROHIBITION REGARDING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize the Corporation to purchase, service, hold, sell, lend on the security of, or otherwise deal with any mortgage that the Corporation is prohibited from so dealing with under the standards issued under section 1330 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency."

(d) FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS.—Section 10(a) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1430(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) PROHIBITION REGARDING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize a Federal Home Loan Bank to provide any advance to a member for use in financing, or accept as collateral for an advance under this section, any mortgage that a Bank is prohibited from so accepting under the standards issued under section 1330 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency."

Page 144, after line 19, insert the following:

"(8) USE OF AMOUNTS FOR COSTS OF REQUIRED MORTGAGE DISCLOSURES.—Of the amount allocated pursuant to subsection (b) in each year to the affordable housing fund, the Director shall set aside the amount necessary to cover any costs to lenders, mortgagees, and other entities of making disclosures required under section 1330, and shall use such amounts to reimburse lenders, mortgagees, and other entities for such costs. The Director shall by regulation provide for lenders, mortgagees, and other entities to apply for such reimbursements and to identify such costs."

Page 153, after line 14, insert the following:

"(o) DETERMINATION OF COST INCREASES.—For each year referred to in section 1337(b)(1), the Director shall make a determination, taking into account the results of the study conducted pursuant to section 139(d) of the Federal Housing Finance Reform Act of 2007, if available, and the amount of allocations made under section subsection (b) of this section to the affordable housing fund established under subsection (a), of the amount by which the requirements on the enterprises to make such allocations have increased the amount to be paid by mortgagors under mortgages for one- to four-family residences over the entire terms of such mortgages in comparison with such amount to be paid absent such requirements, expressed as an increased cost per \$1,000 financed under a mortgage. The Director shall make such determination for each such year publicly available and shall provide for dissemination of such determination

to lenders, mortgagees, and other entities incurring costs of making disclosures required under section 1330."

Page 153, line 15, strike "(o)" and insert "(p)".

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 240, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—183

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

NOES—240

- Abercrombie Bishop (NY) Carney
Ackerman Blumauer Carson
Allen Boren Castor
Altmire Boswell Chandler
Andrews Boucher Christensen
Arcuri Boyd (FL) Clarke
Baca Boyda (KS) Clay
Baldwin Brady (PA) Cleaver
Barrow Braley (IA) Clyburn
Bean Butterfield Cohen
Becerra Capps Conyers
Berman Capuano Cooper
Berry Cardoza Costa
Bishop (GA) Carnahan Costello

Courtney	Kind	Rahall
Cramer	Klein (FL)	Rangel
Crowley	Kucinich	Renzi
Cuellar	Kuhl (NY)	Reyes
Cummings	LaHood	Rodriguez
Davis (AL)	Lampson	Roskam
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Ross
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Rothman
Davis, Lincoln	Larsen (WA)	Royal-Allard
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Delahunt	LaTourette	Rush
DeLauro	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Dicks	Levin	Salazar
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Doggett	Lipinski	T.
Donnelly	Loeb	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle	Loeb	Sarbanes
Edwards	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lowey	Schiff
Ellsworth	Lynch	Schwartz
Engel	Mahoney (FL)	Scott (GA)
Eshoo	Maloney (NY)	Scott (VA)
Etheridge	Markey	Serrano
Farr	Marshall	Sestak
Fattah	Matheson	Shea-Porter
Filner	Matsui	Sherman
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (CA)	Shuler
Giffords	McCarthy (NY)	Sires
Gilchrest	McCollum (MN)	Skelton
Gillibrand	McDermott	Slaughter
Gonzalez	McGovern	Smith (NJ)
Gordon	McHugh	Smith (WA)
Green, Al	McIntyre	Snyder
Green, Gene	McNerney	Solis
Grijalva	McNulty	Space
Gutierrez	Meehan	Spratt
Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)	Stark
Hare	Meeks (NY)	Stupak
Harman	Melancon	Sutton
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Tanner
Hereth Sandlin	Miller (NC)	Tauscher
Higgins	Miller, George	Taylor
Hill	Mitchell	Thompson (CA)
Hinchee	Mollohan	Thompson (MS)
Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Tiahrt
Hirono	Moore (WI)	Tierney
Hodes	Moran (KS)	Towns
Holden	Moran (VA)	Udall (CO)
Holt	Murphy (CT)	Udall (NM)
Honda	Murphy, Patrick	Van Hollen
Hooley	Murtha	Velázquez
Hoyer	Nadler	Visclosky
Inslee	Napolitano	Walz (MN)
Israel	Neal (MA)	Wasserman
Jackson (IL)	Norton	Schultz
Jackson-Lee	Oberstar	Waters
(TX)	Obey	Watson
Jefferson	Oliver	Watt
Johnson (GA)	Ortiz	Waxman
Johnson (IL)	Pallone	Weiner
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Welch (VT)
Kagen	Pastor	Wexler
Kanjorski	Payne	Wilson (OH)
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Woolsey
Kennedy	Peterson (MN)	Wu
Kildee	Platts	Wynn
Kilpatrick	Pomeroy	Yarmuth
	Price (NC)	

NOT VOTING—14

Baird	Hunter	Radanovich
Bordallo	Jones (OH)	Shays
Brown, Corrine	Kirk	Walsh (NY)
DeGette	McMorris	
Emanuel	Rodgers	
Faleomavaega	Putnam	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 1338

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote amendment No. 388 on the Sessions Amendment on H.R. 1427, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “aye” when I should have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 34 offered by Mr. BRADY of Texas:

Page 130, line 8, strike “75 percent” and insert “70 percent”.

Page 130, line 11, strike “25 percent” and insert “20 percent”.

Page 130, after line 11, insert the following: “(iii) The allocation percentage for the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs shall be 10 percent.”.

Page 130, line 19, after “in connection with” insert the following: “(i) in the case of the grantees specified in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A),”.

Page 130, line 20, before the period insert “, and (ii) in the case of the grantee specified in clause (iii) of subparagraph (A), Hurricane Rita of 2005”.

Page 149, line 16, strike “and” and insert a comma.

Page 149, line 17, before the semicolon insert the following: “, and the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs”.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 260, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—163

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Issa
Akin	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Altmire	Doolittle	(TX)
Barrett (SC)	Drake	Johnson, E. B.
Bartlett (MD)	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Barton (TX)	Duncan	Jordan
Bilirakis	Edwards	Keller
Bishop (UT)	Ehlers	King (IA)
Blackburn	English (PA)	Kingston
Blunt	Everett	Kuhl (NY)
Boehner	Feeney	LaHood
Bonner	Ferguson	Lamborn
Brady (TX)	Flake	Lampson
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Brown-Waite,	Fortuno	Lewis (CA)
Ginny	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Buchanan	Fox	Linder
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Mack
Burton (IN)	Gallegly	Manzullo
Butterfield	Garrett (NJ)	Marchant
Buyer	Gerlach	McCaul (TX)
Calvert	Gillmor	McCotter
Camp (MI)	Gingrey	McHenry
Campbell (CA)	Gohmert	McKeon
Cannon	Gonzalez	Mica
Cantor	Goode	Miller (FL)
Capito	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Carter	Granger	Miller, Gary
Chabot	Graves	Moran (KS)
Coble	Green, Al	Murphy, Tim
Cole (OK)	Green, Gene	Musgrave
Conaway	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Crenshaw	Hastert	Neugebauer
Cubin	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Cuellar	Hayes	Ortiz
Culberson	Hensarling	Paul
Davis, David	Hergert	Pearce
Davis, Jo Ann	Hinojosa	Pence
Deal (GA)	Hobson	Peterson (PA)
Dent	Hoekstra	Pitts
Diaz-Balart, L.	Hulshof	Platts

Poe	Sali	Tiberi
Porter	Schmidt	Turner
Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Regula	Sessions	Walberg
Rehberg	Shimkus	Walden (OR)
Reichert	Shuster	Wamp
Reyes	Smith (NE)	Weldon (FL)
Reynolds	Smith (TX)	Weller
Rodriguez	Stearns	Westmoreland
Rogers (KY)	Sullivan	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Tancred	Wilson (NM)
Ros-Lehtinen	Terry	Wilson (SC)
Royce	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Ryan (WI)	Tiahrt	Young (FL)

NOES—260

Abercrombie	Gordon	Moore (WI)
Ackerman	Grijalva	Moran (VA)
Alexander	Gutierrez	Murphy (CT)
Allen	Hall (NY)	Murphy, Patrick
Andrews	Hare	Murtha
Arcuri	Harman	Nadler
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Bachmann	Heller	Neal (MA)
Bachus	Herseth Sandlin	Norton
Baker	Higgins	Oberstar
Baldwin	Hill	Obey
Barrow	Hinchee	Olver
Bean	Hirono	Pallone
Becerra	Hodes	Pascrell
Berkley	Holden	Pastor
Berman	Holt	Payne
Berry	Honda	Perlmutter
Biggert	Hooley	Peterson (MN)
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Petri
Bishop (NY)	Inglis (SC)	Pickering
Blumenauer	Inslee	Pomeroy
Bono	Israel	Price (NC)
Boozman	Jackson (IL)	Pryce (OH)
Boren	Jefferson	Radanovich
Boswell	Jindal	Rahall
Boucher	Johnson (GA)	Ramstad
Boustany	Johnson (IL)	Rangel
Boyd (FL)	Jones (NC)	Renzi
Boyda (KS)	Kagen	Rogers (AL)
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Rogers (MI)
Braley (IA)	Kaptur	Roskam
Capps	Kennedy	Ross
Capuano	Kildee	Rothman
Cardoza	Kilpatrick	Royal-Allard
Carnahan	Kind	Ruppersberger
Carney	King (NY)	Rush
Carson	Klein (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Castle	Kline (MN)	Salazar
Castor	Knollenberg	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Kucinich	T.
Christensen	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Lantos	Sarbanes
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Saxton
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Latham	Schiff
Cohen	Lee	Schwartz
Conyers	Levin	Scott (GA)
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lipinski	Serrano
Costello	LoBiondo	Sestak
Courtney	Loeb	Shadegg
Cramer	Lofgren, Zoe	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lowey	Sherman
Cummings	Lucas	Shuler
Davis (AL)	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Davis (CA)	E.	Sires
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Skelton
Davis (KY)	Mahoney (FL)	Slaughter
Davis, Lincoln	Maloney (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Tom	Markey	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Marshall	Snyder
Delahunt	Matheson	Solis
DeLauro	Matsui	Souder
Dicks	McCarthy (CA)	Space
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Donnelly	McCollum (MN)	Stark
Doyle	McCrery	Stupak
Ellison	McDermott	Sutton
Ellsworth	McGovern	Tanner
Emerson	McHugh	Tauscher
Engel	McIntyre	Taylor
Eshoo	McNerney	Thompson (CA)
Etheridge	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Fallin	Meehan	Tierney
Farr	Meek (FL)	Towns
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Udall (CO)
Filner	Melancon	Udall (NM)
Forbes	Michaud	Van Hollen
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Frelinghuysen	Miller, George	Visclosky
Giffords	Mitchell	Walz (MN)
Gilchrest	Mollohan	Wasserman
Gillibrand	Moore (KS)	Schultz

Waters	Welch (VT)	Woolsey
Watson	Wexler	Wu
Watt	Wicker	Wynn
Waxman	Wilson (OH)	Yarmuth
Weiner	Wolf	

NOT VOTING—14

Baird	Emanuel	McMorris
Bilbray	Faleomavaega	Rodgers
Bordallo	Hunter	Putnam
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Shays
DeGette	Kirk	Walsh (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 1342

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

Strike line 21 on page 128 and all that follows through line 7 on page 129, and insert the following:

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(A) TIMING.—An enterprise shall not be required to make an allocation for a year pursuant to paragraph (1) unless the Director, pursuant to the study under paragraph (2) for such year, makes a determination that such allocation by the enterprise for the year—

“(i) will not contribute to the financial instability of the enterprise or impair the safe and sound operation of the enterprise;

“(ii) will not cause the enterprise to be classified as undercapitalized;

“(iii) will not prevent the enterprise from successfully completing a capital restoration plan under section 1369C; and

“(iv) will not result in increased costs to borrowers under residential mortgages.

“(B) STUDY.—The Director shall, for each year referred to in paragraph (1)—

“(i) conduct a study to determine the effects on each enterprise of making allocations in such year under such paragraph; and

“(ii) submit to the Congress a report containing the findings of such study and the determinations of the Secretary regarding the issues set forth in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (A).”.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 243, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—180

Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Bilirakis
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (UT)
Bachmann	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Bachus	Biggert	Blunt
Baker	Bilbray	Boehner

Bonner	Gerlach	Myrick
Bono	Gillmor	Neugebauer
Boozman	Gingrey	Nunes
Boustany	Gohmert	Paul
Brady (TX)	Goode	Pearce
Brown (SC)	Goodlatte	Pence
Brown-Waite,	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Ginny	Graves	Petri
Buchanan	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Burton (IN)	Hayes	Porter
Buyer	Heller	Price (GA)
Calvert	Hensarling	Radanovich
Camp (MI)	Herger	Regula
Campbell (CA)	Hobson	Rehberg
Cannon	Hoekstra	Reichert
Cantor	Hulshof	Reynolds
Capito	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Coble	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole (OK)	Keller	Roskam
Conaway	King (IA)	Royce
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Sali
Cubin	Kline (MN)	Saxton
Culberson	Knollenberg	Schmidt
Davis (KY)	Kuhl (NY)	Schmitt
Davis, David	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Jo Ann	Lamborn	Sessions
Davis, Tom	Latham	Shadegg
Deal (GA)	LaTourrette	Shimkus
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Linder	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Souder
Drake	Lucas	Stearns
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Duncan	E.	Tancredo
Ehlers	Mack	Terry
Emerson	Manzullo	Thornberry
English (PA)	Marchant	Tiahrt
Everett	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Fallin	McCaul (TX)	Turner
Feeney	McCotter	Upton
Ferguson	McCrery	Walberg
Flake	McHenry	Wamp
Forbes	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Fortenberry	McKeon	Weller
Fortuno	Mica	Westmoreland
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Musgrave	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)		

NOES—243

Abercrombie	Cooper	Harman
Ackerman	Costa	Hastert
Alexander	Costello	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Courtney	Herseth Sandlin
Altmire	Cramer	Higgins
Andrews	Crowley	Hill
Arcuri	Cuellar	Hinchee
Baca	Cummings	Hinojosa
Baldwin	Davis (AL)	Hirono
Barrow	Davis (CA)	Hodes
Bean	Davis (IL)	Holden
Becerra	Davis, Lincoln	Holt
Berkley	DeFazio	Hooley
Berman	Delahunt	Hoyer
Berry	DeLauro	Inslee
Bishop (GA)	Dicks	Israel
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Blumenauer	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Boren	Donnelly	(TX)
Boswell	Doyle	Jefferson
Boucher	Edwards	Jindal
Boyd (FL)	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Boyda (KS)	Ellsworth	Johnson (IL)
Brady (PA)	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Braley (IA)	Eshoo	Kagen
Butterfield	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Capps	Farr	Kaptur
Capuano	Fattah	Kennedy
Cardoza	Filner	Kildee
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Carney	Giffords	Kind
Carson	Gilchrest	Klein (FL)
Castor	Gillibrand	Kucinich
Chandler	Gonzalez	Lampson
Christensen	Gordon	Langevin
Clarke	Green, Al	Lantos
Clay	Green, Gene	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Grijalva	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Lee
Cohen	Hall (NY)	Levin
Conyers	Hare	Lewis (GA)

Lipinski	Ortiz	Skelton
Loeback	Pallone	Slaughter
Lofgren, Zoe	Pascarell	Smith (NJ)
Lowey	Pastor	Smith (WA)
Lynch	Payne	Snyder
Mahoney (FL)	Perlmutter	Solis
Maloney (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Space
Markey	Pickering	Spratt
Marshall	Platts	Stark
Matheson	Pomeroy	Stupak
Matsui	Price (NC)	Sutton
McCarthy (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
McCollum (MN)	Rahall	Tauscher
McDermott	Ramstad	Taylor
McGovern	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
McIntyre	Renzi	Thompson (MS)
McNerney	Reyes	Tierney
McNulty	Rodriguez	Towns
Meehan	Ross	Udall (CO)
Meek (FL)	Rothman	Udall (NM)
Meeke (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen
Melancon	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
Michaud	Rush	Visclosky
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Walden (OR)
Miller, George	Salazar	Walz (MN)
Mitchell	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman
Mollohan	T.	Schultz
Moore (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Watson
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Watt
Murphy (CT)	Schiff	Waxman
Murphy, Patrick	Schwartz	Weiner
Murphy, Tim	Scott (GA)	Welch (VT)
Murtha	Scott (VA)	Wexler
Nadler	Serrano	Whitfield
Napolitano	Sestak	Wilson (NM)
Neal (MA)	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)
Norton	Sherman	Woolsey
Oberstar	Shuler	Wu
Obey	Simpson	Wynn
Olver	Sires	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Baird	Faleomavaega	McMorris
Bordallo	Honda	Rodgers
Brown, Corrine	Hunter	Putnam
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Shays
Emanuel	Kirk	Walsh (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 1347

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. DOOLITTLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. DOOLITTLE:

Page 100, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 136. MORTGAGOR IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR MORTGAGES OF REGULATED ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part 2 of subtitle A of title XIII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4541 et seq.), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1330. MORTGAGOR IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR MORTGAGES OF REGULATED ENTITIES.

“(a) LIMITATION.—The Director shall by regulation establish standards, and shall enforce compliance with such standards, that—

“(1) prohibit the enterprises from the purchase, service, holding, selling, lending on

the security of, or otherwise dealing with any mortgage on a one- to four-family residence that will be used as the principal residence of the mortgagor that does not meet the requirements under subsection (b); and

“(2) prohibit the Federal home loan banks from providing any advances to a member for use in financing, and from accepting as collateral for any advance to a member, any mortgage on a one- to four-family residence that will be used as the principal residence of the mortgagor that does not meet the requirements under subsection (b).

“(b) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements under this subsection with respect to a mortgage are that the mortgagor have, at the time of settlement on the mortgage, a Social Security account number.”.

(b) FANNIE MAE.—Section 304 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1719) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) PROHIBITION REGARDING MORTGAGOR IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize the corporation to purchase, service, hold, sell, lend on the security of, or otherwise deal with any mortgage that the corporation is prohibited from so dealing with under the standards issued under section 1330 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.”.

(c) FREDDIE MAC.—Section 305 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) PROHIBITION REGARDING MORTGAGOR IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize the Corporation to purchase, service, hold, sell, lend on the security of, or otherwise deal with any mortgage that the Corporation is prohibited from so dealing with under the standards issued under section 1330 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.”.

(d) FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS.—Section 10(a) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1430(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) PROHIBITION REGARDING MORTGAGOR IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize a Federal Home Loan Bank to provide any advance to a member for use in financing, or accept as collateral for an advance under this section, any mortgage that a Bank is prohibited from so accepting under the standards issued under section 1330 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.”.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 205, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—217

Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Bilirakis
Akin	Barrow	Bishop (UT)
Alexander	Bartlett (MD)	Blackburn
Altmire	Barton (TX)	Blunt
Bachmann	Bean	Boehner
Bachus	Biggert	Bonner
Baker	Bilbray	Bono

Boozman	Gordon	Pearce	Kilpatrick	Murphy (CT)	Serrano
Boren	Granger	Pence	Kind	Murtha	Sestak
Boucher	Graves	Petri	Klein (FL)	Nadler	Shea-Porter
Boustany	Hall (NY)	Pickering	Kucinich	Napolitano	Sherman
Boyd (KS)	Hall (TX)	Pitts	LaHood	Neal (MA)	Sires
Brady (TX)	Harman	Platts	Lampson	Norton	Skelton
Brown (SC)	Hastert	Poe	Langevin	Oberstar	Slaughter
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (WA)	Porter	Lantos	Obey	Smith (WA)
Ginny	Hayes	Price (GA)	Larsen (WA)	Oliver	Snyder
Buchanan	Heller	Pryce (OH)	Larson (CT)	Ortiz	Solis
Burgess	Hensarling	Radanovich	Lee	Pallone	Stark
Burton (IN)	Herger	Ramstad	Lewis (GA)	Pascarell	Sutton
Buyer	Hill	Regula	Lipinski	Pastor	Tanner
Calvert	Hobson	Rehberg	Loeback	Paul	Tauscher
Camp (MI)	Hoekstra	Reichert	Lofgren, Zoe	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Campbell (CA)	Holden	Reynolds	Lowey	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Cantor	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)	Lynch	Peterson (MN)	Tierney
Capito	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)	Mahoney (FL)	Pomeroy	Townes
Carney	Issa	Rogers (MI)	Maloney (NY)	Price (NC)	Udall (CO)
Carter	Jindal	Rohrabacher	Manzullo	Rahall	Udall (NM)
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Roskam	Markey	Rangel	Van Hollen
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Ross	Matsui	Renzi	Velázquez
Chandler	Jones (NC)	Royce	McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Visclosky
Coble	Jordan	Ryan (OH)	McCullum (MN)	Rodriguez	Wasserman
Cole (OK)	Keller	Ryan (WI)	McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
Conaway	King (IA)	Sali	McGovern	Rothman	Waters
Cramer	King (NY)	Saxton	McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Watson
Crenshaw	Kingston	Schmidt	McNerney	Ruppersberger	Watt
Cubin	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Meehan	Rush	Waxman
Culberson	Knollenberg	Sessions	Meek (FL)	Salazar	Weiner
Davis (KY)	Kuhl (NY)	Shadegg	Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Linda	Welch (VT)
Davis, David	Lamborn	Shimkus	Michaud	T.	Wexler
Davis, Jo Ann	Latham	Shuler	Miller (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (OH)
Davis, Lincoln	LaTourrette	Shuster	Miller (NC)	Sarbanes	Woolsey
Davis, Tom	Levin	Simpson	Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wu
Deal (GA)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)	Mollohan	Schiff	Wynn
Dent	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Moore (KS)	Schwartz	Yarmuth
Donnelly	Linder	Smith (TX)	Moore (WI)	Scott (GA)	
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Souder	Moran (VA)	Scott (VA)	
Drake	Lucas	Space			
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Spratt			
Duncan	E.	Stearns	Baird	Honda	Peterson (PA)
Ellsworth	Mack	Stupak	Bordallo	Hunter	Putnam
Emerson	Marchant	Sullivan	Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Shays
English (PA)	Marshall	Tancredo	DeGette	Kirk	Walsh (NY)
Everett	Matheson	Taylor	Emanuel	McMorris	
Fallin	McCarthy (CA)	Terry	Faleomavaega	Rodgers	
Feeney	McCaul (TX)	Thornberry			
Ferguson	McCotter	Tiahrt			
Forbes	McCreery	Tiberi			
Fortenberry	McHenry	Turner			
Fossella	McHugh	Upton			
Fox	McKeon	Walberg			
Franks (AZ)	McNulty	Walden (OR)			
Frelinghuysen	Melancon	Walz (MN)			
Galleghy	Mica	Wamp			
Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)			
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Weller			
Giffords	Mitchell	Westmoreland			
Gilchrest	Moran (KS)	Whitfield			
Gillibrand	Murphy, Patrick	Wicker			
Gillmor	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (NM)			
Gingrey	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)			
Gohmert	Myrick	Wolf			
Goode	Neugebauer	Young (AK)			
Goodlatte	Nunes	Young (FL)			

NOES—205

Abercrombie	Cohen	Fortuño
Ackerman	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Allen	Cooper	Gonzalez
Andrews	Costa	Green, Al
Arcuri	Costello	Green, Gene
Baca	Courtney	Grijalva
Baldwin	Crowley	Gutierrez
Becerra	Cuellar	Hare
Berkley	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Davis (AL)	Herseth Sandlin
Berry	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Hinchey
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Hirono
Boswell	DeLauro	Hodes
Boyd (FL)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holt
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hooley
Braley (IA)	Dicks	Hoyer
Butterfield	Dingell	Insee
Cannon	Doggett	Israel
Capps	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Capuano	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Cardoza	Ehlers	(TX)
Carnahan	Ellison	Jefferson
Carson	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Castor	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Christensen	Etheridge	Kagen
Clarke	Farr	Kanjorski
Clay	Fattah	Kaptur
Cleaver	Filner	Kennedy
Clyburn	Flake	Kildee

Kilpatrick	Murphy (CT)	Serrano
Kind	Murtha	Sestak
Klein (FL)	Nadler	Shea-Porter
Kucinich	Napolitano	Sherman
LaHood	Neal (MA)	Sires
Lampson	Norton	Skelton
Langevin	Oberstar	Slaughter
Lantos	Obey	Smith (WA)
Larsen (WA)	Oliver	Snyder
Larson (CT)	Ortiz	Solis
Lee	Pallone	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Pascarell	Sutton
Lipinski	Pastor	Tanner
Loeback	Paul	Tauscher
Lofgren, Zoe	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Lynch	Peterson (MN)	Tierney
Mahoney (FL)	Pomeroy	Townes
Maloney (NY)	Price (NC)	Udall (CO)
Manzullo	Rahall	Udall (NM)
Markey	Rangel	Van Hollen
Matsui	Renzi	Velázquez
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Visclosky
McCullum (MN)	Rodriguez	Wasserman
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
McGovern	Rothman	Waters
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Watson
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Watt
Meehan	Rush	Waxman
Meek (FL)	Salazar	Weiner
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Linda	Welch (VT)
Michaud	T.	Wexler
Miller (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (OH)
Miller (NC)	Sarbanes	Woolsey
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wu
Mollohan	Schiff	Wynn
Moore (KS)	Schwartz	Yarmuth
Moore (WI)	Scott (GA)	
Moran (VA)	Scott (VA)	

NOT VOTING—15

Baird	Honda	Peterson (PA)
Bordallo	Hunter	Putnam
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Shays
DeGette	Kirk	Walsh (NY)
Emanuel	McMorris	
Faleomavaega	Rodgers	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1352

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR.

HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 30 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

Page 153, line 14, after the period insert close quotation marks and a period.

Strike line 15 on page 153 and all that follows through line 6 on page 154.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 155, noes 263, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—155

Aderholt	Feeney	McCrery
Akin	Flake	McHenry
Alexander	Forbes	McKeon
Bachmann	Fortenberry	Mica
Bachus	Fossella	Miller (FL)
Baker	Fox	Miller, Gary
Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Bartlett (MD)	Galleghy	Musgrave
Barton (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Biggert	Gillmor	Neugebauer
Bilbray	Gingrey	Nunes
Bilirakis	Gohmert	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Goode	Pearce
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Pence
Blunt	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Graves	Petri
Bonner	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bono	Hastert	Poe
Boozman	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Brown (SC)	Heller	Radanovich
Brown-Waite,	Hensarling	Reynolds
Ginny	Herger	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hobson	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hoekstra	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Hulshof	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Inglis (SC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Issa	Roskam
Camp (MI)	Jindal	Royce
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Sali
Cantor	Jordan	Schmidt
Carter	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	King (IA)	Sessions
Coble	King (NY)	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Kingston	Shimkus
Conaway	Kline (MN)	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Cubin	Kuhl (NY)	Souder
Culberson	LaHood	Stearns
Davis, David	Lamborn	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Latham	Tancredo
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Terry
Deal (GA)	Linder	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lungren, Daniel	E.
Doolittle	E.	Mack
Drake	Mack	Manzullo
Dreier	Manzullo	Marchant
Duncan	Marchant	McCarthy (CA)
Ehlers	McCarthy (CA)	McCaul (TX)
Everett	McCaul (TX)	McCotter
Fallin	McCotter	

NOES—263

Abercrombie	Cohen	Gillibrand
Ackerman	Conyers	Gonzalez
Allen	Cooper	Gordon
Altmire	Costa	Green, Al
Andrews	Costello	Green, Gene
Arcuri	Courtney	Grijalva
Baca	Cramer	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Crowley	Hall (NY)
Barrow	Cuellar	Hare
Bean	Cummings	Harman
Becerra	Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Herseth Sandlin
Berman	Davis (IL)	Higgins
Berry	Davis, Lincoln	Hill
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hinche
Bishop (NY)	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hirono
Boren	Dent	Hodes
Boswell	Dicks	Holden
Boucher	Dingell	Holt
Boustany	Doggett	Hooley
Boyd (FL)	Donnelly	Hoyer
Boyd (KS)	Doyle	Inslee
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Israel
Braley (IA)	Ellison	Jackson (IL)
Butterfield	Ellsworth	Jackson-Lee
Capito	Emerson	(TX)
Capps	Engel	Jefferson
Capuano	English (PA)	Johnson (GA)
Cardoza	Eshoo	Johnson (IL)
Carnahan	Etheridge	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Farr	Kagen
Carson	Fattah	Kanjorski
Castle	Ferguson	Kaptur
Castor	Filner	Kennedy
Chandler	Fortuno	Kildee
Christensen	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Clarke	Frelinghuysen	Kind
Clay	Gerlach	Klein (FL)
Cleaver	Giffords	Kucinich
Clyburn	Gilchrest	Lampson

Langevin	Obey	Skelton
Lantos	Oliver	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
LaTourette	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lee	Pascrell	Snyder
Levin	Pastor	Solis
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Space
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Spratt
LoBiondo	Peterson (MN)	Stark
Loeb	Pickering	Stupak
Lofgren, Zoe	Platts	Sutton
Lowe	Pomeroy	Tanner
Lynch	Porter	Tauscher
Mahoney (FL)	Price (NC)	Taylor
Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
Markey	Ramstad	Thompson (MS)
Marshall	Rangel	Tiahrt
Matheson	Regula	Peterson
Matsui	Rehberg	Towns
McCarthy (NY)	Reichert	Turner
McCollum (MN)	Renzi	Udall (CO)
McDermott	Reyes	Udall (NM)
McGovern	Rodriguez	Upton
McHugh	Ross	Van Hollen
McIntyre	Rothman	Velázquez
McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
McNulty	Ruppersberger	Walden (OR)
Meehan	Rush	Walz (MN)
Meek (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Melancon	Salazar	Schultz
Michaud	Sánchez, Linda	T. Waters
Miller (MI)	T.	Watt
Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Miller, George	Sarbanes	Weiner
Mitchell	Saxton	Welch (VT)
Mollohan	Schakowsky	Weller
Moore (KS)	Schiff	Wexler
Moore (WI)	Schwartz	Whitfield
Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)	Wicker
Murphy (CT)	Scott (VA)	Wilson (NM)
Murphy, Patrick	Serrano	Wilson (OH)
Murphy, Tim	Sestak	Woolsey
Murtha	Shea-Porter	Wu
Nadler	Sherman	Wynn
Napolitano	Shuler	Yarmuth
Neal (MA)	Shuster	Young (AK)
Norton	Simpson	Young (FL)
Oberstar	Sires	

NOT VOTING—19

Baird	Honda	McMorris
Bordallo	Hunter	Rodgers
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Meeks (NY)
Davis (KY)	Kirk	Putnam
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Shays
Emanuel	Lewis (CA)	Walsh (NY)
Faleomavaega		Watson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1356

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

Page 128, strike lines 18 through 20 and insert the following: “amount equal to the lesser of (A) 1.2 basis points for each dollar of the average total mortgage portfolio of the enterprise during the preceding year, (B) the number of basis points for each dollar of the average total mortgage portfolio of the enterprise during the preceding year, which when applied to such average portfolios of both enterprises, results in an aggregate al-

location under this paragraph by the enterprises for the year of \$520,000,000, or (C) a lesser amount, as determined by the Director, if the Director determines for such year that allocation of the amounts under subparagraphs (A) and (B) poses a safety or soundness concern to the enterprise.”.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 256, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—164

Aderholt	Fox	Myrick
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Galleghy	Nunes
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Pence
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Petri
Biggert	Goode	Pickering
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Pitts
Bilirakis	Granger	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Hastert	Radanovich
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Bono	Hayes	Rehberg
Boozman	Heller	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Reynolds
Brown (SC)	Herger	Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)
Ginny	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Calvert	Jordan	Royce
Camp (MI)	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Sali
Cannon	King (NY)	Schmidt
Cantor	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Carter	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Castle	Kuhl (NY)	Shuster
Coble	LaHood	Simpson
Conaway	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Latham	Smith (TX)
Cubin	LaTourette	Souder
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Stupak
Davis, David	Linder	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Lucas	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	E. Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	E.	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	Mack	Tiberi
Doolittle	Manzullo	Upton
Drake	Marchant	Walberg
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Walden (OR)
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Wamp
Ehlers	McCotter	Weller
Emerson	McHenry	Westmoreland
English (PA)	McKeon	Whitfield
Fallin	Mica	Wicker
Feeney	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Flake	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Young (FL)
Fossella	Musgrave	

NOES—256

Abercrombie	Blumenauer	Chabot
Ackerman	Bonner	Chandler
Alexander	Boren	Christensen
Allen	Boswell	Clarke
Altmire	Boucher	Clay
Andrews	Boustany	Cleaver
Arcuri	Boyd (FL)	Clyburn
Baca	Boyd (KS)	Cohen
Baker	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Baldwin	Braley (IA)	Cooper
Barrow	Butterfield	Costa
Bean	Capps	Costello
Becerra	Capuano	Courtney
Berkley	Cardoza	Cramer
Berman	Carnahan	Crowley
Berry	Carney	Cuellar
Bishop (GA)	Carson	Cummings
Bishop (NY)	Castor	Davis (AL)

Davis (CA)	Kind	Renzi
Davis (IL)	Klein (FL)	Reyes
Davis, Lincoln	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Davis, Tom	Lampson	Ross
DeFazio	Langevin	Rothman
Delahunt	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Dent	Larson (CT)	Rush
Dicks	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Levin	Salazar
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Donnelly	Lipinski	T.
Doyle	LoBiondo	Sanchez, Loretta
Edwards	Loeb sack	Sarbanes
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Saxton
Ellsworth	Lowey	Schakowsky
Engel	Lynch	Schiff
Eshoo	Mahoney (FL)	Schwartz
Etheridge	Maloney (NY)	Scott (GA)
Everett	Markey	Scott (VA)
Farr	Marshall	Serrano
Fattah	Matheson	Sestak
Ferguson	Matsui	Shadegg
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	Shea-Porter
Fortuño	McCollum (MN)	Sherman
Frank (MA)	McCrery	Shuler
Frelinghuysen	McDermott	Sires
Gerlach	McGovern	Skelton
Giffords	McHugh	Slaughter
Gilchrest	McIntyre	Smith (NJ)
Gillibrand	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Gonzalez	McNulty	Snyder
Gordon	Meehan	Solis
Green, Al	Meek (FL)	Space
Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)	Spratt
Grijalva	Melancon	Stark
Gutierrez	Michaud	Sutton
Hall (NY)	Miller (NC)	Tanner
Hare	Miller, George	Tauscher
Harman	Mitchell	Taylor
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Terry
Herseth Sandlin	Moore (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Higgins	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Hill	Moran (VA)	Tierney
Hinchev	Murphy (CT)	Towns
Hinojosa	Murphy, Patrick	Turner
Hirono	Murphy, Tim	Udall (CO)
Hobson	Murtha	Udall (NM)
Hodes	Nadler	Van Hollen
Holden	Napolitano	Velázquez
Holt	Neal (MA)	Visclosky
Hooley	Norton	Walz (MN)
Hoyer	Oberstar	Wasserman
Inslee	Obey	Schultz
Israel	Olver	Waters
Jackson (IL)	Ortiz	Watson
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Watt
(TX)	Pascrell	Waxman
Jefferson	Pastor	Weiner
Jindal	Payne	Welch (VT)
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Wexler
Johnson (IL)	Peterson (MN)	Wilson (NM)
Johnson, E. B.	Platts	Wilson (OH)
Kagen	Pomeroy	Woolsey
Kanjorski	Porter	Wu
Kaptur	Price (NC)	Wynn
Kennedy	Rahall	Yarmuth
Kildee	Ramstad	
Kilpatrick	Rangel	

NOT VOTING—17

Baird	Honda	Putnam
Bordallo	Hunter	Shays
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Walsh (NY)
Cole (OK)	Kirk	Weldon (FL)
DeGette	McMorris	
Emanuel	Rodgers	
Faleomavaega	Peterson (PA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1400

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of passage of H.R. 1427, "The Federal Housing Finance Reform Act."

I believe this legislation is one of the most cost-effective ways to provide cities across the country with desperately needed federal funding so they can construct or renovate housing stock for working families on public housing

waiting lists, homeless veterans, homeless Katrina victims, and homeless working families.

I believe that passage of this legislation is a "historic" moment in this Congress, and makes me proud to be a member of this body.

In Detroit, there are thousands of working individuals and families living in homeless shelters or staying with friends and extended family members because they cannot afford the skyrocketing costs of private market housing.

We have a homeless shelter in Detroit where hundreds of veterans live each year, and most are working minimum wage jobs, or work in low to moderate wage employment.

It is a moral outrage that soldiers who have fought in wars and served their country honorably come home to cities like Detroit, only to find out that they cannot afford an apartment or a home.

This bill will help reduce these problems, and provide decent affordable housing to more veterans and working families without raising taxes.

It will also help victims of Katrina who are currently living in hotels or homeless shelters in other cities to return to the Gulf Coast, or remain where they are, because there will be expanded housing opportunities due to passage of H.R. 1427.

Passage of "The Federal Housing Finance Reform Act" will provide billions of dollars to cash-starved cities across the Nation to successfully build new affordable housing units for working families by utilizing existing non-profit housing developers, public housing agencies, and for-profit housing developers.

Passage of H.R. 1427 will help hundreds of thousands of Americans across this Nation who are currently on waiting lists for public housing to be able to get out of homeless shelters and into homes or apartments, since there will now be more federal funding for affordable housing production.

If America is ever to be a great Nation, we must ensure that all Americans, as a basic human right, have decent and affordable housing. Passage of H.R. 1427 will get our Nation on the road to having a real national affordable housing policy, which we currently do not have.

The United States, the wealthiest country in the world, shamefully has one million homeless children, and over 40 percent of those living in homeless shelters are working in jobs. Our current affordable housing problem is building more homeless shelters where there is a lack of affordable housing.

I ask this question Mr. Chairman. How many Members of Congress would want to come home after a hard day's work, and sleep in a homeless shelter? Probably nobody! We need affordable housing for all now.

I urge this body to pass H.R. 1427 with all deliberate speed.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, while I believe that Government Sponsored Enterprise, GSE, reform is absolutely necessary, I cannot support H.R. 1427, the Federal Housing Finance Reform Act, in its current form.

It is important for Congress to promote home-ownership for all Americans by giving citizens access to affordable housing. However, this bill, under the Affordable Housing Fund, AHF, section, requires that GSEs set aside nearly \$3 billion over the next 4 years

into a special fund. H.R. 1427 essentially represents a \$3 billion tax on those seeking to purchase homes. These new fees will simply be passed along to those purchasing homes. I'm not sure how a \$3 billion tax increase is going to make homes more affordable. When given the opportunity to ensure that these costs would not be passed along to homeowners, supporters of the AHF voted against the amendment that would have protected homeowners. Clearly, this is designed to be a hidden tax on homebuyers.

This newly created AHF would make grants to states and Indian tribes, which would then make grants to third-party housing-related entities. H.R. 1427 fails to provide adequate oversight of these third-party grantees and the funds could easily fall into the hands of politically motivated groups. Also, while using grant money for lobbying or other political activities is not permitted under the bill, there is nothing preventing groups from displacing their other funds for these activities while still receiving grant money. One such third party group that stands to benefit financially from this new grant program is ACORN. ACORN is notorious for partisan voter registration drives. Allegations of voter fraud have plagued ACORN political activities in Florida, Virginia, Ohio, Minnesota, New Mexico, Missouri, Michigan, Colorado, Arkansas, Wisconsin, and North Carolina. Yet, the Democrats' plan is to create a slush fund to funnel millions of dollars in grants to ACORN and similar partisan groups, freeing up money for partisan political activities.

Adding more layers of bureaucratic waste and pandering to left-leaning groups will not help low-income buyers purchase the homes of their dreams. While we need GSE reform, we should not be forced to sign onto a \$3 billion tax on homeowners. There are better, more financially responsible ways to address affordable housing.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. PASTOR, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1427) to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 404, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Neugebauer No. 4 amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other

amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

Page 60, line 2, after “posed” insert “to the enterprises”.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Georgia requesting a recorded revote on the bipartisan Bean-Neugebauer amendment which passed by voice vote last week?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman have a proper parliamentary inquiry?

Ms. BEAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make sure this was the bipartisan Bean-Neugebauer amendment.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 36, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—383

Abercrombie Brown-Waite, Davis (CA)
 Ackerman Ginny Davis (IL)
 Aderholt Buchanan Davis (KY)
 Akin Burgess Davis, David
 Alexander Burton (IN) Davis, Jo Ann
 Allen Butterfield Davis, Lincoln
 Altmire Buyer Davis, Tom
 Andrews Calvert DeFazio
 Arcuri Camp (MI) Delahunt
 Baca Campbell (CA) DeLauro
 Bachmann Cannon Dent
 Bachus Cantor Diaz-Balart, L.
 Baldwin Capito Diaz-Balart, M.
 Barrow Capps Dicks
 Bartlett (MD) Capuano Dingell
 Barton (TX) Cardoza Doggett
 Bean Carney Donnelly
 Becerra Carson Doolittle
 Berkley Carter Doyle
 Berman Castle Drake
 Berry Castor Dreier
 Biggert Chandler Duncan
 Bilirakis Clarke Edwards
 Bishop (GA) Clay Ehlers
 Bishop (NY) Cleaver Ellison
 Bishop (UT) Clyburn Ellsworth
 Blackburn Coble Emerson
 Blumenauer Cohen Engel
 Blunt Cole (OK) English (PA)
 Boehner Conaway Eshoo
 Bonner Conyers Etheridge
 Bono Cooper Everrett
 Boozman Costa Fallin
 Boren Costello Farr
 Boswell Courtney Fattah
 Boucher Cramer Feeney
 Boustany Crenshaw Ferguson
 Boyd (FL) Crowley Filner
 Boyda (KS) Cubin Forbes
 Brady (PA) Cuellar Fossella
 Brady (TX) Culberson Frelinghuysen
 Braley (IA) Cummings Gallegly
 Brown (SC) Davis (AL) Gerlach

Giffords Markey
 Gilchrest Marshall
 Gillibrand Matheson
 Gohmert Matsui
 Gonzalez McCarthy (CA)
 Goodlatte McCarthy (NY)
 Gordon McCaul (TX)
 Granger McCollum (MN)
 Graves McCotter
 Green, Al McDermott
 Green, Gene McGovern
 Grijalva McGuinty
 Gutierrez McIntyre
 Hall (NY) McKeon
 Hall (TX) McNerney
 Hare McNulty
 Harman Meehan
 Hastert Meek (FL)
 Hastings (FL) Meeks (NY)
 Hastings (WA) Melancon
 Hayes Mica
 Heller Michaud
 Herseth Sandlin Miller (FL)
 Higgins Miller (MI)
 Hill Miller (NC)
 Hinchey Miller, Gary
 Hinojosa Miller, George
 Hirono Mitchell
 Hobson Mollohan
 Hodes Moore (KS)
 Holden Moore (WI)
 Hoyt Moran (KS)
 Hooley Moran (VA)
 Hoyer Murphy (CT)
 Hulshof Murphy, Patrick
 Inglee Murphy, Tim
 Israel Murtha
 Issa Musgrave
 Jackson (IL) Myrick
 Jackson-Lee Nadler
 (TX) Napolitano
 Jefferson Neal (MA)
 Jindal Neugebauer
 Johnson (GA) Oberstar
 Johnson (IL) Obey
 Johnson, E. B. Oliver
 Johnson, Sam Ortiz
 Kagen Pallone
 Kanjorski Pascrell
 Kaptur Pastor
 Keller Pearce
 Kennedy Perlmutter
 Kildee Peterson (MN)
 Kilpatrick Peterson (PA)
 Kind Petri
 King (NY) Pickering
 Klein (FL) Pitts
 Kline (MN) Platts
 Knollenberg Poe
 Kuhl (NY) Pomeroy
 LaHood Porter
 Lampson Price (GA)
 Langevin Price (NC)
 Lantos Pryce (OH)
 Larsen (WA) Rahall
 Larson (CT) Ramstad
 Latham Rangel
 LaTourette Regula
 Lee Rehberg
 Levin Reichert
 Lewis (CA) Renzi
 Lewis (GA) Reyes
 Lewis (KY) Reynolds
 Linder Rodriguez
 Lipinski Rogers (AL)
 LoBiondo Rogers (KY)
 Loeb sack Rogers (MI)
 Lofgren, Zoe Ros-Lehtinen
 Lowey Roskam
 Lucas Ross
 Lynch Rothman
 Mack Roybal-Allard
 Mahoney (FL) Ruppberger
 Maloney (NY) Rush
 Manzullo Ryan (OH)
 Marchant Salazar

NOES—36

Baker Gillmor
 Barrett (SC) Gingrey
 Bilbray Goode
 Chabot Hensarling
 Deal (GA) Herger
 Flake Hoekstra
 Fortenberry Inglis (SC)
 Foxx Jones (NC)
 Frank (MA) Jordan
 Franks (AZ) King (IA)
 Garrett (NJ) Kingston

Pence Rohrabacher Ryan (WI)
 Radanovich Royce Shadegg
 Baird Honda McMorris
 Brown, Corrine Hunter Rodgers
 Carnahan Jones (OH) Putnam
 DeGette Kirk Shays
 Emanuel Walsh (NY)

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1421

Mr. GINGREY and Mr. KING of Iowa changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Messrs. CONYERS, ROTHMAN and BLUMENAUER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. CANTOR

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cantor moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1427 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions that the Committee report the same back to the House promptly with the following amendments:

Strike line 16 on page 127 and all that follows through line 10 on page 128 and insert the following: “shall be to offset the costs of providing assistance to individuals and families to increase home ownership for all Americans, especially extremely low- and very low-income families.”

Strike line 23 on page 129 and all that follows through line 7 on page 156, and insert the following:

“(c) USE OF FUND AMOUNTS.—The Federal receipts deposited into the affordable housing fund established under subsection (a) shall be available only to offset the cost, for budgetary purposes, of provisions of law enacted after the date of the enactment of the Federal Housing Finance Reform Act of 2007 that—

“(1) provide for the enhancement and continuation of affordable home ownership opportunities related to items such as—

“(A) the construction and rehabilitation of housing in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, or Alabama destroyed or damaged in connection with Hurricane Katrina or Rita of 2005;

“(B) reducing the cost of mortgage insurance for residential mortgages; or

“(C) reducing the cost of financing residences for veterans;

“(2) provide affordable home ownership opportunities through provisions such as provisions that expand existing law to reduce the cost of mortgage interest for borrowers under residential mortgages;

“(3) provide affordable home ownership opportunities through provisions such as provisions that expand existing law related to the construction and rehabilitation of housing in

Kucinich
 Lamborn
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 McCrery
 McHenry
 Nunes
 Paul
 Payne

Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, or Alabama destroyed or damaged in connection with Hurricane Katrina or Rita of 2005 to also include construction and rehabilitation of housing destroyed or damaged in connection with other domestic natural disasters, including tornadoes occurring in Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas and wildfires occurring in California, Florida, Georgia, New Jersey, and New Mexico in 2007; and

“(4) provide affordable home ownership opportunities through provisions such as provisions that expand existing law to reduce the cost of homeowners insurance.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, for many hard-working families, the American Dream and homeownership are one and the same, but lately that dream appears increasingly elusive in the face of ballooning costs of homeowners' insurance and rising interest rates on home mortgages. Nowhere is this disconcerting trend more profound than in States ravaged by natural disasters.

Today we have the ability to help. Congress can enhance the way the law treats mortgage interest, giving American families more buying power when shopping for their dream home. We can also improve how it treats mortgage insurance, assisting those low-income families generally required to pay this insurance to afford better housing.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, in its current form, however, has a glaring weakness. When it comes to disaster relief, it only names the victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, which would help families stricken by hurricanes in Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas. There are countless Americans beset by the recent tornadoes and wildfires in other parts of the country. Their plight is indistinguishable from those families of hurricane-plagued regions. A disaster befalls an area, home insurance rates skyrocket, and, together with the rise in mortgage interest rates, the American dream of owning a home is dashed.

This motion to recommit sets aside funds for families in districts in Kansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina and Texas.

Mr. Speaker, in the past, the majority has described motions to recommit promptly rather than forthwith as an attempt to kill the underlying bill. In this case, this is categorically incorrect. The minority has in effect been prevented by the Democrat rule from offering this language as a forthwith amendment.

As the majority knows, the housing fund in this bill, section 139 on page 127, is a violation of rule XXI, clause 4, because it is appropriating on an authorizing bill. The Democrat rule waives this rule for the underlying bill, but does not provide a waiver for the motion to recommit or any amendments. Therefore, the minority was given no other option than to offer a motion to recommit promptly and comply with House rules.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is a genuine effort to improve this bill with the language we can all agree on ought to be included. In its current form, the bill is far too vague.

Starting brand new government grant programs to help fund more bureaucracies is not the way to go. Instead, policies that have already worked to create record levels of homeownership is preferable. This recommit inserts new language to offset the cost of subsequent legislation that would enhance, continue and expand policies promoting homeownership, such as the construction and rehabilitation of housing destroyed by natural disasters and wildfires. The motion would provide for programs to enhance, continue, expand policies promoting home ownership by reducing the cost of mortgage insurance, reducing the cost of financing residences for veterans, reducing the cost of mortgage interest and reducing the costs of homeowner insurance.

Mr. Speaker, while the underlying bill does provide that Affordable Housing Fund money can be used to help victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, it is incumbent upon us to recognize the plight of families suffering from natural disasters recently affecting other areas of the country. Families in Kansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas and Louisiana deserve no less.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the minority for its persistence and tenacity, if nothing else. This will be the 11th time the House has been asked to vote to kill the Affordable Housing Fund since last Thursday. They have, as I have said, taken as their model apparently the TV pitchmen of yore. They have got a machine that slices and dices and cuts and shreds and chops and whatever. They have offered 10 amendments to kill the Affordable Housing Fund. This is number 11.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No, I will not yield, and I will explain why.

□ 1430

We had an open rule. Any amendment that they wanted to offer could have been offered as long as it met the deadline, which was a very long deadline. Now we have ambush legislation again. There have been 10 tries at this.

Mr. Speaker, if they really wanted this to be debated thoughtfully, it would have been an amendment. It wouldn't have been held back for 5 and 5 with us having only a chance to read it now. It is just one more attempt to kill the bill.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No, I will not yield, Mr. Speaker. I will not be part of self-ambush. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia, offer an amendment when you have the right to offer an amendment, and we will debate the amendment at length as we debated many of these amendments.

But to play this kind of ambush game, do not expect cooperation.

The gentleman may say, well, it is unfair. We got the last word. That was his choice. The gentleman could have offered the amendment in a fashion that would have allowed a broad debate on it. But they chose to have the benefit of the ambush, but not pay the price of it.

This kills the affordable housing fund. What it says is none of this money goes for rental housing.

By the way, they list a lot of the States. They say “including.” It can go to any State; so does the bill as it now stands. The bill as it now stands allows the money to be spent in any State. And the key is this: This amendment, if you take it at face value, I would advise that, but if you do, it kills rental housing.

Now, homeownership is a good thing, but as we have seen from the subprime problem, if you ignore people who should be renting, if you try to shoehorn everybody into homeownership and don't build a single unit of affordable rental housing, and that is what this amendment says, this amendment says none of the funds go to build rental housing, it is all homeownership. Homeownership is useful, but it is not the exclusive answer and we have a problem of people being pushed into it.

Then this says “promptly.” Promptly means maybe not, as we know in parliamentary language. We got some explanation why it couldn't be “forthwith.”

There are some people who don't like this bill. They don't have the votes to kill it. They have tried every which way to do that.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will you instruct the gentleman? When it becomes clear that I am not going to yield, this becomes, it seems to me, somewhat unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts controls the time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we debated a long time on Thursday. I had to have my cast rewrapped because I was waving my arm so much. I did become unwrapped, I will tell the House.

But the point is this: We had ample opportunity to debate this with give-and-take. But you cannot, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, expect to come in at the last minute with a very tough amendment that kills the housing fund

Kagen	Moore (WI)	Sessions
Kanjorski	Moran (KS)	Sestak
Kaptur	Moran (VA)	Shea-Porter
Kennedy	Murphy (CT)	Sherman
Kildee	Murphy, Patrick	Shimkus
Kilpatrick	Murphy, Tim	Shuler
Kind	Murtha	Shuster
King (NY)	Nadler	Simpson
Klein (FL)	Napolitano	Sires
Knollenberg	Neal (MA)	Skelton
Kucinich	Oberstar	Slaughter
Kuhl (NY)	Obey	Smith (NJ)
LaHood	Oliver	Smith (WA)
Lampson	Ortiz	Snyder
Langevin	Pallone	Solis
Lantos	Pascarell	Souder
Larsen (WA)	Pastor	Space
Larson (CT)	Payne	Spratt
Latham	Perlmutter	Stark
LaTourette	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Lee	Peterson (PA)	Sutton
Levin	Petri	Tanner
Lewis (GA)	Pickering	Tauscher
Lewis (KY)	Platts	Taylor
Linder	Pomeroy	Terry
Lipinski	Porter	Thompson (CA)
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Loeback	Pryce (OH)	Tiaht
Lofgren, Zoe	Rahall	Tierney
Lowey	Ramstad	Towns
Lynch	Rangel	Turner
Mahoney (FL)	Regula	Udall (CO)
Maloney (NY)	Rehberg	Udall (NM)
Marchant	Reichert	Upton
Markey	Renzi	Van Hollen
Marshall	Reyes	Velázquez
Matheson	Reynolds	Visclosky
Matsui	Rodriguez	Walden (OR)
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (AL)	Walz (MN)
McCollum (MN)	Rogers (KY)	Wasserman
McCotter	Rogers (MI)	Schultz
McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen	Watson
McDermott	Ross	Watt
McGovern	Rothman	Waxman
McHugh	Roybal-Allard	Weiner
McIntyre	Rush	Welch (VT)
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Weller
McNulty	Salazar	Wexler
Meehan	Sánchez, Linda	Whitfield
Meek (FL)	T.	Wicker
Meeke (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (NM)
Melancon	Sarbanes	Wilson (OH)
Michaud	Saxton	Wolf
Miller (MI)	Schakowsky	Wu
Miller (NC)	Schiff	Wynn
Miller, Gary	Schmidt	Yarmuth
Miller, George	Schwartz	Young (AK)
Mitchell	Scott (GA)	Young (FL)
Mollohan	Scott (VA)	
Moore (KS)	Serrano	

NOES—104

Aderholt	Fallin	McHenry
Akin	Feeney	McKeon
Bachmann	Flake	Mica
Bachus	Forbes	Miller (FL)
Barrett (SC)	Fox	Musgrave
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Myrick
Biggart	Gallely	Neugebauer
Billray	Garrett (NJ)	Nunes
Bilirakis	Gingrey	Paul
Blackburn	Gohmert	Pearce
Blunt	Goode	Pence
Boehner	Goodlatte	Pitts
Bonner	Granger	Poe
Brown (SC)	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Brown-Waite,	Hastert	Radanovich
Ginny	Hastings (WA)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hensarling	Roskam
Burgess	Herger	Royce
Campbell (CA)	Hoekstra	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Inglis (SC)	Sali
Carter	Issa	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Keller	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Stearns
Cubin	Kingston	Sullivan
Culberson	Kline (MN)	Tancredo
Davis, David	Lamborn	Thornberry
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (CA)	Tiberi
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Walberg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Weldon (FL)
Drake	Mack	Westmoreland
Dreier	Manzullo	Wilson (SC)
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	
Everett	McCaull (TX)	

NOT VOTING—15

Baird	Jones (OH)	Shays
Bishop (UT)	Kirk	Walsh (NY)
Brown, Corrine	McMorris	Waters
DeGette	Rodgers	Woolsey
Emanuel	Putnam	
Hunter	Ruppersberger	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1459

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 396, had I been present I would have voted "aye." I returned to the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security to present my bill on "Stop AIDS in Prison."

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 396, I missed the vote on passage. I was chairing a briefing in the Intelligence Committee with NSA. I missed the vote by 30 seconds. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS SERVING AS TRANSLATORS OR INTERPRETERS WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1104) to increase the number of Iraqi and Afghani translators and interpreters who may be admitted to the United States as special immigrants, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 1104

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

SECTION 1. SPECIAL IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS SERVING AS TRANSLATORS OR INTERPRETERS WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) INCREASE IN NUMBERS ADMITTED.—Section 1059 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking "as a translator" and inserting "or under Chief of Mission authority, as a translator or interpreter";

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting "the Chief of Mission or" after "recommendation from"; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by inserting "the Chief of Mission or" after "as determined by"; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking "section during any fiscal year shall not exceed 50." and inserting the following: "section—

"(A) during each of the fiscal years 2007 and 2008, shall not exceed 500; and

"(B) during any other fiscal year shall not exceed 50."

(b) ALIENS EXEMPT FROM EMPLOYMENT-BASED NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Section 1059(c)(2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by amending the paragraph designation and heading to read as follows:

"(2) ALIENS EXEMPT FROM EMPLOYMENT-BASED NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—"; and

(2) by inserting "and shall not be counted against the numerical limitations under sections 201(d), 202(a), and 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(d), 1152(a), and 1153(b)(4))" before the period at the end.

(c) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS; NATURALIZATION.—Section 1059 of such Act is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (2), (7) and (8) of section 245(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255(c)), the Secretary of Homeland Security may adjust the status of an alien to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 245(a) of such Act if the alien—

"(1) was paroled or admitted as a non-immigrant into the United States; and

"(2) is otherwise eligible for special immigrant status under this section and under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

"(e) NATURALIZATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An absence from the United States described in paragraph (2) shall not be considered to break any period for which continuous residence in the United States is required for naturalization under title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

"(2) ABSENCE DESCRIBED.—An absence described in this paragraph is an absence from the United States due to a person's employment by the Chief of Mission or United States Armed Forces, under contract with the Chief of Mission or United States Armed Forces, or by a firm or corporation under contract with the Chief of Mission or United States Armed Forces, if—

"(A) such employment involved working with the Chief of Mission or United States Armed Forces as a translator or interpreter; and

"(B) the person spent at least a portion of the time outside of the United States working directly with the Chief of Mission or United States Armed Forces as a translator or interpreter in Iraq or Afghanistan."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIRE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Translators and interpreters have been crucial to our efforts in Iraq, serving as a critical link between our troops and the Iraqi population. Because of their work for U.S. forces, many of these people have risked their lives and the lives of their families to assist our efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Now they are under serious threat. These translators and interpreters who

serve bravely alongside our troops need our immediate assistance. Singled out as collaborators, many are now targets by death squads, militias and al Qaeda.

In Mosul, insurgents recorded and circulated the brutal execution of two interpreters, a stark warning to others who have assisted U.S. forces in the country. U.S. soldiers and embassy employees who have attempted to help their interpreters flee from violence have had to stand by helplessly as their Iraqi colleagues went into hiding. Often leaving their families behind simply in order to survive.

Congressman JEFF FORTENBERRY came to me with the idea, and I agreed, and we introduced broad, far-reaching legislation on this issue. We are taking up the bill before us today because the Senate already passed this by unanimous consent, and the urgency of the situation requires us to act now.

This legislation will help quickly address this crisis by authorizing up to 500 special visas for Iraqis and Afghans who put their lives at risk by working with the U.S. military and the U.S. embassy in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We all realize this is not a partisan issue, and I am pleased to have worked with the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee on helping to get this bill before us today. The original special visa legislation included in the 2006 Defense Authorization Act has proved wholly inadequate, authorizing only 50 visas a year, creating a backlog estimated to take 9 years to clear at the current rate.

As of last week, nearly 500 Iraqis and Afghans have gone through the requisite background checks and have been approved for the visa. Because of the backlog, they are stuck in limbo waiting for a visa that may never come. These people need us to act. The Senate passed this legislation over a month ago, and the administration is supportive of taking this action.

Paula Dobriansky, Under Secretary of State for Democracy and Global Affairs recently said, "We are committed to honoring our moral debt to those Iraqis who have provided assistance to the U.S. military and embassy." Clearly, we owe these people a debt of gratitude. They have risked everything to help us out in Iraq and Afghanistan and the least we can do is help deliver them out of harm's way.

But I tell my colleagues, the magnitude of the broader refugee crisis in Iraq far exceeds anything this bill attempts to resolve. We need to address the wider refugee issue, which has forced over 4 million Iraqis from their homes.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) has legislation on this subject, and I think will be speaking to that broader issue. No one should take our efforts to do this now as a notion that that satisfies our obligation on something that we played a part in, creating the situation that led to this.

Let me just add, I see this as an emergency effort. It can't be the last

word on this matter. We must do something to deal with the larger refugee issue in Iraq, as I said, and it's very possible that the visas we are discussing in this bill will prove inadequate for this need. Still, I think we need to act now so that the visas are available.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 1104 expands an existing program that provides 50 special immigrant visas per year to Iraqi and Afghani nationals who have served as translators for our Armed Forces.

Translators and interpreters would be eligible to petition if they are an Iraqi or an Afghani national, have served with our military for at least 12 months, and receive a favorable recommendation from the unit in which he or she served. Many of us have heard stories about Iraqis who have faithfully served alongside our troops bridging the language divide. They have been a valuable resource for the United States and its allies.

Yet many Iraqi and Afghani translators have faced intense persecution from their communities as a result of serving the U.S. military. It is because of this persecution that the translator visa program was first established. This program allows us to reward those who worked directly for the United States Government in supporting our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

S. 1104, as amended in committee, increases the number of special immigrant visas available to translators to 500 per year for the next 2 years. The increase to 500 visas is a direct response to the number of petitions that have been received and approved by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Without this increase, many translators will continue to face persecution while they wait in their home country for a visa to become available.

This bill has already been approved unanimously in the Senate, and I urge its passage here today.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate your courtesy in permitting me time to speak on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1104 for all the reasons that have been articulated by my friend from California and my friend from Florida.

Iraq today is the scene of the fastest-growing humanitarian crisis in the world. It rivals only the problems that are being faced in Darfur.

As has been pointed out for one group in Iraq, our moral responsibility is unquestionable to Iraqis whose lives are at risk because they helped the United States. Having cooperated with the United States military, the United Nations, or even a nongovernmental organiza-

nization, can literally mean a death sentence at the hands of any of the many sides of this civil war. This bill is an important first step, expanding the current limit of the 50 special translator visas to 500.

I became acutely aware of the magnitude of this problem working with a local high school in Portland, Oregon, who were partnering with the members of the Oregon National Guard who had served in Iraq and recently returned, who were trying to bring their former translator to the United States, literally to save this young woman's life. But they kept running into bureaucratic hurdles. It took us months to, thankfully, secure her entry into the United States, where she is safely a college student today in Portland, Oregon.

I have heard the same story over and over again. We should keep faith with those who have served our brave men and women in uniform. This is a basic moral responsibility and a simple issue of fairness.

What we have before us in this bill is a critical first step. But as my friend from California pointed out, it's only the first step. We have 4 million Iraqis who have been driven from their homes and tens of thousands who are at risk because they helped the United States, not just as translators but as drivers and construction workers, NGO support staff.

We are, sadly, failing Iraqi refugees. We have allowed into the United States fewer than 800 since 2003, 69 since this fall, only 1 last month. The Swedish prime minister told me last week that Sweden is going to admit 25,000 Iraqi refugees this year.

I introduced, last week, bipartisan legislation H.R. 2265, the Responsibility to Iraqi Refugees Act to address this ongoing humanitarian crisis by using all of the tools at our disposal, admitting refugees, providing assistance to the region and using diplomacy to ensure their well-being.

It would allow not 50 or 500, but 15,000 Iraqis who are at risk because they helped the United States to come to this country, along with their families. It would establish a special coordinator for Iraqi refugees and internally displaced people, and requires the United States to develop, finally, plans to ensure the well-being and safety of these Iraqi refugees.

It increases the number of persecuted Iraqis who can be admitted as refugees. This legislation has been endorsed by Amnesty International, Church World Service, the International Rescue Committee, Refugees International, the Jubilee Campaign, the Truman National Security Project, and many others.

I strongly urge that we adopt this bill today. But I would implore the Members of this House, regardless of how they feel about the war in Iraq or its future, to join and cosponsor my legislation—broad, ambitious, a comprehensive response to the Iraqi refugee crisis—before it's too late, too

late for people whose only crime was working with Americans.

It is also clear that it is not just these Iraqis that we ought to be concerned about. If we cannot keep faith with refugees that the United States has a responsibility for, it sends a very unpleasant message about the reliability of working with us, and, sadly, it sows the seeds for additional instability in the region. With 1 million Iraqis in Jordan, it creates an untenable situation for the long-term stability of that country.

I strongly urge passage of this bill, but I do hope that each of my colleagues will look at the comprehensive legislation that I introduced and determine what they are going to do to stop the fastest-growing humanitarian crisis in the world today.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), who is the sponsor of the companion House version of this legislation and has been a leader in the House on this important issue.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Florida. First, I should also thank my distinguished colleague, Mr. BERMAN of California, for his leadership on this important issue, his support and his partnership. I appreciate your efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the plight of courageous Iraqi and Afghan translators and interpreters who are assisting our military and our government. Given the vigorous and necessary debate about America's involvement in Iraq, this important humanitarian issue should not be overlooked. It warrants immediate attention as we move toward the stabilization of Iraq.

Every day in Iraq, and Afghanistan, American forces receive critical help, the kind of help essential for progress. An acute sense of duty has led thousands of Iraqis and Afghans to aid American forces since late 2001.

□ 1515

Some of these brave men and women have worked alongside our troops providing invaluable assistance serving as translators and interpreters. Although they do not receive much attention, often by design, the translators and interpreters have been instrumental in supporting U.S. military operations. Mr. Speaker, they face mortal danger. They are considered traitors by the terrorist insurgents, and are targets often with bounties on their heads. Many find themselves without secure homes due to their dangerous work. They must conceal and vary their daily routines to preserve their safety. Most do not tell their immediate family about their work.

In 2006, the Defense Department authorization bill established a program that allows translators and interpreters who have worked for the U.S. military for at least 12 months to come to the U.S. on special visas. The pro-

gram, as we have heard, allows up to 50 visas for Iraqi and Afghan translators each year. But since mid-April of this year, 510 applications have been received, 440 have been approved, 16 denied, and 54 are pending. Under the current cap of 50 allowable applicants per year, it will take until approximately the year 2016 to admit those currently in the queue for entry into the U.S.

To correct this problem, I, in partnership again with my distinguished colleague Mr. BERMAN of California, recently introduced legislation that would increase the annual limit for these visas from 50 to 500. The Senate bill before us today does exactly that for the next 2 years.

I believe it is right and just to offer refuge to those who have risked their own lives to help our troops and our Nation. These translators and interpreters are performing crucial work to assist the United States Government in both Iraq and Afghanistan. They have been invaluable to our efforts in the Middle East. It is my hope that our Nation will provide them the protection and asylum they need in honor of their service to our country and in honor to the commitment that they have made.

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

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me in a gracious fashion, and I think there is another viewpoint that this Congress should be considering before we bring this to a vote on this suspension bill.

I start out with I believe there are two things wrong with this legislation that is before us here on the floor. The first one is current law limits the numbers to 50 interpreters who could be brought in legally, and we have a great big problem understanding the rule of law here in America.

Now, I haven't received satisfactory answers from the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services or the State Department on how it is that, with a statutory limit of 50, and it says no more than 50, how was it that USCIS processed nearly 500 applications on an annual basis; and how was it that the State Department was poised to grant, but prohibited by law from granting, these visas for the interpreters from Iraq?

Now, I join my colleagues in praising and celebrating the brave service to our coalition personnel by the interpreters that have done such a good job in saving probably dozens or hundreds of American lives over there. In fact, I have a personal friend who served as an interpreter, and he carries a scar on his wrist from one of Saddam's henchmen who attacked him for being lined up with our side of this argument. I understand from a very personal basis what kind of risk is there and how their lives are at risk, but I would point out that we have such a thing as the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, current law said 50. I offered an amendment, and that amendment would have limited the amount of applications that could be processed by USCIS to the statutory limit. It wasn't because I think 50 is the right number, and I don't take a position on whether I think 500 is the right number, but it was because I believe the rule of law is sacrosanct. And if we are going to allow USCIS process up to 500 applications, and then come here to this Congress and say, well, gee, we must have been wrong because we have 500 applicants, not 50; or, we have no choice because it is implicit that we have promised these people that we are going to grant them the visas, how did we make a promise that exceeded Federal law? And what do we do if there are 2,500 the next time the USCIS processes? How do we adhere to the rule of law if we react to people who stretch the limits? The people within USCIS, who I actually don't blame at this point, but we are here trying to keep our word. At the same time, we are ignoring the rule of law.

Those two things don't sit very well with me. That is the number one issue.

And the next issue is something I do think we need to think about, and that is the tactical side of this. This results in not 1,000 new interpreters, but 900, because 500 was the annual limit. So it is 900 over a 2-year period of time. So that is 900 fewer interpreters to save more lives of American and coalition forces. Tactically we need to consider that. We need to understand that someone needs to be there to rebuild Iraq, someone needs to be there to defend Iraq. If 25,000 go to Sweden, that is another 25,000 of some of the finest citizens that will not be there to put Iraq back together.

Our job isn't to bring everybody here to save their livelihood here in the United States. We need to export our way of life; we need to encourage the Iraqis to rebuild their country. This depletes the resources.

But that is only, Mr. Speaker, my secondary argument. My primary argument is the rule of law. The rule of law should be sacrosanct and shouldn't be violated. And if we are going to pass this legislation, we should have adopted my amendment that limited the applications that USCIS can process to the statutory limit. If we did that, then I would have some confidence that we are going to adhere to the rule of law. As it is, I do not believe we will do that, and I think this turns out to be not probably the last, but the first amnesty bill that might pass off the floor of the 110th Congress. And if we don't have any more respect for the rule of law than we are showing here, then we are reacting to our own bureaucrats that, I will submit, that it is going to be difficult for us to adhere to the rule of law when it is 12 million or 20 million as opposed to 400 or 500 or 900 people.

I think that makes my point, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman from

Florida for his consideration and the time to make my case.

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

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

My friend from Iowa makes interesting arguments, but to some extent undermines those arguments. He says rule of law is important, and, therefore, the committee should have accepted an amendment in the committee to make illegal what folks in our embassies and in our missions did, thereby undermining the argument that in any way there was any law violated.

There was no law against expending funds to process these visas. There were no promises made to Iraqi interpreters and translators they would be guaranteed a visa. But when our folks in the field see a situation developing where the people who have allowed them to do their job, at great risk for their life and limb, are in desperate need for them and their families to essentially be appreciated and rewarded for that life-threatening effort, and they tell their folks that they work for in the Defense Department and in the State Department and the folks in Congress who are dealing with these issues that we need to do something about them, and we respond, that doesn't constitute a promise that no one had authority to make, a violation of the rule or law.

And, by definition, I understand, and we have had many discussions on our immigration issues; in fact, the gentleman and I are both here now rather than at a hearing on the immigration issue. I understand the gentleman has a definition of amnesty which is wider than mine, but I never realized how much wider it was, that a bill that adds to the number of visas that can be given, after background checks and going through the regular process to ensure the security interests that we have before we issue a visa, that a bill that would increase the number of visas for these people who have put themselves in harm's way on behalf of the United States is an amnesty law. This takes that very expansive definition the gentleman has and I think expands it even further.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman, and I ask him for that privilege because I know he is a reasonable individual and very thoughtful on the immigration policy. But I am under the understanding that we are here changing the law almost after the fact to comply with the limitation that has been exceeded in its anticipation by the people who were promised that they would have an opportunity to get a visa if they served the United States in that capacity as interpreters.

Isn't that true?

Mr. BERMAN. Reclaiming my time. I certainly don't know that that is true, and I would be stunned if it were. I would be stunned if our dedicated em-

ployees in a very difficult foreign mission or in the military were out promising things they couldn't deliver. I don't think our folks operate like that. I think they were processing applications in case and in the event that we increased the number of visas because the demand was so urgent. The gentleman from Oregon talked about 4 million refugees. We are talking about an infinitesimal subset that worked for us in our campaign efforts in Iraq.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And I thank the gentleman. But for a point of clarity, we are here. We are amending current law because we essentially have a promise we can't keep without amending current law. And that fits within a definition of amnesty, to amend current law, because if we enforce current law, there will be some people that will be penalized by that. And I don't take so much issue on this as I do the law.

Mr. BERMAN. Let me reclaim my time just to respond to that. We have a law that gives 50 visas a year, but the next year it gives 50 more and then 50 more. Is the gentleman suggesting that we should not process any more than the first 50?

There are people who would be allowed the next year and the year after. Why wouldn't you give these visas to the people who were first in line? I know the gentleman loves the sanctity of the line. Give these to the people who are first in line. Why wouldn't we process applications of people who weren't going to get visas that year but the next year? Why 5 years later would you take somebody who hasn't been waiting in line for 5 years and approve their visas?

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman would yield, I would submit that Congress needs to set the number. And for USCIS to process the applications beyond the statutory number is a waste of resources. But if we believe that we should raise that number, then we should come back and grant that authority to do so.

I see us as reacting to promises that were made that went beyond the limitations of the statute. That is why we have to change the statute today. That could preserve the rule of law and still preserve the numbers that the gentleman is proposing.

Mr. BERMAN. Reclaiming my time. And at this point I think maybe we should end the debate. But no part of Mr. FORTENBERRY's or my motivations for introducing the bill, and I wouldn't speculate on the Senate's motivations, but no part of our motivation was to take the administration out of an embarrassing place where they have been making promises that couldn't be kept.

We thought that justice, fairness, American tradition, and the risks that these people have taken to help our Armed Forces and our diplomats in one of the most difficult, hazardous situations in the world gave them a claim that we should respond to, not a promise made by somebody that we are forced to keep. We wanted them to

have these visas. We weren't responding to pressure to take the administration and their people in Baghdad out of an embarrassing situation.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1104, a bill to increase the number of Iraqi and Afghan translators and interpreters who may be admitted to the United States as special immigrants. The bill improves upon an earlier effort made by Congress to address this matter. The intent that underwrites this bill is a noble one, and the improvements it makes to current law are needed. I am concerned, however, by the limited scope of the authorities provided by the bill before us and that is under consideration.

Section 1059 of P.L. 109-163 allows for 50 Iraqi and Afghan translators or interpreters who work in support of United States Armed Forces in those countries to petition the United States Government and be approved for entry into the United States under special immigrant status. The opportunity to immigrate to the United States has proved to be very popular among translators who work with the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. These individuals are generally the targets of incidences of violence or threats of violence from certain individuals or groups due to their close association with the United States Armed Forces. Reportedly, there is a six year waiting list for the 50 slots authorized by Section 1059 of P.L. 109-163. Unfortunately, Section 1059 of P.L. 109-163 did not provide similar opportunities for translators and interpreters who work with civilian departments and agencies in Iraq and Afghanistan who, like their colleagues who serve alongside the United States Armed Forces, are subject to incidences of violence or threats of violence from insurgents, militias, criminals, and terrorists operating in those countries. S. 1104, the legislation before us today, would expand existing law to authorize 500 special immigrant visas annually for the next two years, and expand eligibility for the visas to include both translators and interpreters working for the Chief of Mission or the United States Armed Forces in Iraq or Afghanistan.

This bill would make useful and important changes to current law. The House Committee on the Judiciary notes in House Report 110-158 that accompanies S. 1104, "that there are potentially dire consequences in delay" of this legislation and that "the Committee chose to consider the Senate-passed legislation in the interest of expediting its enactment." I commend my colleague from Michigan and the Chairman of the House of Representatives' Committee on the Judiciary (Mr. CONYERS), my colleague from Texas and the Committee's Ranking Member (Mr. SMITH), and the members of the Committee for their prompt work toward reporting this legislation for consideration by the full House. Simply put, their efforts on this bill in Committee, and our favorable consideration of this bill on the floor, will directly result in the saving of the lives of some incredibly brave individuals.

But the United States Government can and must do more. We have a moral obligation to do all that we can to protect all of those individuals and their family members who are targeted for death or are subject of acts of intimidation or violence as a result of their employment by, or close association with, United States and Coalition military and civilian personnel operating in Iraq and Afghanistan.

While this bill represents progress in this regard, it alone will not completely fulfill this moral obligation.

The Committee notes in House Report 110–158 that, “[i]n approving this bill for expedited consideration, the Committee acknowledges the issues that are left unaddressed.” The Committee, in its report accompanying this legislation, comments that, “[t]here appears to be little reason to limit this relief to those serving with our Missions in Iraq and Afghanistan as a translator or interpreter. Iraqis and Afghans are serving in many different functions in aid of our Missions there, and as their lives come under threat as a result, they would seem similarly deserving of our help in delivering them from harm’s way.” House Report 110–158, furthermore, notes that, “[t]here is also the question of whether these would-be refugees should be granted access to refugee assistance programs promptly once they arrive in the United States.” I fully understand and recognize that this is a complicated issue. But it is my hope that comprehensive Iraqi and Afghan refugee legislation can be considered and agreed to by this body in the near future.

I would hope that such comprehensive Iraqi and Afghan refugee legislation, at a minimum, would provide the authority for at-risk Iraqi and Afghan individuals and their family members—who serve in any capacity—alongside, in support of, or in close coordination with United States or Coalition military and civilian personnel—to be eligible to petition the United States Government and be approved for entry into the United States under special immigrant status. Specifically, I would hope that such comprehensive refugee legislation would, at a minimum, provide petition authority and approval eligibility for at-risk Iraqis and Afghans who are direct hires of United States Government or Coalition country departments, agencies, and military services; Iraqis and Afghans who work as contractors for, or in support of, United States Government or Coalition country departments, agencies, and military services; Iraqi and Afghan public sector employees or elected members of government who work alongside, or who are closely or commonly associated with, United States and Coalition country military and civilian personnel; and Iraqi and Afghan business owners and operators and laborers who have performed work on construction, service, or other contacts financed by United States Government or Coalition government funds.

Success achieved by United States and Coalition military and civilian personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan to date can be, in part, attributed to the efforts of the local nationals in those countries. Those Iraqis and Afghans, for the most part, believe in democratic, peaceful and prosperous futures for their countries and their families. That is why they choose to stand for election to public office, why they serve alongside United States and Coalition personnel, whether as translators, cultural advisors, or the myriad other roles that these brave individuals perform in support of our missions in those countries, and why they perform work on reconstruction projects financed by the United States Government and the governments of Coalition countries. By doing so, however, they and their family members are exposed to extreme risks.

Here in Washington, DC it is all too easy for us to distinguish between the roles and responsibilities of Iraqis or Afghans who are di-

rect hires of the United States Government and the governments of Coalition countries, Iraqis and Afghans who work on contract in support of United States and Coalition personnel, and Iraqis and Afghans who are employees of their governments. Each has a distinct role and relationship with the United States and Coalition governments and the missions pursued by their personnel. But these distinctions are not similarly considered by insurgents, militias, criminals, and terrorists who wish to do these individuals harm. That is, the enemy does not first review their employment situations and statuses of Iraqis and Afghans, draw distinctions, and then issue threats or conduct acts of intimidation or violence accordingly. The enemy kills, kidnaps, and intimidates “enablers” without discrimination. The Iraqis and Afghans who work alongside our personnel know this reality all too well. Comprehensive legislation to address this issue should, to the best of our ability, not draw distinctions or discriminate either.

S. 1104, as noted by the Committee in its report to accompany this bill, is not a comprehensive response to the problem before our country with respect to Iraqis and Afghans who are at-risk of violence and intimidation as a result of their association with United States and Coalition country departments, agencies, and military services’ operating in Iraq and Afghanistan. Nevertheless, I recognize the urgency of enacting the limited reforms to current law contained in the language of this bill; and, therefore, I support its passage. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill and to continue to work in support of comprehensive refugee legislation with respect to the service of Iraqi and Afghan nationals.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1104, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1615.

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

There was no objection.

ALIEN SMUGGLING AND TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2007

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 2399) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and title 18, United States Code, to combat the crime of alien smuggling and related activities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2399

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Alien smuggling by land, air and sea is a transnational crime that violates the integrity of United States borders, compromises our Nation’s sovereignty, places the country at risk of terrorist activity, and contravenes the rule of law.

(2) Aggressive enforcement activity against alien smuggling is needed to protect our borders and ensure the security of our Nation. The border security and anti-smuggling efforts of the men and women on the Nation’s front line of defense are to be commended. Special recognition is due the Department of Homeland Security through the United States Border Patrol, United States Coast Guard, Customs and Border Protection, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the Department of Justice through the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(3) The law enforcement community must be given the statutory tools necessary to address this security threat. Only through effective alien smuggling statutes can the Justice Department, through the United States Attorneys’ Offices and the Domestic Security Section of the Criminal Division, prosecute these cases successfully.

(4) Alien smuggling has a destabilizing effect on border communities. State and local law enforcement, medical personnel, social service providers, and the faith community play important roles in combating smuggling and responding to its effects.

(5) Existing penalties for alien smuggling are insufficient to provide appropriate punishment for alien smugglers.

(6) Existing alien smuggling laws often fail to reach the conduct of alien smugglers, transporters, recruiters, guides, and boat captains.

(7) Existing laws concerning failure to heave to are insufficient to appropriately punish boat operators and crew who engage in the reckless transportation of aliens on the high seas and seek to evade capture.

(8) Much of the conduct in alien smuggling rings occurs outside of the United States. Extraterritorial jurisdiction is needed to ensure that smuggling rings can be brought to justice for recruiting, sending, and facilitating the movement of those who seek to enter the United States without lawful authority.

(9) Alien smuggling can include unsafe or recklessly dangerous conditions that expose individuals to particularly high risk of injury or death.

SEC. 3. CHECKS AGAINST TERRORIST WATCHLIST.

The Department of Homeland Security shall, to the extent practicable, check against all available terrorist watchlists those alien smugglers and smuggled individuals who are interdicted at the land, air, and sea borders of the United States.

SEC. 4. STRENGTHENING PROSECUTION AND PUNISHMENT OF ALIEN SMUGGLERS.

Section 274(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a)) is amended—

(1) by amending the subsection heading to read as follows: "SMUGGLING OF UNLAWFUL AND TERRORIST ALIENS.—"

(2) by redesignating clause (iv) of paragraph (1)(B) as clause (vii);

(3) in paragraph (1), by striking "(1)(A)" and all that follows through clause (iii) of subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(1)(A) Whoever, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that an individual is an alien who lacks lawful authority to come to, enter, or reside in the United States, knowingly—

"(i) brings that individual to the United States in any manner whatsoever regardless of any future official action which may be taken with respect to such alien;

"(ii) recruits, encourages, or induces that individual to come to, enter, or reside in the United States;

"(iii) transports or moves that individual in the United States, in furtherance of their unlawful presence; or

"(iv) harbors, conceals, or shields from detection the individual in any place in the United States, including any building or any means of transportation;

or attempts or conspires to do so, shall be punished as provided in subparagraph (C).

"(B) Whoever, knowing that an individual is an alien, brings that individual to the United States in any manner whatsoever at a place other than a designated port of entry or place other than as designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, regardless of whether such alien has received prior official authorization to come to, enter, or reside in the United States and regardless of any future official action which may be taken with respect to such alien, or attempts or conspires to do so, shall be punished as provided in subparagraph (C).

"(C) A violator of this paragraph shall, for each alien in respect to whom such a violation occurs—

"(i) unless the offense is otherwise described in another clause of this subparagraph, be fined under title 18, United States Code or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both;

"(ii) if the offense involved the transit of the defendant's spouse, child, sibling, parent, grandparent, or niece or nephew, and the offense is not described in any of clauses (iii) through (vii), be fined under title 18, United States Code or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both;

"(iii) if the offense is a violation of paragraphs (1)(A)(ii), (iii), or (iv), or paragraph (1)(B), and was committed for the purpose of profit, commercial advantage, or private financial gain, be fined under title 18, United States Code or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

"(iv) if the offense is a violation of paragraph (1)(A)(i) and was committed for the purpose of profit, commercial advantage, or private financial gain, or if the offense was committed with the intent or reason to believe that the individual unlawfully brought into the United States will commit an offense against the United States or any State that is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year, be fined under title 18, United States Code, and imprisoned, in the case of a first or second violation, not less than 3 nor more than 10 years, and for any other violation, not less than 5 nor more than 15 years; and

"(v) if the offense results in serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365 of title 18, United States Code) or places in jeopardy the life of any person, be fined under title 18, United States Code or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both;

"(vi) if the offense involved an individual who the defendant knew was engaged in or

intended to engage in terrorist activity (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)), be fined under title 18, United States Code or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both; and"

(4) in the clause (vii) so redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection (which now becomes clause (vii) of the new subparagraph (C))—

(A) by striking "in the case" and all that follows through "(v) resulting" and inserting "if the offense results"; and

(B) by inserting "and if the offense involves kidnaping, an attempt to kidnap, the conduct required for aggravated sexual abuse (as defined in section 2241 without regard to where it takes place), or an attempt to commit such abuse, or an attempt to kill, be fined under such title or imprisoned for any term of years or life, or both" after "or both"; and

(5) by striking existing subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) (without affecting the new subparagraph (C) added by the amendments made by this Act) and all that follows through paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2)(A) There is extraterritorial jurisdiction over the offenses described in paragraph (1).

"(B) In a prosecution for a violation of, or an attempt or conspiracy to violate subsection (a)(1)(A)(i), (a)(1)(A)(ii), or (a)(1)(B), that occurs on the high seas, no defense based on necessity can be raised unless the defendant—

"(i) as soon as practicable, reported to the Coast Guard the circumstances of the necessity, and if a rescue is claimed, the name, description, registry number, and location of the vessel engaging in the rescue; and

"(ii) did not bring, attempt to bring, or in any manner intentionally facilitate the entry of any alien into the land territory of the United States without lawful authority, unless exigent circumstances existed that placed the life of that alien in danger, in which case the reporting requirement set forth in clause (i) of this subparagraph is satisfied by notifying the Coast Guard as soon as practicable after delivering the alien to emergency medical or law enforcement personnel ashore.

"(C) It is a defense to a violation of, or an attempt or conspiracy to violate, clause (iii) or (iv) of subsection (a)(1)(A) for a religious denomination having a bona fide nonprofit, religious organization in the United States, or the agents or officer of such denomination or organization, to encourage, invite, call, allow, or enable an alien who is present in the United States to perform the vocation of a minister or missionary for the denomination or organization in the United States as a volunteer who is not compensated as an employee, notwithstanding the provision of room, board, travel, medical assistance, and other basic living expenses, provided the minister or missionary has been a member of the denomination for at least one year.

"(D) For purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (1)—

"(i) the term 'United States' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States; and

"(ii) the term 'lawful authority' means permission, authorization, or waiver that is expressly provided for in the immigration laws of the United States or the regulations prescribed under those laws and does not include any such authority secured by fraud or otherwise obtained in violation of law or authority that has been sought but not approved."

SEC. 5. MARITIME LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) PENALTIES.—Subsection (b) of section 2237 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Whoever intentionally violates this section shall, unless the offense is described in paragraph (2), be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(2) If the offense—

"(A) is committed in the course of a violation of section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (alien smuggling); chapter 77 (peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons), section 111 (shipping), 111A (interference with vessels), 113 (stolen property), or 117 (transportation for illegal sexual activity) of this title; chapter 705 (maritime drug law enforcement) of title 46, or title II of the Act of June 15, 1917 (Chapter 30; 40 Stat. 220), the offender shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both;

"(B) results in serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365 of this title) or transportation under inhumane conditions, the offender shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both; or

"(C) results in death or involves kidnaping, an attempt to kidnap, the conduct required for aggravated sexual abuse (as defined in section 2241 without regard to where it takes place), or an attempt to commit such abuse, or an attempt to kill, be fined under such title or imprisoned for any term of years or life, or both."

(b) LIMITATION ON NECESSITY DEFENSE.—Section 2237(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(c)";

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) In a prosecution for a violation of this section, no defense based on necessity can be raised unless the defendant—

"(A) as soon as practicable upon reaching shore, delivered the person with respect to which the necessity arose to emergency medical or law enforcement personnel,

"(B) as soon as practicable, reported to the Coast Guard the circumstances of the necessity resulting giving rise to the defense; and

"(C) did not bring, attempt to bring, or in any manner intentionally facilitate the entry of any alien, as that term is defined in section 101(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 (a)(3)), into the land territory of the United States without lawful authority, unless exigent circumstances existed that placed the life of that alien in danger, in which case the reporting requirement of subparagraph (B) is satisfied by notifying the Coast Guard as soon as practicable after delivering that person to emergency medical or law enforcement personnel ashore."

(c) DEFINITION.—Section 2237(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) the term 'transportation under inhumane conditions' means the transportation of persons in an engine compartment, storage compartment, or other confined space, transportation at an excessive speed, transportation of a number of persons in excess of the rated capacity of the means of transportation, or intentionally grounding a vessel in which persons are being transported."

SEC. 6. AMENDMENT TO THE SENTENCING GUIDELINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and, if appropriate, amend the

sentencing guidelines and policy statements applicable to persons convicted of alien smuggling offenses and criminal failure to heave to or obstruction of boarding.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Sentencing Commission, shall—

(1) consider providing sentencing enhancements or stiffening existing enhancements for those convicted of offenses described in paragraph (1) of this subsection that—

(A) involve a pattern of continued and flagrant violations;

(B) are part of an ongoing commercial organization or enterprise;

(C) involve aliens who were transported in groups of 10 or more;

(D) involve the transportation or abandonment of aliens in a manner that endangered their lives; or

(E) involve the facilitation of terrorist activity; and

(2) consider cross-references to the guidelines for Criminal Sexual Abuse and Attempted Murder.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.—The Commission may promulgate the guidelines or amendments under this subsection in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987, as though the authority under that Act had not expired.

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIRE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation gives Federal prosecutors and agents stronger enforcement weapons against the most pernicious forms of human smuggling, terrorism-related smuggling and smuggling that results in kidnapping, rape or an attempt to kill.

This bill is based on a provision that has been added into H.R. 1684, the Homeland Security Department Reauthorization Act, in its committee markup. The supporters of that provision agreed to withdraw it from that bill so the Judiciary Committee, the committee of primary jurisdiction, could take a closer look.

The resulting bill amends both 8 U.S.C. 1324, the alien smuggling prohibition, and 18 U.S.C. 2237, the prohibition against failure to heave to, to provide for extraterritorial jurisdiction, increase maximum penalties for serious offenses and clarify the necessity defense that applies to legitimate maritime rescues.

This bill applies not just to human smuggling in the maritime context,

but to all cross-border human smuggling. It provides appropriately tough penalties for the kind of serious smuggling offenses I've just described, while distinguishing those from other types of transport such as noncommercial efforts to reunify families. While these practices also violate our immigration laws, they do not fall into the same category of offense, and should not be treated as harshly.

Although the bill streamlines and strengthens the current offense language, it does not abandon existing case law that applies to alien smuggling offenses. For instance, it will remain a violation of Federal law both to bring illegal aliens to the United States and to bring other aliens across the border through places other than those designated as official entry ports. This is especially critical as Congress mandates that the Department of Homeland Security institute biometric entry and exit systems. For an orderly and fair immigration system to work, people must come in through these sites.

The bill also prevents the current list of illegal activities, smuggling, recruiting, transporting and harboring, without adding new activities, such as assisting aliens in their efforts to enter our country. Again, this preserves the distinction between true smuggling and the work of groups such as faith-based organizations, who seek to serve the alien community on humanitarian grounds.

Because this important distinction is preserved, the Judiciary Committee believes the religious activities exception in current law is sufficient, and the bill doesn't expand it. The bill also preserves current law in treating the offense of helping to bring in one's close family members as a misdemeanor.

The bill also establishes for the first time in Federal law that it is illegal to transport persons under inhumane conditions, such as in an engine compartment, a storage compartment or other confined space; or overloaded or intentionally run ashore and grounded at high speed and left to scatter. Those kinds of inhumane practices have resulted in death or serious injury to numerous alien passengers.

Finally, the bill directs the Sentencing Commission to consider providing further sentencing enhancements for particularly egregious offenses. Such enhancements should reach the smuggling of aliens in a life-threatening manner, the abandonment of aliens in the desert or discharging them onto spits of land that will be submerged in a high tide, or those cases that involve the facilitation of terrorism.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss H.R. 2399, Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007.

Let me address a few basic issues about this legislation. First of all, what is alien smuggling? What is the existing law? What are the changes that we're proposing? And what, if any, are the problems that we need to fix with regard to this issue of alien smuggling?

Well, let's begin with what is alien smuggling. Alien smuggling is the process whereby people often known as "coyotes" take someone from a country like Mexico and sneak them in, often under the cover of darkness, into the United States for an average fee currently of approximately \$1,500 per person. It requires specialized skills; and folks often feel that they can't come over, say, from Mexico to California and bypass all the border security agents without having a coyote or alien smuggler to help them. So they often have their family members pay the \$1,500 fee.

I wanted to know more about this, so I personally went to the San Diego-Mexico border and spent a week traveling around at 2, 3 in the morning with Border Patrol agents as they arrested illegals and alien smugglers as they came across the border. And I learned from the Border Patrol agents that their biggest frustration is that they have arrested the same alien smugglers more than 20 times. In fact, the agents I met with were so demoralized they had what's called a wall of shame.

And it's hard to see from where you sit, Mr. Speaker, but this is a wall showing over 200 photographs of alien smugglers who they have repeatedly arrested, some of them more than 20 times, such as Antonio Amparo Lopez. And it is currently the law that if you smuggle someone into the United States for financial gain you will be sent to Federal prison for a minimum of 3 years. And yet, agent after agent told me they arrest the same people and they weren't prosecuted by the local San Diego prosecutor.

Well, the existing law, 3 years mandatory minimum if you smuggle someone into the United States. What does this bill do? It keeps the existing law at 3 years for smuggling someone in for financial gain, but adds some newer, stiffer penalties for certain people that you bring in. For example, if a smuggler brings someone in who is a known terrorist, then instead of being a mandatory 3 years in prison, you could be subjected to up to 30 years in prison.

And here is the challenge that I want to talk a little bit about this issue and why it's so important: When Attorney General Gonzales came before the Judiciary Committee on April 6, 2006, I relayed to him the story that I just relayed to you, Mr. Speaker, about the problems with these alien smugglers not being prosecuted. I happen to have a transcript, and I said on April 6 to the Attorney General, "The pathetic

failure of your U.S. attorney in San Diego to prosecute alien smugglers who have been arrested 20 times is a demoralizing slap in the face to Border Patrol agents who risk their lives every day. It also undermines the credibility that you and President Bush have when you talk tough about enforcing laws. And it renders meaningless the laws this Congress passes to crack down on alien smugglers."

Then I asked him, "What, if anything, will you do to see that the U.S. attorney in San Diego prosecutes these alien smugglers, at least those that have been repeatedly arrested by Border Patrol agents?"

This is what the Attorney General said: "I'm aware of what you're talking about with respect to the San Diego situation and we are looking into it. We're asking all U.S. attorneys, particularly those on the southern border to do more, quite frankly. We need to be doing more."

"But the U.S. attorneys along the southern border tell me that the existing law regarding alien smugglers could be tighter. There is a discussion and debate now about what the language should be. No one wants to prosecute those who are engaged in Good Samaritan activities. We are looking into the situation in San Diego, and we are directing that our U.S. attorneys do more because you're right; if people are coming across the border repeatedly, particularly those who are coyotes and they're smugglers or they're criminals or felons, they ought to be prosecuted."

Now, I bring this up because there happen to be a few of us in Congress, and I happen to be one, who are pretty familiar with this issue of alien smuggling, familiar enough, having been there and talked with the Attorney General, talked with the Border Patrol agents. But we didn't have any input to this legislation.

I have the bill before us that we are debating. This is the last version, the one we're debating on. And the date on it is May 22, at 1:35 p.m. It is now 3:40 p.m. It's as thick as a small town phone book, and yet we've only had it for a couple of hours. There have been no hearings. No subcommittee markup. No full committee markup.

Now, I'm not someone who usually gets up and complains about process, but this is an example where someone like me and others of the committee could have been quite helpful if we had had hearings, could have had a markup. There are a couple of major flaws in this bill that I'll talk about. And I say this in good spirit. I'm going to actually vote for this bill because I think your intentions are correct. But let me just give you two examples.

First, if you help smuggle in a terrorist, you can go to jail for up to 30 years. Under the language of this bill, you have to show that the smuggler knew that the person was a terrorist and knew that he intended to engage in terrorist activities.

Now, you don't have to be Johnny Cochran to successfully defend a defendant in that particular case. The standard is just almost impossible for a prosecutor to prove. For example, let's say that you have Mohammad Atta on the stand, and he's just been detained by a Border Patrol agent and we want to apply this new provision.

If I was the defense attorney, my first question to the Border Patrol agent would be, Mr. Border Patrol Agent, you've arrested my client. You want to send him to prison for 30 years. Did Mr. Atta show you his al Qaeda ID card? No? Did Mr. Atta show you the picture that he has with Bin Laden and his family? No? Did he show you some videotape showing him on the monkey bars in the Afghanistan training camps? No? Well, if not, how do you know with mathematical certainty that this guy is a terrorist?

It's almost impossible to prove.

That's an example of something we could have fixed during the markup, saying, if you brought this person into the country for financial gain and he's a member of the terrorist watch list, we're going to give you an enhanced sentence up to 30 years. But we didn't have that chance because there was no markup.

Another thing that's flawed is, it doesn't fix the Good Samaritan exception. There's language in this bill that talks about Good Samaritans. Specifically, it says it is a defense, if you are arrested for a religious organization or one of its members to provide room, board, travel, medical assistance or other basic living expenses. That's the situation of a nun, for example, helping someone who's going to die out there in the 110-degree heat. We all believe that that should be provided.

But I read you the transcript of the Attorney General; he said, because this Good Samaritan exception needs to be tightened, and it does. For example, under this law, because you didn't talk with us about fixing it, if you are a member of the Red Cross or you're a member of the United Way, which is not religious affiliated, you could still be prosecuted.

Now, none of us wants that to happen.

My point is, as this bill moves forward, I'm willing to support it because I support the intent behind it. I support getting tough with alien smugglers. But the bottom line is, we need to fix this in conference. We need to work with Republicans and Democrats to include our input to make sure that at the end of the day we have a much better bill that we can be proud of.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, the sponsor of the legislation, Mr. HILL.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman CONYERS and Chair-

man THOMPSON and Chairman OBERSTAR for working with me to draft this legislation. The staff has been extremely helpful, and I'm very pleased with the outcome of this bill.

The Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act would provide all levels of law enforcement with the tools they need to detain those who knowingly bring illegal aliens into our country.

Additionally, it would provide prosecutors and judges with clear proof and sentencing guidelines. The bill also significantly enhances penalties for illegal alien smuggling. The crime is raised from a misdemeanor to a felony under this bill.

It is estimated that there are currently more than 20 million illegal immigrants in this country. The cost of illegal immigration to our health care system, public education system, prison system and social services continues to rise without any sign of stopping or slowing.

We must reform our immigration system to make it more efficient and effective. This bill is the first step towards doing so.

□ 1545

It concentrates on easing the job of law enforcement, and it is my hope that this bill will act as a deterrent for illegal-alien smugglers.

In addition to this bill, Congress must enact tough, comprehensive immigration reform that does not award illegal aliens with amnesty. We need to make sure that employers who hire illegal aliens are punished, and we need to strengthen our border security.

At the same time, however, we must remember that legal immigration has served America well. America was built by hardworking people from all over the world. Many of them played by the rules and prospered while helping to build a stronger America, and our national immigration policies must reflect this reality. As long as immigrants enter our country legally, abide by our laws, and work hard to strengthen our communities, I believe they have a right to live in this Nation.

But the personal safety and well-being of all citizens, as well as the security of U.S. jobs, are my chief concern. Therefore, I strongly urge passage of H.R. 2399, the Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I appreciate the yielding of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007.

During consideration of the Homeland Security authorization bill earlier this month, I made a commitment to my colleagues that the House would

have the opportunity to vote on maritime smuggling legislation. I am pleased to have been able to work with the Judiciary and Transportation Committees to craft this critical homeland security legislation. It addresses not only alien smuggling at sea, but also alien smuggling by land and air.

Specifically, the Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act includes tough new penalties for those who recruit, encourage, transport, or shield from detection aliens who cross our land, maritime, or air borders illegally. These enhanced penalties are essential to discouraging criminals from building tunnels in remote parts of the desert to smuggle aliens across our borders.

We know that the same people that smuggle drugs into our country are ready and willing to smuggle individuals who would do us harm. In fact, in January we learned of a plot to smuggle about 20 would-be terrorists into the United States from Mexico for \$8,000 a head. The drug dealers called them "Osama's guys."

The bill requires that interdicted smugglers and aliens be run against all available terrorist watch lists. This is an important step in protecting America from terrorists.

I would especially like to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) for authoring this commonsense enforcement legislation. He is to be commended for his commitment to border security.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for working together on this important legislation and urge all Members to give it their support.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY).

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my friend Mr. HILL's bill to get tough on criminals who undermine our Nation's safety.

Mr. Speaker, the Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act is a commonsense bill whose time is overdue. This legislation clarifies current law and would more severely punish those criminals who smuggle illegal aliens into our country, lengthening the amount of time they would have to be imprisoned and providing strong new sentences for those who assist terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. HILL's bill recognizes that there must be real penalties for people who break our laws. When it comes to our immigration policies, we first need to prove to Americans that we can secure our borders against intruders and provide strong enforcement of existing laws. We need to get law enforcement and Federal agents all the tools they need to do their jobs effectively.

We should provide the resources and technology our businesses need to better verify the citizenship of potential

employees and crack down on employers who knowingly flout workplace laws. We must not provide amnesty for those who have broken our laws. And, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the recent proposal on comprehensive immigration reform in the Senate does not appear to have passed these tests.

I strongly urge my colleagues today to vote for H.R. 2399.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I only want to make two points. The gentleman from Florida gave a discussion about the legislation and put it into the context of the Southern District of San Diego, and I just did want to note for the record that the Department of Justice that decided to recommend the U.S. attorney's termination had commended her specifically for her handling of immigration cases.

And the second point I guess I wanted to make on this issue was would it be that the people in charge had ensured that the offices most impacted by illegal immigration and by illegal alien smuggling and those districts on the border of this country had been given the resources to the Justice Department disbursed to the U.S. Attorney's Office so they weren't held under hiring freezes and constrained to try to deal with an enormous issue with a very limited number of prosecutors.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2399, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- S. 214, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 2264, by the yeas and nays;
- S. 1104, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 2399, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 1722, by the yeas and nays.

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

electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PRESERVING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 214, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 214.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 306, nays 114, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

YEAS—306

Abercrombie	Dicks	Jindal
Ackerman	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Allen	Doggett	Johnson (IL)
Altmire	Donnelly	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Doyle	Jones (NC)
Arcuri	Dreier	Kagen
Baca	Edwards	Kanjorski
Baldwin	Ehlers	Kaptur
Barrow	Ellison	Keller
Bean	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Becerra	Emanuel	Kildee
Berman	Emerson	Kilpatrick
Berry	Engel	Kind
Biggart	English (PA)	Klein (FL)
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Knollenberg
Bishop (GA)	Etheridge	Kucinich
Bishop (NY)	Fallin	Kuhl (NY)
Blumenauer	Farr	LaHood
Boren	Fattah	Lampson
Boswell	Ferguson	Langevin
Boucher	Filner	Lantos
Boustany	Flake	Larsen (WA)
Boyd (FL)	Fortenberry	Larson (CT)
Boyd (KS)	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Brady (PA)	Garrett (NJ)	Lee
Braley (IA)	Gerlach	Levin
Brown-Waite,	Giffords	Lewis (GA)
Ginny	Gilchrest	Lipinski
Buchanan	Gillibrand	LoBiondo
Butterfield	Gillmor	Loebsack
Camp (MI)	Gonzalez	Lofgren, Zoe
Capito	Goode	Lowey
Capps	Goodlatte	Lucas
Capuano	Gordon	Lynch
Cardoza	Green, Al	Mack
Carnahan	Green, Gene	Mahoney (FL)
Carney	Grijalva	Maloney (NY)
Carson	Gutierrez	Manzullo
Castle	Hall (NY)	Markey
Castor	Hare	Marshall
Chandler	Harman	Matheson
Clarke	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Clay	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (NY)
Cleaver	Hayes	McCaul (TX)
Clyburn	Heller	McCollum (MN)
Cohen	Hensarling	McCotter
Cole (OK)	Herseth Sandlin	McCreery
Conyers	Higgins	McDermott
Cooper	Hill	McGovern
Costa	Hinches	McHenry
Costello	Hinojosa	McHugh
Courtney	Hirono	McIntyre
Cramer	Hobson	McNerney
Crowley	Hodes	McNulty
Cuellar	Holden	Meehan
Cummings	Holt	Meek (FL)
Davis (AL)	Honda	Meeks (NY)
Davis (CA)	Hoolley	Melancon
Davis (IL)	Hoyer	Michaud
Davis, Jo Ann	Hulshof	Miller (MI)
Davis, Lincoln	Inglis (SC)	Miller (NC)
DeFazio	Inslee	Miller, George
Delahunt	Israel	Mitchell
DeLauro	Jackson (IL)	Mollohan
Dent	Jackson-Lee	Moore (KS)
Diaz-Balart, L.	(TX)	Moore (WI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Jefferson	Moran (KS)

Moran (VA) Rothman
 Murphy (CT) Roybal-Allard
 Murphy, Patrick Ruppertsberger
 Murphy, Tim Rush
 Murtha Ryan (OH)
 Musgrave Salazar
 Nadler Sánchez, Linda
 Napolitano T.
 Neal (MA) Sanchez, Loretta
 Oberstar Sarbanes
 Obey Saxton
 Olver Schakowsky
 Ortiz Schiff
 Pallone Schwartz
 Pascrell Scott (GA)
 Pastor Scott (VA)
 Paul Serrano
 Payne Sestak
 Pence Shadegg
 Perlmutter Shea-Porter
 Peterson (MN) Sherman
 Platts Shimkus
 Pomeroy Shuler
 Porter Sires
 Price (NC) Skelton
 Pryce (OH) Slaughter
 Rahall Smith (NJ)
 Ramstad Smith (TX)
 Rangel Smith (WA)
 Regula Snyder
 Reichert Solis
 Renzi Souder
 Reyes Space
 Rodriguez Spratt
 Rogers (MI) Stark
 Ros-Lehtinen Stearns
 Ross Stupak

NAYS—114

Aderholt Duncan
 Akin Everett
 Alexander Feeny
 Bachmann Forbes
 Bachus Fossella
 Baker Foxx
 Barrett (SC) Franks (AZ)
 Bartlett (MD) Frelinghuysen
 Barton (TX) Gallegly
 Bilbray Gingrey
 Bishop (UT) Gohmert
 Blackburn Granger
 Blunt Graves
 Boehner Hall (TX)
 Bonner Hastert
 Bono Hergert
 Boozman Hoekstra
 Brady (TX) Issa
 Brown (SC) Johnson, Sam
 Burgess Jordan
 Burton (IN) King (IA)
 Buyer King (NY)
 Calvert Kingston
 Campbell (CA) Kline (MN)
 Cannon Lamborn
 Cantor Latham
 Carter Lewis (CA)
 Chabot Lewis (KY)
 Coble Linder
 Conaway Lungren, Daniel
 Crenshaw E.
 Cubin Marchant
 Culberson McCarthy (CA)
 Davis (KY) McKeon
 Davis, David Mica
 Davis, Tom Miller (FL)
 Deal (GA) Miller, Gary
 Doolittle Myrick
 Drake Neugebauer

NOT VOTING—12

Baird Jones (OH)
 Berkley Kirk
 Brown, Corrine McMorris
 DeGette Rodgers
 Hunter Putnam

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

□ 1623

Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. BONO and Mrs. MYRICK and Messrs. BURGESS, NEUGEBAUER, BARRETT of South Carolina, REHBERG, CALVERT, ALEXANDER, ROGERS of Kentucky,

LATHAM, BACHUS, ISSA, LEWIS of Kentucky, FOSSELLA, PITTS, BARTON of Texas, CRENSHAW, BROWN of South Carolina, EVERETT, BONNER, PICKERING, ROGERS of Alabama, BOOZMAN, PEARCE, TURNER, ADERHOLT, WAMP, WHITFIELD and FRELINGHUYSEN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WALBERG and Mr. STEARNS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NO OIL PRODUCING AND EXPORTING CARTELS 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. 2264, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk reads the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2264, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 72, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—345

Abercrombie Cardoza Emanuel
 Ackerman Carnahan Emerson
 Aderholt Engel
 Akin Carson English (PA)
 Alexander Carter Eshoo
 Allen Castle Etheridge
 Altmire Castor Everett
 Andrews Chabot Farr
 Arcuri Chandler Fattah
 Baca Clarke Ferguson
 Bachmann Clay Filner
 Bachus Cleaver Forbes
 Baker Clyburn Fortenberry
 Baldwin Cohen Fossella
 Barrett (SC) Conyers Frank (MA)
 Barrow Cooper Gerlach
 Bean Costello Giffords
 Becerra Courtney Gilchrest
 Berman Cramer Gillibrand
 Berry Crenshaw Gillmor
 Biggert Crowley Gohmert
 Bilirakis Culberson Gonzalez
 Bishop (GA) Cummings Goode
 Bishop (NY) Davis (AL)
 Blackburn Davis (CA)
 Blumenauer Davis (IL)
 Bonner Davis (KY)
 Bono Davis, David
 Boozman Davis, Jo Ann
 Boswell Davis, Lincoln
 Boucher Davis, Tom
 Boyd (FL) DeFazio
 Boyda (KS) Delahunt
 Brady (PA) DeLauro
 Braley (IA) Dent
 Brown (SC) Diaz-Balart, L.
 Brown-Waite, Diaz-Balart, M.
 Ginny Dicks
 Buchanan Dingell
 Burgess Doggett
 Butterfield Donnelly
 Buyer Doyle
 Camp (MI) Drake
 Campbell (CA) Duncan
 Cantor Edwards
 Capito Ehlers
 Capps Ellison
 Capuano Ellsworth

Hooley Mica
 Hoyer Michaud
 Inglis (SC) Miller (FL)
 Inslee Miller (MI)
 Israel Miller (NC)
 Jackson (IL) Miller, George
 Jackson-Lee Mitchell
 (TX) Mollohan
 Jefferson Moore (KS)
 Jindal Moore (WI)
 Johnson (IL) Moran (KS)
 Johnson, E. B. Moran (VA)
 Johnson, Sam Murphy (CT)
 Jones (NC) Jones (NC) Murphy, Patrick
 Jordan Murphy, Tim
 Kagen Kagen
 Kanjorski Kanjorski
 Kaptur Kaptur
 Keller Keller
 Kennedy Kennedy
 Kildee Kildee
 Kilpatrick Kilpatrick
 Kind Kind
 King (NY) King (NY)
 Klein (FL) Klein (FL)
 Knollenberg Knollenberg
 Kucinich Kucinich
 Kuhl (NY) Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood LaHood
 Lampson Lampson
 Langevin Langevin
 Lantos Lantos
 Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
 Latham Latham
 LaTourette LaTourette
 Lee Lee
 Levin Levin
 Lewis (CA) Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA) Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY) Lewis (KY)
 Lipinski Lipinski
 LoBiondo LoBiondo
 Loeb sack Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey Lowey
 Lynch Lynch
 Mahoney (FL) Mahoney (FL)
 Maloney (NY) Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo Manzullo
 Markey Markey
 Marshall Marshall
 Matsui Matsui
 McCarthy (NY) McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul (TX) McCaul (TX)
 McCollum (MN) McCollum (MN)
 McCotter McCotter
 McCrery McCrery
 McDermott McDermott
 McGovern McGovern
 McHenry McHenry
 McHugh McHugh
 McIntyre McIntyre
 McNerney McNerney
 McNulty McNulty
 Meehan Meehan
 Meek (FL) Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY) Meeks (NY)
 Melancon Melancon

NAYS—72

Bartlett (MD) Franks (AZ)
 Barton (TX) Frelinghuysen
 Bilbray Gallegly
 Bishop (UT) Garrett (NJ)
 Blunt Gingrey
 Boehner Granger
 Boren Hastert
 Boustany Hastings (WA)
 Brady (TX) Hensarling
 Burton (IN) Hoekstra
 Calvert Hulshof
 Cannon Issa
 Coble King (IA)
 Cole (OK) Kingston
 Conaway Kline (MN)
 Costa Lamborn
 Cubin Linder
 Cuellar Lucas
 Deal (GA) Lungren, Daniel
 Doolittle E.
 Dreier Mack
 Fallin Marchant
 Feeney Matheson
 Flake McCarthy (CA)
 Foxx McKeon

Schmidt
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Solis
 Souder
 Space
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Tierney
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Vislosky
 Walden (OR)
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch (VT)
 Wexler
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (OH)
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Yarmuth
 Saxton
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Baird	Johnson (GA)	Putnam
Berkley	Jones (OH)	Shays
Brown, Corrine	Kirk	Tiberi
DeGette	McMorris	Walsh (NY)
Hobson	Rodgers	
Hunter	Pryce (OH)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1630

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.

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS SERVING AS TRANSLATORS OR INTERPRETERS WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNYDER). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1104, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1104, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 8, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Boyd (FL)	Cooper
Aderman	Boyda (KS)	Costa
Aderholt	Brady (PA)	Costello
Akin	Brady (TX)	Courtney
Alexander	Bralely (IA)	Cramer
Allen	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Altmire	Brown-Waite,	Crowley
Andrews	Ginny	Cubin
Arcuri	Buchanan	Cuellar
Baca	Burgess	Culberson
Bachmann	Burton (IN)	Cummings
Bachus	Butterfield	Davis (AL)
Baker	Buyer	Davis (CA)
Baldwin	Calvert	Davis (IL)
Barrett (SC)	Camp (MI)	Davis (KY)
Barrow	Campbell (CA)	Davis, David
Bartlett (MD)	Cannon	Davis, Jo Ann
Barton (TX)	Cantor	Davis, Lincoln
Bean	Capito	Davis, Tom
Becerra	Capps	DeFazio
Berman	Capuano	Delahunt
Berry	Cardoza	DeLauro
Biggert	Carmahan	Dent
Bilbray	Carney	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bilirakis	Carson	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bishop (GA)	Carter	Dicks
Bishop (NY)	Castle	Dingell
Bishop (UT)	Castor	Doggett
Blackburn	Chabot	Donnelly
Blumenauer	Chandler	Doolittle
Blunt	Clarke	Doyle
Boehner	Clay	Drake
Bonner	Cleaver	Dreier
Bono	Clyburn	Duncan
Boozman	Coble	Edwards
Boren	Cohen	Ehlers
Boswell	Cole (OK)	Ellison
Boucher	Conaway	Ellsworth
Boustany	Conyers	Emanuel

Emerson	Latham	Reyes
Engel	LaTourette	Reynolds
English (PA)	Lee	Rodriguez
Eshoo	Levin	Rogers (AL)
Etheridge	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Everett	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (MI)
Fallin	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Farr	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
Fattah	Lipinski	Roskam
Feeney	LoBiondo	Ross
Ferguson	Loebsack	Rothman
Filner	Lofgren, Zoe	Roybal-Allard
Flake	Lowey	Royce
Forbes	Lucas	Ruppersberger
Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel	Rush
Fossella	E.	Ryan (OH)
Fox	Lynch	Ryan (WI)
Frank (MA)	Mack	Salazar
Franks (AZ)	Mahoney (FL)	Sali
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Galleghy	Manzullo	T.
Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Gerlach	Markey	Sarbanes
Giffords	Marshall	Saxton
Gilchrest	Matheson	Schakowsky
Gillibrand	Matsui	Schiff
Gillmor	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt
Gohmert	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Gonzalez	McCaul (TX)	Scott (GA)
Goodlatte	McCollum (MN)	Scott (VA)
Gordon	McCotter	Scott (VA)
Granger	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Graves	McDermott	Serrano
Green, Al	McGovern	Sessions
Green, Gene	McHenry	Sestak
Grijalva	McHugh	Shadegg
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Shea-Porter
Hall (NY)	McKeon	Sherman
Hall (TX)	McNerney	Shimkus
Hare	McNulty	Shuler
Harman	Meehan	Shuster
Hastert	Meek (FL)	Simpson
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Sires
Hastings (WA)	Melancon	Skelton
Hayes	Mica	Slaughter
Heller	Michaud	Smith (NE)
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Herger	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Herse	Miller (NC)	Smith (WA)
Herseth Sandlin	Miller, Gary	Snyder
Higgins	Miller, George	Solis
Hill	Mitchell	Souder
Hinche	Mollohan	Space
Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Spratt
Hirono	Moore (WI)	Stark
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Hodes	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Hoekstra	Murphy (CT)	Sutton
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Tanner
Holt	Murphy, Tim	Tauscher
Honda	Murtha	Taylor
Hooley	Musgrave	Terry
Hoyer	Myrick	Thompson (CA)
Hulshof	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Inglis (SC)	Napolitano	Thornberry
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Tiahrt
Allen	Issa	Tiberi
Altmire	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Andrews	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Arcuri	(TX)	Obey
Baca	Jefferson	Oliver
Bachmann	Jindal	Ortiz
Bachus	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Baker	Johnson (IL)	Pascarella
Baldwin	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Barrett (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Payne
Barrow	Jones (NC)	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Jordan	Pence
Barton (TX)	Kagen	Perlmutter
Bean	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Kaptur	Peterson (PA)
Berman	Keller	Petri
Berry	Kennedy	Pickering
Biggert	Kildee	Pitts
Bilbray	Kilpatrick	Platts
Bilirakis	Kind	Poe
Bishop (GA)	King (NY)	Pomeroy
Bishop (NY)	Klein (FL)	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Kline (MN)	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Knollenberg	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Kucinich	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Kuhl (NY)	Radanovich
Boehner	LaHood	Rahall
Bonner	Lamborn	Ramstad
Bono	Lampson	Rangel
Boozman	Langevin	Regula
Boren	Lantos	Rehberg
Boswell	Larsen (WA)	Reichert
Boucher	Larson (CT)	Renzi
Boustany		

Woolsey	Wynn	Young (AK)
Wu	Yarmuth	Young (FL)

NAYS—8

Deal (GA)	King (IA)	Tancredo
Gingrey	Kingston	Whitfield
Goode	Paul	

NOT VOTING—12

Baird	Jones (OH)	Shays
Berkley	Kirk	Sullivan
Brown, Corrine	McMorris	Walsh (NY)
DeGette	Rodgers	
Hunter	Putnam	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1637

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the number of Iraqi and Afghani translators and interpreters who may be admitted to the United States as special immigrants, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALIEN SMUGGLING AND TERRORISM PREVENTION 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. 2399, 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 gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2399, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, answered "present" 6, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 400]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Blumenauer	Capito
Ackerman	Blunt	Capps
Aderholt	Boehner	Capuano
Akin	Bonner	Cardoza
Alexander	Bono	Carnahan
Allen	Boozman	Carney
Altmire	Boren	Carson
Andrews	Boswell	Carter
Arcuri	Boucher	Castle
Baca	Boustany	Castor
Bachmann	Boyd (FL)	Chabot
Bachus	Boyda (KS)	Chandler
Baker	Brady (PA)	Clarke
Baldwin	Brady (TX)	Cleaver
Barrett (SC)	Bralely (IA)	Clyburn
Barrow	Brown (SC)	Coble
Bartlett (MD)	Brown-Waite,	Cohen
Barton (TX)	Ginny	Cole (OK)
Bean	Buchanan	Conaway
Becerra	Burgess	Conyers
Berman	Burton (IN)	Cooper
Berry	Butterfield	Costa
Biggert	Buyer	Costello
Bilbray	Calvert	Courtney
Bilirakis	Camp (MI)	Cramer
Bishop (GA)	Campbell (CA)	Crenshaw
Bishop (NY)	Cannon	Crowley
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Cubin

Cuellar Jackson-Lee
 Culberson (TX) Obey
 Cummings Jefferson
 Davis (AL) Jindal
 Davis (CA) Johnson (GA)
 Davis (IL) Johnson (IL)
 Davis (KY) Johnson, E. B.
 Davis, David Johnson, Sam
 Davis, Jo Ann Jones (NC)
 Davis, Lincoln Jordan
 Davis, Tom Kagen
 Deal (GA) Kanjorski
 DeFazio Kaptur
 Delahunt Keller
 DeLauro Kennedy
 Dent Kildee
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kilpatrick
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kind
 Dicks King (IA)
 Dingell King (NY)
 Doggett Kingston
 Donnelly Klein (FL)
 Doolittle Kline (MN)
 Doyle Knollenberg
 Drake Kuhl (NY)
 Dreier LaHood
 Duncan Lamborn
 Edwards Lampson
 Ehlers Langevin
 Ellsworth Lantos
 Emanuel Larsen (WA)
 Emerson Latham
 Engel LaTourette
 English (PA) Lee
 Eshoo Levin
 Etheridge Lewis (CA)
 Everett Lewis (GA)
 Fallin Lewis (KY)
 Farr Linder
 Fattah Lipinski
 Feeney LoBiondo
 Ferguson Loeb sack
 Filner Lofgren, Zoe
 Flake Lowey
 Forbes Lucas
 Fortenberry Lungren, Daniel
 Fossella E.
 Foxx Lynch
 Frank (MA) Mack
 Franks (AZ) Mahoney (FL)
 Frelinghuysen Maloney (NY)
 Gallegly Manzullo
 Garrett (NJ) Marchant
 Gerlach Marshall
 Giffords Gilchrist
 Gillibrand Mathe son
 Gillmor Matsui
 Gingrey McCarthy (CA)
 Gohmert McCarthy (NY)
 Gonzalez McCaul (TX)
 Goode McCollum (MN)
 Goodlatte McCotter
 Gordon McCrery
 Granger McDermott
 Graves McGovern
 Green, Al McHenry
 Green, Gene McHugh
 Gutierrez McIntyre
 Hall (NY) McKeon
 Hall (TX) McNe rney
 Hare McNulty
 Harman Meehan
 Hastert Meek (FL)
 Hastings (FL) Meeks (NY)
 Hastings (WA) Melancon
 Hayes Mica
 Heller Michaud
 Hensarling Miller (FL)
 Herger Miller (MI)
 Herseth Sandlin Miller (NC)
 Hill Miller, Gary
 Hinchey Mitchell
 Hinojosa Mollohan
 Hirono Moore (KS)
 Hobson Moore (WI)
 Hoekstra Moran (KS)
 Holden Moran (VA)
 Holt Murphy (CT)
 Honda Murphy, Patrick
 Hooley Murphy, Tim
 Hoyer Murtha
 Hulshof Musgrave
 Inglis (SC) Myrick
 Inslee Nadler
 Israel Napolitano
 Issa Neal (MA)
 Jackson (IL) 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)
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 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
 Shea-Porter
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 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
 Blumenauer

Towns
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden (OR)
 Walz (MN)
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch (VT)
 Weldon (FL)
 Weller
 Westmoreland
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, David
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Lincoln
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 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
 Gilchrist
 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 Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hobson
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Inglis (SC)
 Inslee
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Oberstar
 Jefferson
 Jindal
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jordan
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kline (MN)
 Knollenberg
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Mahoney (FL)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Mathe son
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul (TX)
 McCollum (MN)
 McCotter
 McCrery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McNe rney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 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
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pearce
 Perlmutter
 Peterson (MN)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 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
 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

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Becerra Ellison Kucinich
 Clay Grijalva Schakowsky

NOT VOTING—14

Baird Jones (OH) Shays
 Berkley Kirk Sherman
 Brown, Corrine Larson (CT) Walsh (NY)
 DeGette McMorris
 Hodes Rodgers
 Hunter Putnam

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1643

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.

LEONARD W. HERMAN POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1722, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1722.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie Blunt Cardoza
 Ackerman Boehner Carnahan
 Aderholt Bonner Carney
 Akin Bono Carson
 Alexander Boozman Carter
 Allen Boren Castle
 Altmire Boswell Castor
 Andrews Boucher Chabot
 Arcuri Boustany Chandler
 Baca Boyd (FL) Clarke
 Bachmann Boyd (KS) Clay
 Bachus Brady (PA) Cleaver
 Baker Brady (TX) Clyburn
 Baldwin Braley (IA) Coble
 Barrett (SC) Brown (SC) Cohen
 Barrow Brown-Waite, Cole (OK)
 Bartlett (MD) Ginny Conaway
 Barton (TX) Buchanan Conyers
 Bean Burgess Cooper
 Becerra Burton (IN) Costa
 Berman Butterfield Costello
 Berry Buyer Courtney
 Biggert Calvert Cramer
 Bilbray Camp (MI) Crenshaw
 Bilirakis Campbell (CA) Crowley
 Bishop (GA) Cannon Cubin
 Bishop (NY) Cantor Cuellar
 Bishop (UT) Capito Culberson
 Blackburn Capps Cummings
 Blumenauer Capuano Davis (AL)

Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, David
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Lincoln
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 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
 Gilchrist
 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 Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hobson
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Inglis (SC)
 Inslee
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Oberstar
 Jefferson
 Jindal
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jordan
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kline (MN)
 Knollenberg
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Mahoney (FL)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Mathe son
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul (TX)
 McCollum (MN)
 McCotter
 McCrery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McNe rney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 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
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pearce
 Perlmutter
 Peterson (MN)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 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
 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	Wasserman	Whitfield
Udall (CO)	Schultz	Wicker
Udall (NM)	Waters	Wilson (NM)
Upton	Watson	Wilson (OH)
Van Hollen	Watt	Wilson (SC)
Velázquez	Waxman	Wolf
Viscosky	Weiner	Woolsey
Walberg	Welch (VT)	Wu
Walden (OR)	Weldon (FL)	Wynn
Walz (MN)	Weller	Yarmuth
Wamp	Westmoreland	Young (AK)
	Wexler	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Baird	Jones (OH)	Putnam
Berkley	Kirk	Radanovich
Brown, Corrine	McGovern	Shays
DeGette	McMorris	Walsh (NY)
Gohmert	Rodgers	
Hunter	Peterson (PA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1649

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution I noticed on May 21, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 428

Whereas the Code of Official Conduct provides that a Member “may not condition the inclusion of language to provide funding for a Congressional earmark . . . on any vote cast by another member”;

Whereas Chairman Reyes filed the Report to accompany the bill H.R. 2082, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008;

Whereas the report states that, with respect to the requirements of clause 9 of House Rule XXI, “The following table provides the list of such provisions included in the bill or report,” and includes a table of 26 items identifying “Requesting Member,” “Subject,” and “Dollar Amount (in Thousands)”;

Whereas the referenced table includes an item denoted as: Requesting Member, Mr. Murtha; Subject, NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT—National Drug Intelligence Center; Dollar Amount, \$23 million;

Whereas the Gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Rogers, offered and voted for a motion to recommit the bill to change the provisions of the aforementioned Murtha earmark during its consideration in the House;

Whereas as a result of Mr. Rogers’ motion and vote on the Murtha earmark, the Gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Murtha subsequently threatened to withdraw support for earmarks providing funding for projects located in the Gentleman from Michigan’s district;

Whereas on May 17, 2007, in the House Chamber, the Gentleman from Pennsylvania stated, in a loud voice words to the effect, to the Gentleman from Michigan as a result of offering and voting for the motion to recommit, “I hope you don’t have any earmarks in

the defense appropriation bill because they are gone and you will not get any earmarks now and forever.”;

Whereas the Gentleman from Michigan responded, in words to the effect, “this is not the way we do things here and is that supposed to make me afraid of you?”;

Whereas the Gentleman from Pennsylvania raised his voice, pointed his finger and stated, in words to the effect, “that’s the way I do it.”;

Whereas the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murtha) is the ninth most senior member of Congress, whose seniority ranks him over 426 of his 433 colleagues in the House;

Whereas the gentleman from Pennsylvania chairs the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense;

Whereas the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murtha), the second-ranking and second longest serving Democrat on the Appropriations Committee, has been described in numerous media accounts as a master of the legislative process and an expert on earmarks; and

Whereas the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murtha) has stated that he is a former member of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, whose members are among the most knowledgeable in the House concerning the ethical obligations of Members of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Member from Pennsylvania, Mr. Murtha has been guilty of a violation of the Code of Official Conduct and merits the reprimand of the House for the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of privilege.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 189, answered “present” 13, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

AYES—219

Abercrombie	Chandler	Eshoo
Ackerman	Clarke	Etheridge
Allen	Clay	Farr
Altmire	Cleaver	Fattah
Andrews	Clyburn	Filner
Arcuri	Cohen	Frank (MA)
Baca	Conyers	Giffords
Baldwin	Costa	Gillibrand
Barrow	Costello	Gonzalez
Bean	Courtney	Gordon
Becerra	Cramer	Green, Al
Berman	Crowley	Grijalva
Berry	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hall (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Davis (AL)	Hare
Boren	Davis (CA)	Harman
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Boucher	Davis, Lincoln	Herseth Sandlin
Boyd (FL)	DeFazio	Higgins
Boyd (KS)	DeLauro	Hill
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Hinchev
Bralley (IA)	Dingell	Hinojosa
Butterfield	Doggett	Hirono
Capps	Donnelly	Hodes
Capuano	Doyle	Holden
Cardoza	Edwards	Holt
Carnahan	Ellison	Honda
Carney	Ellsworth	Hooley
Carson	Emanuel	Hoyer
Castor	Engel	Inslee

Israel	Melancon	Schwartz
Jackson (IL)	Michaud	Scott (GA)
Jackson-Lee	Miller (NC)	Scott (VA)
(TX)	Miller, George	Serrano
Jefferson	Mitchell	Sestak
Johnson (GA)	Mollohan	Shea-Porter
Johnson, E. B.	Moore (KS)	Sherman
Kagen	Moore (WI)	Sires
Kanjorski	Moran (VA)	Skelton
Kaptur	Murphy (CT)	Slaughter
Kennedy	Murphy, Patrick	Smith (WA)
Kildee	Murphy, Tim	Solis
Kilpatrick	Murtha	Space
Kind	Nadler	Spratt
Klein (FL)	Napolitano	Stark
Kucinich	Neal (MA)	Stupak
Lampson	Oberstar	Sutton
Langevin	Obey	Tanner
Lantos	Oliver	Tauscher
Larsen (WA)	Ortiz	Taylor
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Pascarell	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Pastor	Tierney
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Towns
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Udall (CO)
Loeback	Petersen (MN)	Udall (NM)
Lofgren, Zoe	Pomeroy	Van Hollen
Lowey	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lynch	Rahall	Viscosky
Mahoney (FL)	Rangel	Walz (MN)
Maloney (NY)	Reyes	Wasserman
Markey	Rodriguez	Schultz
Marshall	Ross	Waters
Matsui	Rothman	Watson
McCarthy (NY)	Ruppersberger	Watt
McCollum (MN)	Rush	Waxman
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
McGovern	Salazar	Welch (VT)
McIntyre	Sánchez, Linda	Wexler
McNerney	T.	Wilson (OH)
McNulty	Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey
Meehan	Sarbanes	Wu
Meek (FL)	Schakowsky	Wynn
Meeks (NY)	Schiff	Yarmuth

NOES—189

Aderholt	Dreier	Linder
Akin	Duncan	LoBiondo
Alexander	Ehlers	Lucas
Bachmann	Emerson	Lungren, Daniel
Bachus	English (PA)	E.
Baker	Everett	Mack
Bartlett (MD)	Fallin	Manullo
Barton (TX)	Feeney	Marchant
Biggart	Ferguson	McCarthy (CA)
Bilbray	Flake	McCotter
Bilirakis	Forbes	McCreery
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	McHenry
Blackburn	Fossella	McHugh
Blumener	Fox	McKeon
Blunt	Franks (AZ)	Mica
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Bono	Gallegly	Miller (MI)
Boozman	Garrett (NJ)	Miller, Gary
Boustany	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Musgrave
Brown (SC)	Gingrey	Myrick
Brown-Waite,	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Ginny	Goode	Nunes
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Paul
Burgess	Granger	Pearce
Burton (IN)	Graves	Pence
Buyer	Hall (TX)	Peterson (PA)
Calvert	Hastert	Petri
Camp (MI)	Hayes	Pickering
Campbell (CA)	Heller	Pitts
Cannon	Hensarling	Platts
Cantor	Hergert	Poe
Capito	Hobson	Porter
Carter	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Castle	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Chabot	Inglis (SC)	Radanovich
Coble	Issa	Ramstad
Cole (OK)	Jindal	Regula
Conaway	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Cooper	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Crenshaw	Jordan	Renzi
Cubin	Keller	Reynolds
Culberson	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Davis (KY)	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, David	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Davis, Tom	Kuhl (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal (GA)	LaHood	Roskam
Dent	Lamborn	Royce
Diaz-Balart, L.	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaTourette	Sali
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Drake	Lewis (KY)	Schmidt

Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Weldon (FL)
Sessions	Tancredo	Weller
Shadegg	Terry	Westmoreland
Shimkus	Thornberry	Whitfield
Shuster	Tiahrt	Wicker
Simpson	Tiberi	Wilson (NM)
Smith (NE)	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ)	Upton	Wolf
Smith (TX)	Walberg	Young (AK)
Souder	Walden (OR)	Young (FL)
Stearns	Wamp	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—13

Barrett (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Bonner	Jones (NC)	Shuler
Delahunt	Kline (MN)	Snyder
Gilchrest	Matheson	
Green, Gene	McCaul (TX)	

NOT VOTING—11

Baird	Jones (OH)	Shays
Berkley	Kirk	Walsh (NY)
Brown, Corrine	McMorris	
DeGette	Rodgers	
Hunter	Putnam	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1710

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1100, CARL SANDBURG HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY REVISION ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-165) on the resolution (H. Res. 429) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1100) to revise the boundary of the Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SENATE AMNESTY BILL IS DOA IN FLORIDA'S FIFTH DISTRICT

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

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when I was a child and I misbehaved, my mother would give me a stare that could curdle milk. Believe me, when I saw that stare, I knew how angry she was.

Well, after reading the Senate amnesty giveaway plan, I now know how to give that same look, and so do my constituents. Rather than doing what the American people want, securing our borders, the Senate has thrown open the barn doors and given away the farm.

Our Nation already faces huge deficits in Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. Now the Senate and President Bush want to give away to anywhere from 12 to 20 million illegal immigrants the possibility to get welfare benefits, Social Security and Medicare.

My constituents back home in Florida work hard each and every day to pay their taxes and to keep America strong. In contrast, the Senate amnesty plan rewards illegal behavior and gives away our constituents' hard-earned Social Security and Medicare dollars.

Listen up, America. The Senate amnesty plan is a tax amnesty bill. This is bad legislation.

THIS HOUSE IS FALLING DOWN AROUND THE MAJORITY'S PROMISES

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I didn't have planned remarks, but then again, I didn't think what we just witnessed would take place today.

We had heard for 1½ years, 2 years, that if the Democratic Party got the majority in this House, we would have the most bipartisan Congress ever. We were told there would be no earmarks if the Democratic majority took control of this House. There would be all love and affection.

Well, of course, we saw how procedural rules went early this year, had things crammed down our throats, no chance for amendments, no participation, no committee involvement. Then we have a threat, an unrefuted allegation of a threat over earmarks. Unbelievable.

This party that was going to be so bipartisan will not even let discussion take place over whether or not a threat occurred. This House is falling down around the majority's promises.

□ 1715

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me just for a moment talk about where we are at this point with immigration reform, as from my observation I see the Senate has done some of the work. It negotiated the bill that they will then bring before their house, and further negotiations will take place, and bill amendments will be made to that legislation. Ultimately they will pass a bill on immigration reform in their house.

We will then have an opportunity on our side to do a similar measure. It will be different from the Senate when they go to conference. In that conference, hopefully we will be able to get to a bill we can all agree upon, we can send to the President, and the President can sign into law.

Let's not rush to judgment on what that legislation will be. This bill is not going to be amnesty. This bill is going to be one that will secure our borders, that will create a virtual fence, one that will address the issues of illegal

immigration, but also address the issue of the 12 million undocumented, those who find themselves in illegal status here in the United States today. The human element is as much an important part of how we move forward to deal with this issue, and I hope that all my colleagues keep an open mind as the debate moves forward.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). 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.

SUPPORTING THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE FOR ACCUSED MARINES

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, only those who have been to war can truly understand the hell of war. I have not been to war, but I know enough to understand that when our men and women are in harm's way, we should be respectful of the extreme dangers they encounter. Most of us cannot imagine the stress that those in uniform undergo when they have to make a split-second decision as to whether to fire or be fired upon, to kill or be killed.

Recently in Afghanistan, the vehicle convoy of U.S. Special Operations marines stationed at Camp Lejeune was struck by a suicide bomber during an ambush. After the incident, why I do not know, an Army official felt compelled to speak out in the press. Whether intentionally or not, this Army officer implicated the marines in the killing of Afghanistan civilians by stating, "Americans have killed and wounded innocent Afghan people."

His comments were irresponsible and without respect for his fellow comrades. The four branches of the military are a family. No one in the military family should be in the newspapers criticizing a fellow member of that family who has been faced with death. And, because of his comments to the press, these marines have been publicly indicted as indiscriminate killers.

Mr. Speaker, President Theodore Roosevelt once said, "A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards. More than that no man is entitled, and less than that no man shall have."

To ensure due process for these marines, all military officials should refrain from making public comments or expressing their opinions about the incident until the investigation is complete and all the facts are verified. Mr. Speaker, our military servicemembers, the military family, and certainly these marines deserve no less.

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 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 California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MEMORIAL DAY: ROLL CALL OF THE FALLEN

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day will soon be upon us. Eighteen soldiers from southeast Texas and troops have given their lives in Iraq. These are their photographs over here to my left, all 18 of them. These are the names of those warriors, the roll call of the fallen:

Staff Sergeant Russell Slay, United States Marine Corps, age 34. He was killed on November 9, 2004. He is from Humble, Texas. When Russell told his mother he was joining the Marine Corps after high school, he told her that he knew she would not like it, but he joined anyway to serve his country.

Lance Corporal Wesley Canning, United States Marine Corps, age 21, killed November 10, 2004. He is from Friendswood, Texas. He always wanted to be a marine and had the ambition to serve for 20 years. He was a proud Texan, and when he was home on leave, he bought a new pickup truck so he could show his marine buddies his "Don't Mess with Texas" bumper sticker.

Lance Corporal Fred Lee Maciel, United States Marine Corps, age 20, killed January 26, 2005. He was from Spring, Texas. He was killed in a helicopter crash in al-Anbar province on his way to begin security preparations for the historic Iraqi elections. Four days later I was in Iraq to witness those successful elections. Lance Corporal Maciel made them possible.

Private First Class Wesley Riggs, United States Army, age 19, killed May 17, 2005, from Baytown/Beach City, Texas. He graduated in just 3 years from high school, and he loved agriculture.

Sergeant Bill Meeuwse, United States Army, age 24, killed November

23, 2005, from Kingwood, Texas. He went to Texas A&M, but he dropped out of school and enlisted in the Army as a result of 9/11.

Lance Corporal Robert Martinez, United States Marine Corps, age 20, killed December 1, 2005, from Cleveland, Texas. He dreamed of getting a degree in education and becoming a baseball coach after his career in the Marines was over. Today, there is a post office in Cleveland, Texas, named in his honor.

Staff Sergeant Michael Durbin, United States Army, age 27, killed January 25, 2006, from Houston, Texas. He was a gifted artist. The day he was killed, he called his wife to tell her that he loved her.

Tech Sergeant Walter Moss, Jr., United States Air Force, age 37, killed on March 30, 2006, from Houston, Texas. He joined the Air Force after high school, and he served in Operation Desert Storm. He specialized in detecting and defusing makeshift bombs. He was killed while defusing an IED.

Private First Class Kristian Menchaca, United States Army, age 23, killed June 16, 2006, from Houston, Texas. When he joined the Army, Kristian wanted to become an infantryman. Kristian's wife stated that being in the military was what he always wanted to do. He was kidnapped and murdered by enemy forces.

Staff Sergeant Ben Williams, United States Marine Corps, age 30, killed June 20, 2006, from Orange, Texas. He joined right after high school, and he served his country for 12 years and was on his third duty in Iraq when he was killed.

Lance Corporal Ryan Miller, United States Marine Corps, age 19, killed September 14, 2006, from Pearland, Texas. He was a third-generation marine, and he graduated early so he could enlist and follow his father's and grandfather's footsteps. After his tour of duty was over, he wanted to become a Houston police officer, just like his mom and dad.

Staff Sergeant Edward Reynolds, Jr., United States Army, age 27, killed September 26, 2006, from Port Arthur, Texas. He was looking forward to his New Year's Eve wedding date with his new fiancée, and he was the man that pushed his friends to succeed.

Captain David Fraser, United States Army, age 25, killed November 26, 2006, from Spring, Texas. He attended West Point Military Academy, where he graduated as the top student in civil engineering.

Lieutenant Corporal Luke Yepsen, United States Marine Corps, age 20, killed September 14, 2006, from Kingwood, Texas. He attended Texas A&M after high school, but he dropped out to enlist in the United States Marine Corps.

Specialist Dustin Donica, United States Army, age 22, December 28, 2006, from Spring, Texas. When he was asked why he joined the United States Army, he said, "Most people my generation

want something for them, but I want to give something back."

Specialist Ryan Berg, United States Army, age 19, killed January 9, 2007, from Sabine Pass, Texas. He joined the Army on his 18th birthday, and he was the first soldier from Sabine Pass killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Staff Sergeant Terrance Dunn, United States Army, age 38, killed February 2, 2007, from Atascocita, Texas. He enlisted in the Army several years after high school, and to his fellow soldiers he was known as "Dunnaman," because he could get anything done.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, Lance Corporal Anthony Aguirre, United States Marine Corps, age 20, killed February 22, 2007, from Channelview, Texas. He entered the Marines because it was the toughest branch in the military.

Mr. Speaker, these are the few, the bold, the brave, the courageous, the Americans. These are the sons of southeast Texas who have fallen in battle for their country.

And that's just the way it is.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1427, FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 2007

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1427, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross-references, and the table of contents, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

(Mr. WYNN 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 Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROGERS of Michigan 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 Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McDERMOTT 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 Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona 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 Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE REVEREND JERRY FALWELL

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor the memory of my constituent and my friend, the late Rev. Jerry Falwell.

Last week, the city of Lynchburg, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the entire country lost one of our dearest sons in the passing of Rev. Falwell. Today Dr. Falwell was laid to rest. I am sad that business here in Washington kept many of us from being able to attend today's services, but since we were unable to attend, we have joined here tonight to pay homage to this great leader.

Dr. Falwell's legacy is one that will not soon be forgotten. He was a man whose strong faith and vision were unshakable. He lived his life trying to strengthen the moral fabric of our great Nation.

In his crusade to strengthen family values, he was a frequent visitor to Washington, DC, he led many people to the Nation's Capital to demand that leaders here strengthen our country's moral foundation.

Jerry lived his life guided by a strong set of values and an unshakable moral compass. He lived by example, embodying the Bible's greatest commandments. He followed the words of Matthew 22 in his daily life: Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: Love your neighbors as yourself.

Anyone who ever met Jerry Falwell knew that he took this commandment seriously and chartered his life by it.

One thing is for sure. Whether one was viewed as a friend or foe of Jerry Falwell, he loved them all. This love for the neighbor extended to everyone, even those who wouldn't expect it. I had many times heard Rev. Falwell say, "Love the sinner, hate the sin."

This was more than just a catch phrase. It was a way of life.

Many people have heard of the infamous Supreme Court battle between Jerry Falwell and Larry Flynt. But what few people didn't realize is that Falwell and Flynt actually became friends. I know Jerry did not approve of Mr. Flynt's business, but he separated his thoughts about the man from Flynt's activities.

□ 1730

To most people, Jerry Falwell is a national figure. But I also know him as a local guy who was always giving back to his community. He was a local preacher who worked to serve his congregation and the community. He started his church over 50 years ago in an old bottling factory. That small congregation has grown from 35 to the over-22,000 current members of Thomas Road Baptist Church.

Dr. Falwell, through his church, set in place many ministries to aid the community. In 1959, he established the Elim Home to help men dealing with chemical addictions. This home has transformed the lives of hundreds of men and remains a place to free men of their addictions.

Additionally, Dr. Falwell helped found the Liberty Godparent Foundation. The foundation's mission is to improve the quality of life for unwed mothers and provide a hopeful future for unborn children. The foundation maintains Liberty Godparent Maternity Home, which offers a safe haven for unwed mothers, and Family Services Adoption Agency, which helps place unwanted children in safe and stable homes. The reach of the church has touched many thousands and extends past central Virginia and across the United States.

The list of Jerry Falwell's many ministries and accomplishments is nearly endless. However, many people asked him of what accomplishment he was most proud. Without hesitation he would say, Liberty University. This university, located in my congressional district in Lynchburg, started as a small Baptist college. Today it has grown exponentially and serves over 10,000 students. Washington, DC is filled with Liberty University alumni. I have been pleased to have many Liberty University alumni serve in my office as staff and interns. In fact, L.U. alumni are all over Capitol Hill. I have heard them talk fondly of the education they received at Liberty, and they refer to themselves warmly as "Jerry's kids."

I have frequently been on the campus of Liberty, and they are, in fact, Jerry's kids. He loved those kids as his own. Rev. Falwell was very involved and engaged in university life. He always had time for the students. He was also a fixture at school events. Jerry was especially proud of L.U. athletics and he would, with the students, cheer the Flames on to victory. I have even heard stories of Jerry crowd surfing at

basketball games. Students would transport him from the bottom of the stands to the top.

There is no doubt that Liberty and the alumni that it produces will live on as Jerry Falwell's lasting legacy. These alumni carry with them the strong values and morals that were reinforced through their education at Liberty. The university and its alumni will remain a living testimony of the work and vision of Jerry Falwell.

You cannot talk about Rev. Falwell without also talking about the town that he loved, the city of Lynchburg. Jerry, though a national figure, never left his home in central Virginia. He led his spiritual network out of his offices in Lynchburg. The city of Lynchburg greatly benefited from Rev. Falwell's work. As Falwell's ministries, and especially Liberty University flourished, so did the city. The impact that Jerry had on Lynchburg's economy and culture is undeniable.

When word of Jerry's death came, the city of Lynchburg seemed to take a collective gasp and was filled with shock and sorrow. The loss of Rev. Falwell was a huge loss for Lynchburg. And today I tell the citizens of Lynchburg that the Nation mourns with you.

When I heard of the passing of my good friend, Jerry Falwell, I was deeply saddened. My wife, Mary Ellen, and I had the pleasure of knowing Dr. Falwell for many years. He was a good man and made an undeniable impression on many lives. Two hours after his death was confirmed, an impromptu memorial service brought a standing room only crowd to Thomas Road Baptist Church, a church that holds 6,000 people. Since then, thousands have shown up to pay their respects, and thousands showed up today for his funeral.

While many people mourn the death of Rev. Falwell, no one experiences this loss harder than Jerry's family. Jerry was a devoted family man. He was dedicated to his bride and partner of 49 years, Macel. Together they raised three children. Jerry, Jr., Jonathan and Jeannie, who I have no doubt will build on the great legacy that their father leaves behind. Nothing can compare to the deep personal loss that they are experiencing, and our thoughts and prayers and hearts are with them.

After hearing the sad news of Jerry's death, I was able to call and offer my condolences to Macel. She shared with me how Jerry spent his last day. I don't think she would mind me sharing with you what happened, as I feel it fully embodies the man that Jerry was.

The night before he passed away, Macel and Jerry went out to dinner. As they talked to their waitress, Jerry found out that she attended the local community college. When he asked the young lady why she didn't go to Liberty University, she told him that she had applied and been accepted, but as a private school, it was too expensive. Jerry told her that he would find a way

for her to attend Liberty. The next morning, the morning he passed away, Rev. Falwell lived up to his word and found scholarship money for the young waitress. It was perhaps one of the last things he did before collapsing in his office.

This last act of charity and giving is a perfect example of the man that Jerry Falwell was. Right up till the end of his life, he was working to change lives.

There are many other stories like this one out there of how this extraordinary man touched and changed ordinary lives. Rev. Jerry Falwell was a loving and caring man. He led his life guided by strong convictions. He left an unquestionable impression on our country.

I will greatly miss my friend. I pray for his family and his congregation, and I join the Nation in mourning this great spiritual leader.

Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, sometimes when a man affects the world as much as Jerry Falwell does, there are all kinds of things that are said, both by those who remember him in different ways, and I, today, would like to just point out some basics about Jerry Falwell. I had the privilege of knowing him many years ago, and sometimes I wonder how many of us are in this place because Jerry Falwell lived and did what he did.

But just to recap some of the basics, Mr. Speaker, Jerry Falwell was born in Lynchburg, Virginia, to Helen and Carey Hezekiah Falwell. He married the former Macel Pate on April 12, 1958. He had two sons, Jerry, Jr., Jonathan, and one daughter, Jeannie.

The church that Jerry Falwell first started was in an abandoned bottling plant in 1956, and it grew into a ministry giant that includes the 22,000-member Thomas Road Baptist Church, the Old Time Gospel Hour carried on television stations across the Nation, and the nearly 8,000-student Liberty University founded in Lynchburg in 1971.

He built Christian elementary schools. He built homes for unwed mothers and a home for alcoholics. Through these venues, Jerry's legacy lives on in the lives of thousands of young adults whom he called champions for Christ. And they were American patriots in his heart as well.

Jerry Falwell launched the Moral Majority in 1979, and its purpose was to transform a politically sleeping Christian evangelical universe into a force to transform and preserve the very soul of America. It grew into a 6.5-million-member organization and raised nearly \$70 million, as it supported conservative candidates and campaigned to protect innocent human life, to work against the debasing of life and pornography and to fight for the religious freedom of students to pray in schools.

After a decade of catalyzing a wave of conservatism that culminated in the

election and the reelection of one Ronald Reagan, Jerry disbanded the Moral Majority, saying, "Our mission is accomplished."

Today, Mr. Speaker, approximately one of every four American voters is a Christian evangelical; and one in four American citizens, those that were the ones that Jerry helped awaken.

Not so long ago he said, what we've worked on for nearly 30 years ago, to mobilize people of faith and value in this country, and what we've done in those years is coming to a culmination.

The Pew Research Institute, a senior fellow there, John Green, to paraphrase him, he said, Falwell changed the way that evangelicals think about their political responsibility.

But it was one of Jerry's friends and colleagues, I think, Mr. Speaker, that put it the very best. His name was Chuck Baldwin. He spoke the following words in tribute, which I think sum up the legacy of Jerry Falwell. He said, "America has lost a seasoned patriot. Thomas Road Baptist Church has lost a faithful and dedicated pastor. Liberty University has lost a visionary chancellor. The Church of Christ, collectively, has lost a dynamic preacher of the gospel. The Falwell family has lost a loving husband and father. And thousands of people, such as me, have lost a hero, mentor and friend. No matter what his enemies say, America is a better place because of Jerry Falwell. And those of us who were privileged to personally know him will never forget him."

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to add to those words. But just in the way that I could, I would simply say this, that Jerry Falwell was a man who loved God, who loved his country, who loved his family and who loved humanity. And more than we all realize, we are very blessed that he came our way. And now that he has stepped over the threshold of eternity, he has found a welcome place. He has looked into the eyes of his Saviour and heard those eternal words of victory, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his very kind and thoughtful words.

And now I'd like to turn to the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman GOODE. VIRGIL GOODE and I have the honor of representing central Virginia and share many of the members of Thomas Road Baptist Church. I have the City of Lynchburg and part of Bedford County and Amherst County in my district, and VIRGIL has Appomattox County and Campbell County and the remainder of Bedford. And we've both had the opportunity to work with Reverend Falwell on many, many occasions. And it's my pleasure to yield now to the gentleman for his words.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Roanoke for arranging this special order. I rise tonight to pay homage to Dr. Jerry Falwell, whose funeral and visitation drew tens of thousands to Lynchburg, Virginia, this past weekend and today.

Jerry Falwell was a native of Lynchburg, which is next to the Fifth District, which I have the honor of representing. A devout Christian, Dr. Falwell began his first church 51 years ago, with 35 parishioners. In 3 years the congregation had grown to 800. During part of this period, Dr. Falwell ran buses throughout this region and south to the North Carolina line to bring persons to services.

Today, Thomas Road Baptist Church welcomes thousands to its sanctuary and all related services. The services and activities offered by Thomas Road are important to citizens of Lynchburg and to many nearby counties, including Campbell and Bedford and Appomattox, which are in the Fifth District. His broadcast ministry has touched millions all around the globe.

Dr. Falwell remarked in an interview 2 years ago that his mission remained the same, to train young champions for Christ. That training has extended well beyond the church.

Having an equally important impact on this area of Central Virginia is Liberty University. It is the product of Dr. Falwell's decision to launch Liberty Baptist College in 1971. This school has grown into a major university with an enrollment in excess of 10,000.

□ 1745

And projections are its distance-learning programs may reach 25,000 students in a few years. It offers 71 majors and specializations and boasts a growing law school. Liberty University is a significant contributor to the economy of Lynchburg and the surrounding area.

And while Thomas Road Baptist Church and Liberty University may be considered the pillars of a legacy that will endure for generations, an equally important contribution was Dr. Falwell's determined spirit and unrelenting belief that Christians should stand forth proudly and be integral parts of all of American life.

To that end he urged all to be involved politically and to press those who would seek elective office to subscribe to strong moral principles as the guiding light of this Nation. Today we hear the candidates for national office professing their faith and its importance in their lives. This is due, in no small measure, to the trail blazed by Dr. Jerry Falwell.

To thousands in central Virginia, he was simply known as Jerry, and those individuals will sadly miss their friend, pastor, and mentor.

To his wife, Macel; and his children, Jerry Jr., Jonathan, and Jeanie; and to all in the Falwell family, my heartfelt sympathies are extended, and may God bless them during this time of sorrow.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

And it is now my pleasure to yield to another representative from Virginia, Congressman ERIC CANTOR, the chief deputy whip from the Richmond area, who I knew not too long ago stopped

off in Lynchburg and had the opportunity to spend some time with Reverend Falwell.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend from Virginia, for yielding.

I, too, rise this evening to pay tribute to a fellow Virginian and a great leader in America's conservative movement.

Dr. Jerry Falwell made his mark as an outspoken, passionate advocate for conservative causes. More than any other 20th century Virginian, Jerry Falwell's passion and convictions sparked a new generation of grassroots activism.

Recently, as my friend from the Sixth District noted, I visited with Dr. Falwell in his office on the campus of his beloved Liberty University. During that visit, I gleaned a little more and had gained a little more insight into this impressive public figure.

Jerry Falwell, a man of faith, was a pastor who loved his congregation. He was chancellor of a growing university, a place that began just as a vision, but one that he built into a thriving reality that has become a major educational and economic force in Virginia.

Jerry Falwell was a husband, father, and grandfather who actively engaged in the affairs of this Nation because he, like all of us, wanted to leave behind a country better, more hopeful, and filled with greater opportunity than even the one he inherited from his parents.

The people of the Commonwealth of Virginia have lost a son and the American people a true patriot.

To his family, I extend my deepest sympathy during this time of sorrow.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his words.

We will be joined shortly by another speaker, but before we are, let me tell a little bit more about Dr. Falwell.

At the age of 22, having just graduated from college in June of 1956, Jerry Falwell returned to his hometown of Lynchburg, Virginia, and started Thomas Road Baptist Church with just 35 members. The offering that first Sunday totaled \$135. Falwell often said about that first collection, "We thought we had conquered the world." Today Thomas Road has over 22,000 members, and the total annual revenues of all of the Jerry Falwell ministries total over \$200 million.

Within weeks of founding his new church in 1956, Falwell began the Old-Time Gospel Hour, a daily local radio ministry and a weekly local television ministry. Nearly five decades later, this Old-Time Gospel Hour is now seen and heard in every American home and on every continent except Antarctica. Through the years, over 3 million persons have communicated to the Falwell ministries that they have received Christ as Lord and Savior as a result of this radio and television ministry.

In 1967, Falwell implemented his vision to build a Christian educational

system for evangelical youth. He began with the creation of Lynchburg Christian Academy, a Christ-centered, academically excellent, fully accredited Christian day school providing kindergarten, elementary, and high school. In 1971, Liberty University was founded. Today, over 21,500 students from 50 States and 80 nations attend this accredited liberal arts Christian university. Falwell's dream has become a reality. A preschool child can now enter the school system at age 3 and, 20 or more years later, leave the same campus with a Ph.D., without ever sitting in a classroom where the teacher was not a Christian.

Falwell is also publisher of the National Liberty Journal, a monthly newspaper which is read by over 200,000 pastors and Christian workers; and the Falwell Confidential, a weekly e-mail newsletter to over 500,000 pastors and Christian activists.

In June of 1979, Falwell organized the Moral Majority, a conservative political lobbying movement, which the press soon dubbed the "Religious Right." During the first 2 years of its existence, the Moral Majority attracted over 100,000 pastors, priests, and rabbis and nearly 7 million religious conservatives who mobilized as a pro-life, pro-family, pro-Israel, and pro-strong-national-defense organization. The Moral Majority supported California Governor Ronald Reagan as their candidate for President in 1980, registered millions of new voters, and set about to inform and activate a sleeping giant: 80 million Americans committed to faith, family, and moral values.

With the impetus of the newly organized Moral Majority, millions of people of faith voted for the first time in 1980 and helped Ronald Reagan be elected President, and many conservative Congressmen and Senators.

Since 1979, about 30 percent of the American electorate has been identified by media polls as the "Religious Right." Most recent major media surveys have acknowledged that these "faith and values" voters reelected George W. Bush in November 2004.

Though perhaps better known outside Lynchburg for political activism, Jerry Falwell's personal schedule confirms his passion for being a pastor and a Christian educator. He often states that his heartbeat is for training young people for every walk of life.

Falwell and his wife of 49 years Macel have three grown children and eight grandchildren.

While we continue to await for our next speaker, let me read from a report in the Lynchburg News & Advance from last Tuesday:

"Jerry Falwell was born in 1933 in Lynchburg and lived here all his life. He married Macel Pate of Lynchburg in 1958. They had three children: Jerry Falwell, Jr., an attorney who represents the Falwell ministries and is vice chancellor of Liberty University; Jeannie Falwell Savas, a Richmond

surgeon; and Jonathan Falwell, the executive pastor at Thomas Road Baptist Church.

"Falwell founded Thomas Road in 1956 in an old soft drink bottling plant after graduating from Baptist Bible College in Springfield, Missouri. That same year he started his weekly television broadcast, the Old-Time Gospel Hour.

"The church moved into a 3,200-seat sanctuary on Thomas Road in the Fort Hill area in 1970, with services broadcast around the world. Falwell founded Liberty University, then known as Lynchburg Baptist College, in 1971. He always hoped the school would be one of his lasting legacies.

"He started the Moral Majority, Incorporated, in 1979, conducting 'I love America' rallies at 44 State capitals.

"The rise of the Moral Majority coincided with the Reagan Presidency, and Falwell rose to national prominence as well."

Falwell and his ministries faced many challenges through the years.

"In the late 1990s, Falwell reemerged on the national stage in a flurry of television appearances," a series of changes to his ministries, "but Falwell gave up campaigning for politicians as he did for President Ronald Reagan in the 1980s. 'I don't plan ever to get back into the Moral Majority-type work,' he said in a 1998 interview. 'What I did I did because I felt led to do it then, and I'm glad I did it . . . My thing now is a nonpartisan Biblical approach to moral and social issues.'"

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to the Republican whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT). I am very pleased to have his presence as we commemorate the life of Reverend Jerry Falwell.

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

I thank the gentleman also for putting this time together today so that we could talk about the incredible, remarkable life of Rev. Jerry Falwell, a man who never apologized for his spiritual beliefs, who never wavered in his commitment to furthering the dialogue of faith and family in America.

Jerry Falwell was a native son of Virginia, the senior pastor of one of its most prominent and well-attended churches, and the founder of a Christian college in Lynchburg that started its enrollment with 154 students in 1971 and today has over 20,000 students.

Along the way, Rev. Falwell honed his leadership skills and pursued his academic study. In Springfield, Missouri, the town I live in now and I am pleased to represent it in Congress, he transferred there as a sophomore to Baptist Bible College. He later graduated from that school in 1956 with a degree in theology.

And the first time I met Rev. Falwell was when he returned to Springfield. I was a county official at the time, and I had begun to watch him on television. And unlike so many other

television pastors, watching Rev. Falwell was like you were right there in the church service because it was a church service. And I remember the growth of the church as you could watch it on that late Sunday night broadcast that I happened to watch on Sunday evening. I remember when they started moving the church, they had a song that was something like "I Want That Mountain," the site on which Rev. Falwell and the church had decided they wanted to grow the church and eventually the school. And watching his incredible faith and what he was doing, his unflinching determination to spread the Gospel, his ability to use the communication tools available to him in ways that others hadn't, but in ways that his growing congregation were totally comfortable with, in ways, in fact, that didn't compete with what he was doing every Sunday morning and every Sunday night at the Thomas Road Baptist Church.

□ 1800

He left Missouri in the mid-1950s with a renewed commitment to the power of ideas, ideas about the importance of spirituality and public life, ideas that promoted the family, ideas about the protection of human life at all stages of development. And for 50 years, for half a century, his mission was a mission of defending those ideas.

It would give rise to a movement of citizen activists in evangelical Christianity that, frankly, for the previous 50 years in many ways had been intentionally removing itself from the civic and political process, with a focus on what was going to happen after we were here, rather than also being focused on the world we live in. He never lost sight of his mission.

He was a man of purpose, not a man of things, it appeared to me. Whenever he applied that purpose to improve the conditions of the world around him, it made a difference. The time and energy he devoted to his once small college, in fact, once just his idea of a college, became one of our larger universities. It's a great example.

The church he started, the Thomas Road Baptist Church, which he started in 1956 in a bottling plant with a congregation of 35 people, now is a church of nearly 25,000 members. But his achievements weren't only building a church and building a school, he was deeply concerned about the moral direction of this country, and worked hard to ensure that people of faith were part of the national dialogue, part of a way of changing who we were for the better.

His lifelong pursuit of truth was not a casual affair nor was his commitment to a way of life and learning that acknowledged the lessons of the past and applied those experiences to building a better future.

Earlier this afternoon, parishioners of the Thomas Road Baptist Church and people from all over the country and all over the world gathered in

Lynchburg to pay a final tribute to their pastor, their friend, a leader that they respected.

Tonight, I would like to join my good friend, Mr. GOODLATTE, and others and use this opportunity to pay my final respects to a person who clearly was a leader. He was a teacher, he was a father and a husband, and above all other things, he was an untiring messenger of the good news and the eternal hope of our Lord.

I want to thank my friend for organizing this time tonight and for giving me the time to join you.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Well, I thank the whip for joining us in this special tribute to Reverend Jerry Falwell.

I must tell you that the mountain you refer to, which is Chandler Mountain in Lynchburg, was acquired by Liberty University. You can see the university growing up the sides of that mountain now. In fact, they now have a big "LU" planted in trees near the top of the mountain.

Jerry Falwell climbed many mountains, and he leaves behind a legacy not only of building an outstanding educational organization and an outstanding church, but more importantly, he leaves behind the people who make that church and that university strong and growing, led by his children, who will carry on his legacy and reach out to many, many more throughout our country and throughout the world.

I close this special order with a moment of silence, acknowledging the life and work of my constituent and my friend, the late Rev. Jerry Falwell.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEMOCRATIC BLUE DOG COALITION

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening on behalf of the 43 Members that make up the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. We are conservative Democrats, we are commonsense Democrats that want to restore fiscal discipline to our Nation's government.

Mr. Speaker, as you walk the halls of Congress, as you walk the halls of this Capitol and the Cannon House Office Building and the Longworth House Office Building and the Rayburn House Office Building, it's not difficult to know when you're walking by the door of a fellow Blue Dog member because you will see this poster that reads, "The Blue Dog Coalition". And it will tell you, it serves as a reminder to Members of Congress and to the general public that walk the halls of Congress that today the U.S. national debt is \$3,807,559,710,099. And I ran out of room, but if I had a poster that was just a little bit more wide, Mr. Speaker, I would have added 85 cents.

Your share, every man, woman and child, including the children born today in America, if you take that number, the U.S. national debt, and divide it by the number of people living in America today, our share, everyone's share of the national debt is \$29,174.38. It is what those of us in the Blue Dog Coalition refer to as "the debt tax," d-e-b-t tax, which is one tax that can't go away, that can't be cut until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first bills I filed as a Member of Congress back in 2001 was a bill to tell the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off the Social Security trust fund. The Republican leadership at the time refused to give me a hearing or a vote on that bill, and now we know why; because the projected deficit for 2007, based on the budget bill written when the Republicans controlled Congress, they will tell you is only \$172 billion.

Not so. It's \$357 billion. The difference is the money they are borrowing from the Social Security trust fund, with absolutely no provision on how that money will be paid back or when it will be paid back or where it's coming from to pay it back.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when I go down to the local bank in Prescott, Arkansas, and sit across from a loan officer and get a loan, they want to know how I am going to pay it back, when I am going to pay it back and where the money is going to come from to pay it back. It is time the politicians in Washington keep their hands off the Social Security trust fund.

The national debt, the total national debt from 1789 to 2000 was \$5.67 trillion. But by 2010, the total national debt will have increased to \$10.88 trillion. That is a doubling of the 211-year debt in just a decade, in just 10 years. Interest payments on the debt are one of the fastest growing parts of the Federal budget. And the debt tax is one that cannot be repealed.

People ask me, why should I care about the fact that our Nation is in debt? Why should I care that we continue to borrow billions of dollars? After all, it's future generations that are going to be stuck with the bill.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it should matter for a lot of reasons. But here is a good one right here: interest payments. Our Nation is borrowing about a billion dollars a day. We are spending about a half a billion a day paying interest on a debt we've already got before we borrow another billion dollars today.

I-49 is important to the people in Arkansas in my congressional district. I need nearly \$2 billion to finish I-49, an interstate that was started when I was in kindergarten. That's a lot of money, at least for a country boy from Prescott and Hope, Arkansas. But I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we will spend more money paying interest on the national debt in the next 4 days than

what it would cost to complete Interstate 49 in Arkansas, creating with it all kinds of economic opportunities and jobs.

That's on the western side of my district. I represent about half the State.

On the eastern side of my district, I-69 is very important. I need about \$2 billion to finish I-69. I-69 was announced in the State of Indiana, in Indianapolis, 5 years before I was born. That was 50 years ago. And with the exception of about 40 miles in Kentucky in a section they are now building from Memphis to the casinos, none of it has ever been built south of Indianapolis. \$2 billion is a lot of money, but we will spend more than that in the next 4 days paying interest on the national debt.

As you can see from the chart here, in red, that is the amount of money, of your tax money, Mr. Speaker, that we will spend paying interest on the national debt this year. Compare that to how much we are spending on our children and their education.

You know, folks in this country come up to me all the time saying that English should be the official language. And I personally don't necessarily disagree with that. But let me tell you what people should be equally concerned about; they should be equally concerned about the fact that we have got more young people today in India learning English than in America. We've got more young people today in China learning English than in America. And it is not because they love America, it is because they want our jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely critical that we provide our young people with a world-class education, and yet you can see we are spending a fraction on educating our children of what we will spend this year paying interest on the national debt.

You hear a lot of talk about homeland security. We all take off our shoes when we go through the airports. And I guess we feel a little bit safer, but look at what our real commitment as a Nation is to homeland security compared to what we are spending paying interest on the national debt. Homeland security is in the green, the red is the interest we are paying on the national debt.

And finally, veterans. We can talk about patriotism all we want, but I will tell you what, the rest of the world can look at America and determine how much we value our soldiers by how we treat our veterans.

And a whole new generation of veterans are coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan. How do we value them? The dark blue shows how much we are spending of your tax money, Mr. Speaker, on our veterans compared to the red, which is the amount we've been simply paying interest on on the national debt.

Where is this money coming from that we are borrowing a billion dollars a day? I have already told you, Mr.

Speaker, a lot of it is coming from raiding the Social Security trust fund. Where is the rest of it coming from? Foreign central banks and foreign lenders.

That's right, Mr. Speaker. In fact, to put it another way, this administration has borrowed more money from foreigners in the past 6 years than the previous 42 Presidents combined. Let me repeat that. This administration has borrowed more money from foreign central banks and foreign investors in the past 6 years than the previous 42 Presidents combined.

Foreign lenders currently hold a total of about \$2.199 trillion of our public debt. Compare that to only \$623.3 billion in foreign holdings in 1993. Who are they? The top 10 list.

Japan. The United States of America has borrowed \$637.4 billion from Japan to fund tax cuts in this country for people earning over \$400,000 a year, leaving our children with the bill.

China, \$346.5 billion.

The United States of America has borrowed \$223.5 billion from the United Kingdom.

\$97.1 billion from OPEC. And we wonder why gasoline is \$3.25 a gallon today in south Arkansas.

Korea, \$67.7 billion; Taiwan, \$63.2 billion; the Caribbean banking centers, \$63.6 billion; Hong Kong, \$51 billion; Germany, \$52.1 billion.

And get a load of this. Rounding out the top 10 countries that the United States of America has borrowed money from to fund tax cuts in this country for folks earning over 400,000 a year and to fund the war in Iraq: Mexico.

□ 1815

Our country has borrowed \$38.2 billion from Mexico to fund our government.

So debts do matter. Deficits do matter. And in this case, I submit to you, it is a national security issue.

So what do we do about it? As members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, we have got a plan. We have got a plan for budget reform. We have a plan to demand accountability in Iraq. We support our soldiers, and as long as we have soldiers in harm's way, we are going to make sure they are funded.

But this administration has acted like if you challenge them on how they are spending your tax money in Iraq, then you are unpatriotic. We are not going to stand for that anymore, because, Mr. Speaker, we believe that this administration and the Iraqi Government should be accountable for how \$12 million of taxpayer money is being spent every hour in Iraq.

That is right, our Nation is spending \$12 million of your tax money, Mr. Speaker, every hour in Iraq, and it is time that the Iraqis be held accountable for how that money is being spent. It is time we demand that they step up and accept more responsibility for training the Iraqis to be able to take control of their police and military

force. And, yes, it is time that we demand more accountability from this administration on how this money is being spent on Iraq and ensure that it is being spent on our brave men and women in uniform.

John Grant of Pearcy, Arkansas, brought to my attention the fact that our soldiers may very well not be equipped with the most advanced and the best body armor that is made. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we must ensure that the very best in body armor is being provided to our men and women in uniform. We have learned a lot about that in the last few days through an NBC investigative report. I am proud to tell you that over 40 Members of Congress, including a lot of my Blue Dog friends, have signed on to a letter to the administration, to the Pentagon, demanding that further tests be done, and that our men and women in uniform be provided with the very best in body armor.

I am joined by a number of fellow Blue Dogs this evening, and it is with great honor that I introduce at this time my friend, an active member of the Blue Dog Coalition from the State of Colorado, Mr. JOHN SALAZAR.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the gentleman from Arkansas and his work with my Blue Dog colleagues in demanding more fiscal responsibility in Iraq. I believe that Congress has now approved nearly \$510 billion for military operations since 2001, with nearly no oversight on spending. Operation Iraqi Freedom alone has cost American taxpayers \$51 billion in 2003, \$77.3 billion in 2004, \$87.3 billion in 2005, \$104 billion in 2006, and in 2007 we are in the process of funding Operation Iraqi Freedom once again with a supplemental. Now we are spending over \$10 billion a month in Iraq and Afghanistan just on government contractors working on reconstruction. All of this is unchecked, and that is why I am so proud to join my Blue Dog colleagues as a supporter of H. Res. 97.

H. Res. 97 was introduced by the Blue Dog Coalition to call for transparency on how Iraq funds are spent. We have a plan for accountability in Iraq. Our plan calls for, first, transparency on how war funds are spent. Second of all, it creates a commission to investigate awarded contracts. Third of all, it stops the use of emergency supplementals to fund the war.

Everything that I have read over the past several years indicates that this is the first administration that has used supplementals to fund a war after the first year, after initiation. In January we passed what was called the PAYGO rule. It is my understanding that with supplementals, you don't have to follow PAYGO rules. I think it is critical that we as Blue Dogs continue to move forward and push for an honest budget.

Number four, it uses American resources to improve Iraq's ability to police itself. I believe that this is of critical importance.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot push democracy on someone who does not want it. Over 65 percent of the Iraqi population now says it is okay to shoot at American soldiers. The Iraqi Parliament a couple of weeks ago voted 144 out of 275 members to tell Americans that it is time for us to come home. We cannot force democracy on someone who does not want it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that today what is important is that we turn this over to the Iraqi Government. Our soldiers can become the advisors. They should not be on the front lines.

The gentleman talks about the Social Security Trust Fund. Two years ago I introduced the Social Security Protection Act, which would not allow any politician in Washington to touch that trust fund. I think the gentleman raises a critical point there.

He also talks about the veterans. I am the only veteran in the Colorado delegation. I am proud to be a Blue Dog, and I am proud that this legislation addresses the lack of oversight and accountability in Iraq. But I am also very proud that this resolution stands for veterans' issues.

Government reports have documented waste, fraud and abuse in Iraq. Contractors are being paid billions of dollars by the United States for their services in Iraq. Most of these, Mr. Speaker, are no-bid contracts. Where is the accountability in that? I believe that if their work is resulting in unsanitary conditions, potential health hazards, poor construction methods or significant cost overruns, then Congress has the right to know about it. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is time to stop this waste.

Congressional oversight is desperately needed. This administration should be held accountable for how reconstruction funds are being used. This Blue Dog bill is a commonsense proposal that ensures transparency and accountability. We bring oversight back to Congress. We start showing improvement in Iraq, and accountability leads directly to success. Iraqis must begin progress towards full responsibility for policing their own country. Without progress, it is a waste to continue U.S. investment in troops and financial services.

Mr. Speaker, I visited Iraq twice. While I have seen some improvements in some areas, I have also seen the increase in insurgent attacks not only on American troops, but on other Iraqis.

We all support our troops, and we will do everything within our power to make sure that they have the equipment and the funding that they need. However, Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to write blank checks to the administration. I firmly believe that until our last troop is returned home, the American people deserve to know how their money is being spent.

Accountability is not only patriotic, it often determines success from failure. The Blue Dog bill gives an opportunity to regain oversight responsi-

bility. This is the responsibility that we have to all of our men and women in uniform, to their parents and to the American taxpayer who is footing the bill.

The gentleman brings up another valid point. He talks about how the budget is a moral document. I, frankly, sir, could not run my household and put my farm into debt and pass the debt on to my children. That is exactly what has happened over the last 5 years. We had a surplus in the budget. The economy was doing great.

Democrats have a plan that by 2011 we will balance this budget. It is with the help of the Blue Dog Coalition, with the help of gentlemen like the gentleman from Arkansas, who is so committed to make sure there is accountability, that we will figure out a way to truly be honest with the American people in our budgets.

We want to put the Iraqi war supplemental back into the regular budget process so that we have a true, accurate picture of what our national debt is, what our deficit is. The gentleman was showing that we have \$8.8 trillion in debt right now. Well, I can assure the gentleman from Arkansas when I came into Congress in the last Congress, our national debt was \$78.045 trillion. Your share of that debt, your children's share of that debt, was back then \$26,000. I believe the figure you show now, Mr. ROSS, is some \$29,000, I believe \$29,174 and some cents.

I believe, Mr. ROSS, that this is morally wrong, and I believe that it is time for Congress to start being honest and report to the American people what troubles the last 5 years Congress has moved the American people toward. I have heard that by the year 2040, every single penny that comes in in Federal revenues will go to pay just the interest on the national debt. That is without running government. I believe that is morally wrong.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask this Congress, I would ask this Democratic Congress and the Blue Dog Coalition, to continue fighting for balanced budgets, to continue fighting for accountability, because that is what the American people want.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his active involvement in the Blue Dog Coalition and for his words this evening.

Some people may be saying, what is the Blue Dog Coalition? The Blue Dog Coalition was founded back in 1994 shortly after the Republicans took control of Congress by a group of conservative Democrats, Democrats that used to be Yellow Dog Democrats. The saying in the South is that a Democrat is so Democratic that they would vote for a yellow dog if a yellow dog was running for office. That is where the saying comes from.

There was a group of conservative Democrats back in 1994 that felt like they were being choked blue by the extremes of both parties. That is what the Blue Dog Coalition is all about. We

are a group of fiscally conservative Democrats that want to restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government. We don't care if it is a Democrat or Republican idea. We ask ourselves, is it a commonsense idea, and does it make sense for the people who send us here to be their voice in our Nation's Capital?

An active and leading member of the Blue Dog Coalition, an independent voice within the Congress from the State of Georgia, is Mr. David Scott. At this time I yield to him.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. ROSS. It is a pleasure, as always, to be on the floor with you and my fellow Blue Dogs.

I want to talk about two issues here that relate. One, of course, is the debt, the deficit that we have; the lack of accountability, financial accountability. But I would like to talk about it from the standpoint of what is really on the minds of the American people today, and that is the situation that faces us in Iraq and what we desperately need to do.

We need to do two things: One is be honest with the American people; and, two, be honest with the money that the American people send up here for us to apportion. Nowhere is that more significant than with military affairs.

As I stand here, Mr. ROSS, I am trying to think of the best illustration I can come up with that would kind of paint a picture for where we are. I think if we look back in history, a certain event took place around 1952 when we were in a similar position of debating this issue of who has control of military affairs or how do we deal with the issues in time of war. Is it the executive branch, or is it the Congress, and what is the role therein?

This debate is heated on those two things today. The President says Congress has no role in this. Congress says we definitely do. And we are right that we do.

□ 1830

It was borne out in a case in 1952 when there was a decision made by the Supreme Court when this issue came up on who had the right to determine whether the steel mills would be seized during a time of war, during the Korean War.

And it got so hot and heavy in that debate it went to the courts. Is it the Congress or is it the President? Well, the Supreme Court ruled on that which brings us to a point here today. But in the concurrence that was written by Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson, he said some very important, significant and prophetic words.

He said that this is a case that clearly fits within the realm of Congress's responsibility in a time of war. And in his concurrence he said that when the executive branch operates in tandem with the congressional branch, with congressional authority, he said that is a time of maximum power for the President. He said, but when the President acts counter to the express constitutional authority of the Congress,

he said, we enter into what he referred to then as a zone of twilight, or in essence a twilight zone which, quite ironically, is where Rod Sterling got the name for his television program "The Twilight Zone."

That is where we find ourselves here, in the twilight zone.

He went on to say, when we enter this twilight zone, the Presidency in at its lowest ebb when it does not recognize the authority of the Congress.

Our authority rests with the purse. Our authority rests with making sure that we raise and support the military. Our authority rests with legislation. And when you wrap those two things together, that is what is the embodiment of what we have captured in our resolution for financial responsibility and accountability in a time of war to make sure that the money is accounted for; to make sure when our troops are going into war, that they have the money for the armor.

That is exactly why when they were sent into war by this President and this administration without the body armor, we had to amend the appropriations bill with over \$200 million to get it in there, led by Democrats, led by Blue Dog Democrats, if you recall, to get the money in the budget for that.

The reason that happened is, up until January, this President has had the luxury of a rollover Congress that did exactly what he wanted them to do without even a whimper or a bang. They just rolled over, gave the President everything that he wanted, and we did not do the constitutional function of oversight, of making sure that there is financial accountability and responsibility in the actions that we are giving.

That is why it is important what we do today. Now this is incorporated into our presentation, into each of the bills that we have put forward. The status is now that these efforts are being worked between the House and the Senate. But I think it is very important for the public to also know that in this bill we have the accountability features in. But we also have the responsibility where we are not going to cut off any funds as long as our troops are in danger on the battlefield.

It is our hope, however, that we will be responsive to the American people and bring this matter to a close in terms of the loss of life of our soldiers that are caught in the cross hairs of a civil war.

Now, the Middle East is a region of vital interest, and there is absolutely no way we will ever be able to completely disappear from the Middle East, nor is that our intent. Nor is it the intent of the American people.

The point is our nose has been poked into a civil war, a civil war that has been festering for thousands of years between the Sunnis and the Shiites. That is their civil war. It is not right to have our soldiers in the middle of that. That needs to be brought back and we need to enter into a more rea-

sonable support of containment and redeployment of our troops, and in a manner that pays attention to the wear and tear on our military.

Mr. ROSS, it is shameful when we have to say that so many of our troops are over there for the third or fourth time. That is not right. The American people are against that. It is my hope that we will bring financial accountability and responsibility to this matter. The American people, who are very much engaged with us on this Iraq situation, are looking to Democrats; and quite honestly, they are looking to Blue Dog Democrats. They are looking to people who have fiscal responsibility and also understand that we know we are in a dangerous world.

The most important thing we need for our advancement right now is to make sure we have a strong defense and we have got that, but we also want our policies to be responsive to the American people. That is what the Democrats are putting forward as we move forward on our way out of this terrible civil war that our Nation finds itself in. We are going to do exactly that.

Mr. ROSS, it is a pleasure to be here, and I am sure the American people fully support our efforts and understand exactly what we are talking about when we say it is time to bring financial accountability and transparency to our efforts here on Capitol Hill, and nowhere is that more important than dealing with our military affairs and the men and women serving in harm's way overseas.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for joining us, as he does most Tuesday evenings.

At this time we are honored to be joined by a veteran of the Iraq war, a new Member of Congress, and I yield to Congressman MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ROSS for yielding me this time.

Just a few days ago we stood here, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my chairman, Congressman IKE SKELTON, who has two sons who are currently serving in the military, who is a great leader in this Congress. In the Defense bill, we did several things. We wanted to make sure that the troops knew that we supported them.

When we stood there, Congressman ROSS, we said thank you, Chairman SKELTON, because you believe what all Blue Dogs believe, accountability and responsibility. It established those benchmarks, that oversight which is so needed right now.

So in the Defense bill that gave the troops a 3.5 percent pay increase, a pay increase because there is such a gap, such a disparity between the private sector and our servicemen and women and their salaries. When they join the military, they are not trying to make a lot of money. But the fact is that those privates who are making \$17,000 a

year, those privates that are leaving their wives and kids at home, many of whom have to survive on food stamps, those privates who saw what we did in the Defense bill, who said that is great, 3.5 percent pay increase, a couple hundred dollars a year. The President of the United States said, Private, thank you for your service to your country, but that is too much of a pay increase.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people at home are watching. The President of the United States said a couple hundred dollars more a year to a private making \$17,000 a year is too much.

Now the Blue Dog Coalition believes in two things: one, fiscal responsibility; two, strong national defense.

How do the soldiers feel that are running convoys up and down Ambush Alley, scouting on the streets for roadside bombs and looking for snipers on rooftops, when they hear their President back at home, the President of the United States thinks a couple hundred dollars more a year is too much. The President says, hey, it would add up over the next 5 years, \$7.3 billion; that is a lot of money.

But the same standard that the President uses where he says it is too much for the troops, it is not too much for the contractors who have proven that they mismanage over \$9 billion of our hard-earned money, the contractors who don't want any accountability and don't want to see the light of day.

The President has threatened to veto the pay raise of our soldiers. I believe that is morally wrong during a time of war, especially when you are saying we are not asking for a 10 percent or 20 percent or 30 percent increase in their pay when they make \$17,000, just a couple hundred dollars more a year, not even reaching \$1,000 more. The President says no.

In the Defense bill that we passed that the President has said he will veto, and this was not some sly comment he said as an aside, the President pointed to a document and said, a 3.5 percent increase is too much.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that everyone in America write the President of the United States and say 3.5 percent increase in pay for our troops is not too much to ask for; a 3.5 percent increase during the Memorial Day weekend when we honor their servicemembers is not too much to ask for.

This is a pattern, Mr. Speaker, that upsets me greatly, a pattern of neglect that this White House has for our troops. See, when I was in Baghdad in 138-degree heat and this White House and the Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld floated out the idea and said, Let's take away their imminent danger pay, their combat pay, a couple hundred dollars a month, because mission is accomplished. Let's take away their combat pay. It's over.

Now, fast forward 4 years later, the President says, hey, 3.5 percent is too much. This is a pattern of neglect of our troops. It is okay when the President wants to use our troops as props

for a fancy speech in the Rose Garden. But when it comes to budget time when budgets are moral documents, the President says, too much. I respectfully beg to differ.

When we look at the debt of our country, just under \$9 trillion, with \$29,000 that every single man, woman and child in the United States owes towards our national debt. In March, 2007, we paid \$21 billion in interest alone. Does it get any better? No. Why? Because there is no accountability. There is no tightening of the belt. It is wrong to pass this debt, this \$9 trillion of debt, on to our children. That is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, when I know my wife, Jenny, and daughter, Maggie, are home in Bristol, in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, when I know that they are watching on C-SPAN, I know that they know that their daddy and husband is fighting a good fight. They know that I cannot stand here in good conscience, Mr. Speaker, and allow this President to use our troops as props and yet can't give them a couple hundred dollars of pay increase to try to alleviate some of the pay disparity with the private sector.

I can't stand here in good conscience and pay our good tax dollars, \$21 billion a month, just to pay the interest, without cutting off the spending spigot.

We need to rein in the spending of this country. The Blue Dogs are absolutely committed to doing that. We need partners from the other side of the aisle. We might be Democrats, and there might be Republicans on the other side of the aisle, but we are all Americans and we all owe \$9 trillion in debt in America to foreign countries like Communist China and Mexico and Japan.

Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. Enough is enough, and the Blue Dog Coalition, my brothers and sisters in this coalition, are taking the floor of the House of Representatives and all across America. We need the help of the American people to make sure people understand what is at stake. What is at stake is the future of America. What is at stake is the security, the financial security, of our country and the country that our children will inherit.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time tonight.

Mr. ROSS. I thank Congressman MURPHY from Pennsylvania for his insight and life experiences as a veteran of the Iraq War, and for sharing his thoughts with us this evening as we demand accountability and common sense on how your tax money, some \$12 million an hour of your tax money, is being spent in Iraq. It is important, we believe, that we make sure that it is being spent on our troops, to protect and support them, and that it be accounted for.

□ 1845

That's what H. Res. 97 is all about, and we're very pleased, and we want to

thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SKELTON, for including key provisions of our legislation, written in part by Mr. MURPHY, in the Defense authorization bill this year.

I yield to an active member of the Blue Dog Coalition, gentleman from the State of Tennessee (Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS).

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for the recognition. I'll be very brief, which is difficult for me to do, being from the mountains of Tennessee. Sometimes I get a little wordy. I had one of my folks back home tell me that after I'd been here for about a year, he said, LINCOLN, you've gotten so windy as those folks in Washington, I believe you could blow up an onion sack. I'm not sure exactly what he meant by that, but I had to tone down my rhetoric somewhat after that.

But it's good to be here to talk about accountability and, quite frankly, how the lack of accountability has gotten us in the situation we're in in Iraq, as well as in our budget management. When we take a look at how the growth of government grew through the 1980s up to the early 1990s, in 1992, we were spending roughly 22 percent of gross domestic product on national expenditures, on our budgetary process, Mr. Speaker.

And through the 1990s, we saw a downsizing of government through the Clinton-Gore years, where we were spending roughly 18.5 percent of gross domestic product. We now have seen that jump to the point to where it's somewhat over 20 percent in gross domestic product. We've seen government grow the last 6 years. We saw it downsized during the Clinton-Gore administration, and the 12 years prior to that we saw it grow to where it was well over 22 percent.

So, when we talk about accountability, let's be sure that America understands, Mr. Speaker, that it has certainly not been the Democratic Party that has made that happen. Under our management, under our watch, we saw a downsizing of government expenditures.

I want to move now to Iraq. I recently had an opportunity to visit the White House, Mr. Speaker, with our President, along with 12 or 13 other Members. We had a very frank conversation. In one of the conversations, the comment was made that we have a strong commitment in the Middle East, and we do have a strong commitment there.

We denied Hitler during World War II being able to obtain the oil in the Middle East. The tanks of Rommel ran out of fuel, and we were able, quite frankly, through the mass force we had, 16 million Americans, as well as help from Europe during World War II, the Allied Forces were able to eventually conquer Germany.

We then continued to be there and have a presence all through the Cold

War, which also denied the Russians from being able to obtain the oil that was there.

There's no doubt in my mind that we're going to be in the Middle East for a long time when we leave the war zone and the hostile war zones of Iraq.

And as we made that conversation, Mr. Speaker, our President certainly agreed with that, that we have a long-term commitment and an interest in the Middle East for many years to come, and we will have. It's kind of like 1953, in South Korea, when Eisenhower decided a cease-fire would be in order, and we signed a cease-fire and have been maintaining troops in South Korea since 1953. We'll be in the Middle East for a long, long time. After the first Persian Gulf War, we maintained a presence there in the Middle East, and we'll still do that. It's how we stay that determines whether or not we'll win.

What my real concern is about this situation in Iraq is I don't think, Mr. Speaker, this administration, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, this President understands the gravity of what's going on in the Middle East.

Every country in the Middle East, some our friends supposedly and some might continue to be our friends, during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, the Shah of Iran was also our friend. When the ayatollahs took over, we lost that friendship, and Iran no longer maintained our friendship. But in places like Saudi Arabia, in Kuwait, in the Emirates, when you look at Jordan, King Abdullah, a decree made him King, not an election. He is our friend, and I personally like King Abdullah, but he had an uncle named Prince Hassan that most folks thought would eventually go on to be King of Jordan. That didn't happen.

So, when we talk about having a free-standing democracy in the Middle East, in Iraq, I'm puzzled somewhat that that becomes one of the major objectives to determine whether or not we win. We need to have stability in Iraq, stability, Mr. Speaker. My hope is that eventually a democracy will occur.

For us to assume that the Shias, the Sunnis and the Kurds, in one of the most volatile mixed populations in any country in the Middle East, that we, you notice I say we, we're going to use that country as a model of how we democratize the Middle East, I think, is a flawed failure, will continue to be, and will be something that will be unsuccessful.

If, in fact, this administration, led by our President, had decided that we ought to have democracy in the Middle East, maybe he should have started with this gentleman he's holding hands with, the monarchy, the royal family of Saudi Arabia. I wonder how many times this administration, Mr. Speaker, how many times this President, Mr. Speaker, has talked to the royal family of Saudi Arabia and say, wouldn't it be nice to have in Saudi Arabia a thriving democracy, a freestanding democracy.

I wonder how many times, Mr. Speaker, this President, Mr. Rumsfeld and others, Mr. Speaker, asked the people of Kuwait after being liberated in 1991 that you should establish a democracy and not revert back to the royal families, to be dictatorial in the decisions that you made.

Every nation in the Middle East has a strongman-type government, except for Israel and except for Lebanon. Whether it's Syria, whether it's Iran, Iraq had theirs, the Emirates, Qatar, every country over there has a strongman-type government, and we believe that for us to consider having one, that we've got to democratize Iraq. I think that's a flawed policy, and, Mr. Speaker, I hope our President engages with this Congress to try to find some solutions to how we establish stability in the Middle East and certainly in Iraq.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his insight, and, Mr. Speaker, if you've got any comments, questions or concerns of us, you can e-mail us at bluedog@mail.house.gov. Again, Mr. Speaker, if you've got any comments, questions or concerns for us, you can e-mail us at bluedog@mail.house.gov.

This is the Special Order with members of the 43-Member-strong, fiscally conservative, Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. We are committed to trying to restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government, and a former cochair of the group and active member of the group from the State of California (Mr. CARDOZA), I yield to him.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas, and I appreciate him yielding.

Today I rise because on Monday I reintroduced a bill the Blue Dogs had endorsed last year, H.R. 2402, the Public Official Accountability Act.

The Blue Dogs just aren't fiscally responsible, Mr. Speaker, but we're responsible in a number of other ways, and one is accountability of the Members of this institution to make sure that we uphold the public trust.

H.R. 2402 gives judges the discretion to increase the sentence for public officials convicted of certain enumerated crimes that violate the public trust. If a public official has been convicted of bribery, fraud, extortion or theft of public funds greater than \$10,000, a sentencing judge should have the discretion to double the length of a sentence up to 2 years for those public officials convicted of such ethical violations.

Unfortunately, recent scandals have somewhat tarnished the reputation of this great institution and have stretched the bonds of trust between the public and their government. This bill signals that breaches of the public trust will not be condoned and, therefore, will help to restore the bonds of trust that have been frayed.

The 110th Congress has already taken steps to ensure that public officials ad-

here to the highest ethical standards and are more accountable for their actions. Banning meals, constricting congressional travel, and tightening the lobbying rules are all important first steps that have already been taken; however, much more needs to be done. It will take a concerted effort and some time to overcome the spate of negative examples of public officials abusing the trust conferred upon them.

For government to function effectively, the public must be able to trust the people making decisions in this institution. My bill will help restore that bond of trust between public officials and the people they represent. By holding ourselves to the highest ethical standards, we are making clear that we have heard the message of the people who are demanding honesty and accountability of their leaders.

I urge my colleagues to support me in this effort and to become cosponsors of my bill. A number of Members have already signed on, and I hope the rest of my colleagues will join them. Let's pass this bill and restore the faith that our constituents have in their public institutions.

As we're talking about accountability, you've raised the Blue Dog Coalition debt poster that we have in front of our offices. I'm disturbed, as we always are, that every single day that poster goes up. We've done a lot of work as Blue Dogs to restore accountability in the fiscal side. We have put into the House rules PAYGO rules that say you have to pay as you go. We need to work on statutory PAYGO yet some more. There's some more things that we need to do. We're not finished with this, but clearly we have been heard in this House, and we are changing the culture.

This bill that I've brought forward today during our Blue Dog hour will also change the culture. It will send an important message that don't commit the crime if you can't do the time. We say that to common burglars and drug offenders all throughout our society. We also should say it to those same common criminals that perpetrate their crimes in the halls of Congress.

So, today, I stand with my Blue Dog colleagues, as we always do during this Blue Dog hour, to ask for accountability in this Congress, accountability in our country, accountability with our finances. I'm just so proud to be a member of this organization.

Thank you for yielding to me, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to get this bill inserted into the ethics bill that's going through the House this week or as a stand-alone measure later in the Congress.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California and could not agree with him more. There's a lot of folks that believe Members of Congress are held to a different standard, and they should be. They should be held to a much greater standard, a much harsher sentence than the average citizen on the street, because if

Members of Congress can come here and make laws, they ought to abide by those laws they make. And if they can't, they should have additional time put onto their sentence.

And I want to thank the gentleman from California for trying to work with those of us in the Blue Dog Coalition to clean up the mess here in Washington.

I'm very pleased at this time to yield the time that is left if he would like it to the cochair for administration for the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend Mr. Ross for yielding, and I'm very proud of him. He's obviously one of our elected leaders of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition and does a great job. I'm very proud of him, and I'm very proud of the other 42 members of the Blue Dogs who deliver this message to the American public that accountability and good stewardship of our tax dollars does matter.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS) was here earlier talking about the 1990s and how we extracted ourselves from a fiscal mess where we were experiencing huge and systemic annual deficits, and how this government worked hard during the 1990s under a Democratic President and Republican-led Congress in a bipartisan way, worked real hard to pare down what government was doing and make the revenues come into balance with the expenditures.

We did that during the course of the 1990s under a divided government, but, Mr. Speaker, none of us like taxes. We live in America, the greatest country on the face of the Earth. I talk about this regularly with my constituents back home in north Florida, that America is the greatest country on the face of the Earth. We're the most successful democracy. We're the most successful, greatest economy in the history of mankind. We have the greatest military machine in the history of mankind.

I tell my constituents that 25 percent of the world's wealth is controlled by 5 percent of the world's population. That's what America is. One out of every 20 people live in America, and we control 25 percent of the world's wealth. We have a gross domestic product that exceeds, I don't know, \$13-, \$14 trillion a year.

And we have the greatest military machine on the face of the Earth ever assembled. You can amass the military of all the other 193 countries. It will not equal, Mr. Speaker, the firepower that the United States of America can bring to bear.

I tell my constituents that that great wealth and that great military power, with it comes a great responsibility in this world to use that wealth and that power in a responsible and careful manner.

□ 1900

Now, none of us like to pay taxes. None of us like to pay taxes. Our job, as Members of the United States Congress, House of Representatives, is to make sure that we are good stewards of the taxpayers' money that our good citizens send up here for us to run the country.

Now, a great deal of that money is spent on our national defense, the number one priority of this Nation. None of us on this House floor ever like to vote against defense dollars that are being spent around the world where we ask our men and women to go put on the uniform and defend our values and our freedom and our causes around the world.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 6 years, I think the greatest act of omission that has been perpetrated by this Congress is the lack of oversight that has been exercised by this Congress over the executive branch when it comes to how we spend those tax dollars.

Six years ago, our national defense budget was in the neighborhood of \$400 billion; today it is in excess of \$650 billion. That's about 5 percent of our gross domestic product. There are not many countries, if any, around the world, that spend that much on their military.

Our American citizens, our people back home, don't mind us doing that. They like for us to do it. But they want to know that when they send that money to Washington, somebody is making sure that it's spent wisely, and we are good stewards of that.

What has happened over the last 6 years, when we had one party come in control of the White House, and the House and the Senate, the oversight role by Congress has been abdicated. It's not the first time it happened. It happened before when the Democrats controlled everything.

But in this case it was the Republican Party that was in the majority. As a result, we have seen systemic deficits built in. We have seen a situation where there has been no oversight exercised by the House of Representatives and the Senate over the administration, and the Congress just got in the mode of rubber-stamping everything that the administration wanted, and ultimately, we had some problems. Some arrogance developed, some corruption developed.

That's basically when the American people stood up in November and said, no more, we don't want that any more. We think a divided government works best.

As Blue Dogs, we want to work with the Members on the other side of the aisle in making sure that the American people's money, when it comes to Washington, is spent wisely and is accounted for.

I wanted to remind our citizens back home that this chart in front of us that shows the \$8.8 trillion national debt is for real, and that money has got to be paid back by somebody, or at least in-

terest on it has to be paid back; and we ought to stop increasing that number on a daily basis. That's what the Blue Dogs are all about. Let's make sure that the tax money that we collect from American citizens is spent wisely, and that we exercise good stewardship as we see about the people's business of the United States of America.

I am proud to be a Member of the U.S. House with my good friends on both sides of the aisle. I'm proud to be an American. I want to thank my friend from Arkansas for the time.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

In the hour we have been on the floor this evening talking about the need to restore common sense and fiscal accountability to our Nation's government, we have seen the national debt increase by at least \$40 million.

Today, the U.S. national debt is \$8,807,559,710,099. And for every man, woman and child in America, their share of the national debt is \$29,174. Every Tuesday night, those of us in the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition take to the floor of the House to demand that we pass commonsense solutions to this problem, because it affects all of us. It's time that we restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 21, 2007, I was not present for two votes in order to attend a ceremony awarding the BJ Stupak Memorial Fund scholarships.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 698, the Industrial Bank Holding Company Act (House rollcall vote 384).

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 1425, the Staff Sergeant Marvin "Rex" Young Post Office Building (House rollcall vote 385).

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the floor tonight, like I have so often in recent weeks, to talk a little bit about health care in our country. The delivery of health care services is one of the things that may not be the first thing that registers in any poll that's taken in this country, but it's sure third or fourth, and it appears in every poll that is taken in this country.

We are, indeed, on the threshold of what might be called a transformational time as far as how health care services are delivered in this country. Certainly, over the remaining 18 months of the 110th Congress, we are going to have several different issues before us, several different times, where we will be able to talk about and

debate various aspects of our health care system.

Of course, just of necessity, as a big part of the Presidential election that will occur in the 18 months time, we will deal with the issues surrounding health care and the delivery of health care services in this country. We will be deciding, what road do we want to go if we have a system in our country now where about half is delivered, half of every health care dollar that is spent originates here in the U.S. Congress, and the other half comes from the private sector, uncompensated care and so-called charity care.

What do we want to see grow? What do we want to see encouraged? What do we want to see improved? Do we want to grow the public sector or do we want to grow the private sector?

Certainly expanding the government sector and its involvement in delivery of services, terms you will hear talked about on the floor of this House, things like universal health care, health care for all—in the early 1990s, we called it "Hillary care"—or do we want to encourage the private sector?

Do we want to encourage the private sector to stay involved in the delivery of health care services in this country, to be sure, to be certain, whether it's public or private, that the dollars that are spent are spent wisely to expand the coverage that's generally available for our citizens of this country. But these two options, and all of the questions and concerns that surround them, this is what we are going to have to decide in this House, certainly within the 18 months that remain in the 110th Congress, or very quickly after we enter into the 111th Congress.

I am hopeful that by visiting with you on some of these things tonight, providing some explanations and some insights into the directions that we might go, or we could consider going, and at its heart, at its core, I think we need to bear in mind that for all of the criticisms that are out there, and we have heard several of them here in the last hour, but for all the criticisms out there about this country and, in particular, its health care system, we do have a health care system that is indeed the envy of the world.

We have people from all over the world who come to the various medical centers over the United States to receive their care there. I believe, my position is, that we want to be certain that we maintain the excellence in the health care system that we have today, improve those parts that need improving, but don't sacrifice the excellence that exists in many areas of our country.

Some people are going to say, well, that's an overstatement that the United States health care system is a good one. They will look at, cite the numbers of the uninsured, they will start to cite the high cost of prescription drugs. There is no question that these are tough issues that this House is going to have to tackle.

Face it, you can pretty much manipulate statistics and numbers any way that you want to. The old adage is that there are lies, there are darn lies, and there are statistics. We have to be careful about how we ask the question and how we frame the question. We have to also be careful that we don't frame the question just so we get the answer that we want, and that we don't effect any improvement for the American people.

But let's talk a little bit about the history, about the background of how we got the system that we have today, how we got where we are today.

So, actually, if we go back and look at our country during the time of World War II, President Roosevelt felt that he had to do something to prevent wartime inflation from simply overtaking the economy. In an effort to do that, he put in place wage and price controls and told employers that, well, employees' wages would be frozen at certain amounts.

Well, employers were having a tough time keeping employees anyway. Many people were off fighting the war or were otherwise involved in the war effort. So employees that were here in this country and available were at a premium. So the employer wanted to do something to ensure that he kept his workforce on the job. And one of the things that they thought about doing was, what if we offer a health care benefit? Is that something that we can do that we will still not violate the spirit of the wage controls that President Roosevelt has imposed?

Indeed, they got a Supreme Court ruling on this subject, and the Supreme Court said that, no, health care benefits would be outside the scope of the wage and price controls. Health care benefits are something that you can make available to your employees, and in fact, you can make those available to employees, and neither the employee nor the employer will be taxed on those dollars that are so spent.

We came out of the Second World War, of course, victorious; at the same time, we had an economy that was just beginning the postwar boom. That economy that was so robust after the war led to the creation of more jobs, more employment. Indeed, the health care benefit was a benefit that was attractive; it was one that people liked. Indeed, it was one that stuck around and persevered and grew over time.

But we were also right at the beginning of a lot of pent-up demand as far as people starting their families, and we saw families start to have children. Boy, did they have children. This was the initiation of the so-called baby-boom generation.

The United States, like many other allies coming out of the Second World War, the United States was really in a unique position, both economically, and from the standpoint that the war was not fought in our backyard, in contrast to Western Europe, we actually were in pretty good shape coming out of the Second World War.

Contrast that to Western Europe, and even Great Britain, ostensibly a victor in the Great War, but at the same time, their economy was in much tougher shape; and when you get onto the continent of Europe, indeed, a good deal more difficulty with the economic recovery in the time immediately following the Second World War.

So a single-payer health care system of necessity was a requirement that the government needed to stand up and stand up in a hurry in order to prevent a significant humanitarian crisis that might otherwise have existed. In order to uphold the health care of their citizens, these governments were required to set up systems in a fairly short period of time.

Fast forward 20 years from 1945 to 1965, and we have the initiation of Medicare, and, shortly thereafter, of the program now known as Medicaid. These programs were signed into law by another Texas President; agreeably, of note, he was from across the aisle, but another Texas President signed these programs into law.

Today, these large government-run programs are focused. Initially they were created to focus on hospital care for the elderly and basic health care services for individuals who are less well off. Now, decades later—1965, when the Medicare program was started—decades later it was evident that the government-run program was slow to change, in need of reform, and it operated at an expense that was just unthought of at the time of the inception of the program. The expense of running Medicare was truly extraordinary.

□ 1915

By 2003, Congress certainly recognized the outdated model, and was called upon by the President here in this Chamber. President Bush in the first State of the Union Address that I attended as a Member of Congress stood in this House and said: The problem of providing a prescription drug benefit to our seniors is too important to wait for another Congress; it is too important to wait for another President; and it is work we are going to take up this year with this Congress, and we are going to get this done.

Indeed, the President was correct, and that happened. By the end of 2003, the Medicare Modernization Act, that did provide for a prescription drug benefit we now know as the part D section of Medicare, was signed into law, and 2 years later it began to deliver on that promise and deliver prescription benefits to senior citizens who previously had not had access to a prescription drug program.

But it was clear that the government system needed to catch up to what by comparison was a relatively robust private system that was already doing the things required, focusing on things like disease management and disease prevention.

The good work done by the people at the National Institutes of Health over

the previous 40 years had certainly set the stage for what we now recognize as a virtual explosion in preventive care. The premature cardiac deaths prevented by research done and delivered by the National Institutes of Health, probably somewhere between 800,000 and 1 million lives from the mid-1960s to the present time, over that 40-year interval, probably 1 million lives that have been saved or 1 million premature deaths that have been prevented by advances in treatment and prevention of heart disease, which in 1965 was certainly a more serious illness or affected a good number of people. And the problem was that oftentimes the first symptom of cardiac disease in 1965 was sudden death.

We no longer think in terms of cardiac disease as extracting that type of toll from our citizens, and that is largely because of the benefits that are there, benefits provided by the medicines like the statins that lower cholesterol, that are able to prevent and postpone the serious aspects of cardiac disease.

So Congress passed the Medicare prescription drug plan that gives seniors coverage for medication. The program has been successful, providing greater benefits for seniors. It did not come without considerable discussion and considerable argument back and forth. But with a massive push by the Department of Health and Human Services, the success of the Medicare prescription drug program now, I think, is clearly evident. But, at the same time, the private sector also continued to improve and expand, and it kind of brings us to the crossroads where we find ourselves today.

Again, at the present time the government pays for about half of all health care administered in this country. The current gross domestic product is roughly \$11 trillion, and the Department of Health and Human Services, with its Medicare and Medicaid services alone, costs this country each year upwards of \$600 billion. Add to that the expense for the VA, Indian Health Service, Federal Prison Service, and clearly you can see that we are getting quickly to that number which represents 50 percent out of every health care dollar that is spent in this country originating in this Congress.

Again, the other half is broken down, with the primary weight being carried by private industry, commercial insurance. There is also some charitable and some self-pay accounting for the balance of that number.

As the numbers increase for just the overall expense of health care, and the Federal Government continues to have to put more and more of the American taxpayers' dollars into health care, we have got to ask ourselves, are we using the taxpayer dollar wisely? Is the government providing excellence as far as managing money when it spends dollars for health care? Is the government better suited to make decisions about

health care than families? Who is better suited to handle the growing health care requirements in this country?

Now, a government-only universal health care system tends to be more inflexible. In America, my concern is that it will hamper our innovation and delivery of some of the most modern health care services available anywhere in the world.

Two specific examples that a private-based system is more flexible and less expensive. Look at what goes on to our northern neighbor in Canada, a government-run system that took over health care shortly after the Second World War. It is a universal system, and the Canadians are very proud of their system, and rightly so. But there are some trade-offs, and one of the trade-offs is there can be a wait for health care services. In fact, the Canadian Supreme Court ruled in 2005 that access to a waiting list was not the same thing as access to care, and that in some instances the waiting list was, in fact, health care denied to Canadian citizens. And the Supreme Court required that the Canadian system remedy that.

But in Canada, if you find yourself with a diagnosis and a treatment, but a long time between that diagnosis and treatment, people who have the cash can certainly travel across the border to the south into the United States and find that they can have whatever it is they have been placed on a waiting list that seems interminable; whether it be a cardiac catheterization, a CAT scan, an MRI, they find they get it much more quickly than if they simply waited it out in Canada.

So, we have to ask ourselves, is our health or the health of someone in our family something with which we are willing to gamble that that length of time, that that delay won't cause problems, won't increase the morbidity for that particular disease process, won't lead to a lower expectation of a cure or salvage with whatever that particular diagnosis is?

The British Isles, where they have a similar type of system, they have a National Health Service. Again, very famous. Britons love the system. But, in fact, they also have a private system that coexists within their country. And if the National Health Service is not able to get to someone in a timely manner, and if that patient or their family has the funds available to expend, then indeed they can be seen in the private system. And for patients who are concerned that they might not survive their wait, or they are living with significant disability, this is a choice that they are willing to make.

But the reality is, again, our population is getting older and older, and if you ask someone who is in their sixth decade, seventh decade, eighth decade of life to wait for 4 months, 6 months, 8 months, 12 months or longer for a procedure or a diagnostic test, we, in fact, are consuming a significant amount of the available time they have left, and this, in fact, is not a fair allocation of health services.

So my premise would be that the private sector, with all of its difficulties, with all of its faults, is more nimble and is a more suitable and stable arena from which we can build our health care system in the future.

This is a complex relationship; and how Congress instructs the medical care in this country be done is largely going to determine if we have the best health care system possible. Certainly, it is incumbent upon Congress to promote policies that help the public sector maintain efficiency and become efficient in areas where it is not efficient, and, at the same time, allow the private sector to lead the way with innovation and development of new therapies, new techniques, and new ways of tackling old problems.

Now, one of the things that immediately comes to mind any time you have a discussion about health care is the issue with the uninsured. The uninsured population in this country is estimated by the United States Census Bureau to be somewhere around 46 million people. Now, within that group, I would argue that access to health care is not frequently the issue; it is the coverage that is the issue, because there always exists an emergency room someplace where care can be delivered urgently. But we all know the problem there is you don't always get your best result if you put off the treatment or the diagnosis until such time as it just no longer will allow itself to be put off, and we can increase the cost of health care by delivering health care under that model. But I would stress that in this country, it is not lack of access to health care, because those access points do exist, but it is lack of access to coverage that drives a lot of this debate.

Now, some of the things that have happened, and two examples that we should talk about, and, in fact, they are issues that we are going to need to take up within this Congress, because both programs require reauthorization, are the State Children's Health Insurance Program, or the SCHIP program, and Federally Qualified Health Centers.

Now, currently the children's health insurance operates as a joint Federal-State partnership. It certainly provides some flexibility for States to determine the standards of providing health care and funding for those children who are not eligible for Medicaid, but whose parents truly cannot afford health insurance. The program has been successful, and it has been successful across the board.

As we look to reauthorize the program this year, I think one of the things we can do and should do is clarify the fact that it is children's health insurance. While the intent of the legislation is clear, some States have opted to spend their funds on individuals other than children or pregnant adults. In an effort to correct this process, I introduced H.R. 1013, making certain that the SCHIP funds are spent ex-

clusively on children and pregnant women, not on other groups. We don't cover every child who should be covered under the SCHIP program; and, until we do, it only makes sense that we restrict the funding, again, for children and for pregnant women, who are obviously going to be having a child in the near future, so that child can be covered during the prenatal period. But to take those dollars that should be spent covering children when not every child is covered in this country and spend that covering nonpregnant adults seems to undo the intent of the legislation.

Now, if our intent is to provide other coverage for other individuals, let's have that debate, let's have that discussion, let's have that vote. But let's keep those dollars that are designated to provide health care for children providing health care for children.

But SCHIP is an example where children and pregnant women can receive additional medical coverage which otherwise would not be available to them through the Medicaid program. And, certainly, there are some people who are now covered by SCHIP who previously would have fallen into the broad category as the uninsured.

Other ways of coverage for those individuals who are not children, who are not pregnant, there is access to care. If a Federally Qualified Health Center is available in the area, certainly health care can be gained through an FQHC. The patient has access to health care without insurance. In fact, 15 million of that number of the uninsured can access their health care through a Federally Qualified Health Center. A medical home, continuity of care, see the same doctor every time, in some instances have dental and other coverage, have some coverage for prescription drugs. This is real care available to real people, and it is care that should not be discounted, because it is available to all persons in the community regardless of ability to pay, and it is a program that has been up and running for 35 years. It is a program that is providing care today.

Both SCHIP and the Federally Qualified Health Center program were designed to help the poorest, the youngest, and those underserved in our communities. What about individuals that can afford to pay some of their health care services? Two programs that would assist individuals and their companies in receiving health care coverage, health savings accounts and association health plans.

Health savings accounts, previously known as medical savings accounts, are a tax-advantaged savings account that is available to taxpayers who are enrolled in a high-deductible insurance plan, an insurance plan with lower premiums and higher deductibles than a traditional health plan. Sometimes that is referred to as a catastrophic health plan, but it is with a difference, because you can put money away up to an amount that is \$5,000 for a married

couple. You can put money away in a tax-deferred or tax-free savings account. That money must be used only to pay for health care services in the future, but that money grows over time and can be a significant source of health care funds for an individual or a couple as they go through life.

For the health savings accounts, the funds are contributed to the account, they are not subject to income tax, and they can only be used to pay for qualified medical expenses. But the best part of having a health savings account is that all deposits to an HSA become the property of the policyholder regardless of the source of the deposit. So that means whether it is the individual themselves or their employer who deposits that money into the health savings account, the actual policyholder is the owner of those dollars designated for health care.

□ 1930

And patients have a say in how and when they spend their health care dollars; any funds deposited but not withdrawn each year carry over to the next year. And the popularity of HSAs has grown considerably since their inception.

Now remember, medical savings accounts were started a little over 10 years ago in the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill that was passed in 1996. With the Medicare Modernization Act in 2003, the health savings accounts became the follow-on from the medical savings account. These were expanded. The number of companies offering insurance greatly expanded, a lot of the restrictions were removed, and health savings accounts really represent the full measure of what the old medical savings account attempted to achieve, but it just simply had too many regulations in its way to allow itself to come to fruition.

But numbers from 2005, by December of 2005, some 3.2 million individuals had coverage from a HSA. Of that number, 42 percent of those individuals or families had incomes below \$50,000 and were purchasing health savings account-type insurance. The HSAs are an affordable option.

In addition, the number of previously uninsured HSA plan purchasers over the age of 60 nearly doubled, proving that plans are accessible to people of all ages. And really, the proof of that, for a young person in the mid-1990s, getting out of college, perhaps going to go into business for themselves, didn't want to go to work for a big company, no longer can be carried on their parents' health insurance, almost impossible to buy health insurance coverage at any price. I know, because I tried in the mid-1990s to do just that for one of my children.

Fast forward to the present time. Go on the Internet, your search engine of choice, type in health savings accounts, and very quickly, with a few clicks, you'll be with a menu that has a number of options available as far as

health savings accounts are concerned. And a high deductible, reputable company, PPO plan in the State of Texas for a male, 25 years of age, nonsmoker, these premiums run about \$65 a month.

Yes, you do have a high deductible. Yes, until that high deductible is funded with tax-deferred, pretax dollars that are going to go into that health savings account to grow over time and provide the offset for that high deductible, sure, during the first year or early years of having a health savings account, things like preventive care are not necessarily going to be covered. Those are expenses that will have to be paid for out of pocket because most people, fortunately, will not get to the limit of their deductible.

A young person needs a flu shot. They're probably going to have to write a check for that out of personal funds. But over time, that so-called medical IRA will grow and, again, it grows tax deferred and so it can begin to grow quite quickly.

Albert Einstein one time said the most powerful force for good known to man was the miracle of compound interest. That money will grow over time. So for a young person especially, starting that type of account, again, that that can be very powerful.

Now, of the 46 million Americans who are uninsured, nearly 60 percent of them are employed, and they're employed within a small business. Some of these individuals prefer a more traditional health plan than a HSA, but their employer, the small business for whom they work, find offering a health benefit is either nonexistent or just quite simply too expensive for them to provide.

To take some of the burden off of the small employer who wants to provide insurance for their employee, Congress has devised the concept of what is known as association health plans. This allows small businesses a similar business model, or business plan, to band together to get the purchasing power of a much larger corporation in order to provide more cost-effective insurance coverage to their employees.

A group of realtors, for example, or a group of Chambers of Commerce, or medical offices or dental offices or insurance offices, these groups would be able to form a purchasing unit that would be able to purchase health care, again, get the purchasing clout of a much larger group than a small office could ever provide by itself.

This legislation has passed the House of Representatives twice in the 108th Congress, twice in the 109th Congress. It never could get through the Senate, and I believe it is still an important concept and one which we need to come together and work on.

We heard the group before me talking about how important it was to have a bipartisan effort on these issues, and I certainly welcome that spirit, and would suggest we do need to have a bipartisan effort on working out these types of problems for the American

people, because association health plans might not bring down the number of uninsured acutely, right away, but it will certainly help stem the number of small employers who are finding it increasingly difficult to provide insurance for their employees.

So it will bend that growth curve of the uninsured that has gone inexorably upward. It will bend that growth curve of the uninsured in a much more favorable direction.

But I think we also heard from the President this year when he talked in the State of the Union address, he talked a little bit about perhaps providing some tax relief to individuals who are self-employed, who would purchase insurance but, gosh, I've got to buy it with after-tax dollars, and that just adds to the expense. So the President was talking about providing some measure of tax relief for individuals who wish to have their own insurance policy.

He also talked about putting a cap on the upper limit of insurance benefits that would be able to be offered by a company to an employee and come to that employee as an untaxed benefit.

One of the things in addition to the issues that the President brought up and one of the things that I think this Congress should look at as perhaps a follow-on or extension to what the President was talking about, would be to provide, whether you call it vouchers, whether you call it tax credits for people who lack insurance, whether you call it premium support, to buy down the cost of the premiums so that a person who is employed, but says those health insurance premiums are just too expensive for me to afford. If we can help that individual pay that premium cost, that keeps the individual off of the Medicaid rolls. So it keeps them from being a governmental expense and allows them to participate in their employer's insurance plan, which has an advantage of keeping the insurance plan that the employer offers a viable one because more employees will be participating; and over time, perhaps that employer will find that they can indeed reach a stage in their employment where they are, in fact, able to carry the cost of the premium expense themselves.

But the concept of premium support not mentioned by the President during his State of the Union address, but one which I feel very strongly is an issue that should be explored by this Congress, it is a concept that we should study, and I think come up with a solution that would be a benefit for the American people.

Well, one of the other things that I do want to talk about in the context of all of these things that I've discussed with health care is, we've got to be careful we're not putting the cart before the horse. A conversation with Alan Greenspan about a year and a half ago, just as he was leaving the Federal Reserve Board, the obvious question came up, how in the world is Congress

ever going to pay for Medicare in the future?

He thought about it. He said, at some point, when the time comes, the Congress will do the right thing and figure out a way to pay for Medicare. He paused and then said, what concerns me more is, will there be anyone left to provide the services that you desire when you get to that point? And that is a very valid observation, and certainly one that drives a lot of my thinking when I study the issues surrounding health care and health care delivery in this country. Because the question legitimately can be asked, is our country heading into what might be described as a crisis in physician staffing, a crisis brought on by a physician shortage in the country?

And I reference back in my home State of Texas. The Texas Medical Association puts out a magazine every month, a periodical every month, called Texas Medicine. I stole the cover of their March issue because it really says what Mr. Greenspan was telling us that day. The title of the lead article in the periodical last March was, *Running Out of Doctors*. And that is a concept that I think this Congress, we need to pay some attention to that. And if we don't, I think we put the system in this country in greater peril than it needs to be.

And we need to ensure that the doctors who are in practice today stay in practice, that they stay engaged, they stay there providing care to their patients. These are doctors who are at the peak of their clinical abilities, they're at the peak of their diagnostic abilities. We want them to remain active in their practices and providing services and, honestly, services to the patient who have, who provide them with their most complex medical challenges, our senior citizens.

So what steps do we need to take to ensure we have an adequate physician workforce going forward into the future and ensure that the doctors of today stay engaged in the practice of medicine, and that the young people of tomorrow come to realize that a career in health care is one that is not only viable but one that is going to be rewarding for them as well?

Well, tackling a problem that has plagued the medical community for years and years revolves around the issues of medical liability. My belief is that we need a commonsense medical liability reform to protect patients, to stop the escalation of costs associated with lawsuits, and to make health care, to keep health care more affordable and thereby more accessible for more Americans, and to keep the necessary services in the communities that need them the most.

My belief is that we do need a national solution. The State-to-State solutions that have grown out of necessity do leave vast populations in jeopardy, and have the undesirable effect of actually increasing health care expenditures in this country all of the time that we leave that condition unsolved.

I like the system that was developed by my home State of Texas that placed caps on noneconomic damages in medical liability suits. I think it is one that certainly is worthy of study by this body, and perhaps worthy of consideration by this body. Texas brought together all the major stakeholders in the discussion, doctors, hospitals, nursing homes and patients. The State was able to have these discussions and bring the stakeholders to the table and come up and craft legislation that really put the brakes on the escalation that was going on in medical premiums; and just as importantly, to keep medical liability insurers involved in writing policies in the State of Texas.

We'd lost most of our medical liability insurers from the State. They had simply closed up shop and left because they could not see a future in providing medical liability insurance in Texas. We went from 17 insurers in 2000 down to two in 2002. Rates were increasing year over year. In my personal situation, before I left medical practice, my rates were increasing by 30 percent to 50 percent each year.

So, in 2003, the Texas State Legislature passed a medical liability reform based on a much older reform passed in the State of California. California, in 1975, passed the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975, which essentially put a cap on noneconomic damages in medical liability suits, and it has worked extraordinarily well in the State of California.

The Texas law was modified a little bit, I'd say made ready for the 21st century. Instead of a single \$250,000 cap, there is a \$250,000 cap on noneconomic damages as it pertains to a physician, a \$250,000 cap on noneconomic damages as it pertains to a hospital, and an additional \$250,000 cap as it pertains to a nursing home or a second hospital, if one is involved, for an aggregate cap of \$750,000.

So the question is, how has the Texas plan fared? It actually came into law September 12th of 2003, and remember, I said the State had dropped from 17 medical liability carriers down to two because of the medical liability crisis in the State. Now we're back up to 14 or 15 carriers. And most importantly, they came back to write business in the State of Texas without an increase in their premiums. This is, indeed, a significant reversal.

More options mean better prices and a more secure setting for medical professionals to remain in practice and certainly provides physicians the certainty that they need to keep their practices open in Texas. And one of the most astounding and unintended beneficiaries of this was that of the small, community, not-for-profit hospital that was self-insured for medical liability. These small community hospitals have been able to take money out of those escrow accounts that they were having to hold in abeyance in case they found themselves involved in a liability

suit, and have been able to put more money back into their community hospitals, been able to spend money on capital expenses, been able to spend money on nurses' salaries, precisely the types of things you want your small, community, not-for-profit hospital to be doing, rather than just holding money against a day where they might be involved in a large damage suit.

So I took the language of the Texas plan and worked so it would fit within our legislative structure here in the House of Representatives, and actually gave this legislation to the ranking member of our Budget Committee, and he had that bill scored by the Congressional Budget Office. So the Texas plan, as applied to the Texas house of representatives, to the entire 50 States, would yield an average savings of \$3.8 billion over 5 years.

□ 1945

Not a mammoth amount of money, but when you are talking about a \$2.99999 trillion budget, this savings would amount to moneys that we could use on any of the other number of spending priorities that we hear so much about in this Congress.

And consider this: A study done in 1996 by Stanford University revealed that in the Medicare system alone, the cost of defensive medicine was approximately \$28 to \$30 billion a year, 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker. I suspect that that number is significantly higher today. Defensive medicine, those additional tests and procedures that are ordered by doctors in order to help them provide a good defense should they have a bad outcome and should the case go to litigation in the courts, again, moneys expended on medical care not for the care of the patient, but to provide the best possible defense for a physician if a case is taken into court.

Another consideration is young people getting out of college who are considering a career in the health professions, whether it be medical school, nursing school, dental school, or one of the allied professionals, the current system keeps young people out of the practice of health care for their livelihood because of the burden that we put on them. One thing we have to consider: They are graduating from school with massive amounts of debt, and then immediately upon getting out and emerging on the world and starting into practice, they have to come up with another \$100,000 for their liability insurance. It is an untenable position, and it drives young people away from considering a career in health care.

One of the things that I think we really need to focus on, getting back to the cover of Texas Medical Association and running out of doctors, part of ensuring that the workforce for the future includes helping younger doctors and younger students with residency programs, one of the strange things about doctors is we do tend to have a

lot of inertia. A lot of us tend to practice very close to where we did our training. Studies have shown that many doctors will stay within 100 miles of where they trained. They like to practice in communities similar to the communities in which they did their training. So it would be a great asset to look at areas in this country where there is high need for certain types of physician specialties, areas that are currently medically underserved, and encourage young doctors to get their training in these locations where they are actually needed.

Now, a bill that I am going to introduce, called the Physician Workforce and Graduate Medical Education Enhancement Act, would develop a program that would permit hospitals that do not traditionally operate a residency training program the opportunity to start a residency training program to build a physician workforce of the future. This bill would create a loan fund available to hospitals to create residency training programs where none has operated in the past. The programs would require full accreditation and be generally focused in rural, suburban, inner-urban community hospital locations.

On average it costs a hospital \$100,000 a year to train a resident, and the cost for smaller hospitals can be prohibitive. Another concern stems from the 1997 congressionally passed balanced budget amendment that set a residency cap that also limits resources to non-traditional residency hospitals such as smaller community hospitals. In my bill the loan amount to any institution would not exceed \$1 million, and the loan itself would constitute start-up funding for a new residency program.

As we all know, the start-up money is essential. Since Medicare graduate medical education funding can be obtained only when a residency program is firmly established, the cost to start a training program for a smaller, more rural, or suburban hospital can be cost-prohibitive because these hospitals operate on much narrower operating margins.

The overall bill would authorize a total of \$25 million to be available over 10 years. The fund, of course, would be replenished because these are constructed as loans, and the Health Resources Service Administration may make the loans available to new applicants. These moneys would be repaid, and the residency slots in existing programs would continually work to bring new residents into the program and keep the program self-perpetuating.

To be eligible, a hospital must demonstrate that they currently do not operate a residency program, have not operated a residency training program in the past, and that they have secured preliminary accreditation by the American Council on Graduate Medical Education. Additionally, the petitioning hospital must commit to operating a residency program in one of five medical specialties or a combina-

tion of specialties: family medicine, internal medicine, emergency medicine, OB-GYN, or general surgery. Again, the hospital may request up to \$1 million to assist the establishment of this new residency program, and funding could be used to offset the cost of residents' salaries and benefits.

The bill would require that the Health Resources Services Administration study the efficacy of the program in increasing the number of residents in family medicine. The loans would be made available beginning January 1, 2008, and the program would be sunsetted in 10 years' time, in January 2018, unless Congress voted to reauthorize the program.

Now, locating young doctors where they are needed is just part of solving the impending physician shortage crisis that will affect the entire health care system. Another aspect that must be considered is training doctors for high-need specialties.

My High-Need Physician Specialty Workforce Incentive Act of 2007 will establish a mix of scholarships, loan repayment funds, tax incentives to entice more students to medical school, and create incentives for those students and those newly minted doctors. This program will have an established repayment program for students who agree to go into, again, family medicine, internal medicine, emergency medicine, general surgery, or OB-GYN, and practice in an underserved area. The Health and Human Services Department will administer and promulgate the requirements. The recipients must practice in the prescribed specialty and the prescribed area, which is designated as a medically underserved area, and the practices may include solo or group practices, clinics, public or private nonprofit hospitals. And it will be a 5-year authorization at \$5 million a year.

The bill would provide additional educational scholarships in exchange for a commitment to serve a public or private nonprofit health facility determined to have a critical shortage of primary care physicians. Such scholarships will be treated as equivalent to those under the National Health Service Corps, and penalties apply for those that take advantage but do not go into one of those practice areas.

This will establish the Primary Care Physician Retention and Medical Home Enhancement grants to help ensure that primary care physicians continue to provide coordinated care to patients in underserved areas or high-risk populations. And the reality is we can all think of areas like that back in our home States or, indeed, back in our districts.

In other areas such as the Louisiana gulf coast, where so many doctors left after the devastating hurricanes of Katrina and Rita 1½ years ago, it has been very hard on the doctors in this area, very hard to keep doctors in this area, very hard to encourage and entice new doctors to come to the area; and

this would be one more tool, one more way, to keep the rather fraying social safety net from becoming completely undone in that area.

Every year there would be a report back to Congress about the effectiveness of the program. This would allow us to assess if we are spending our dollars wisely and getting what we thought we would get when we initiated the program. Again, oversight is going to be key to this process.

Well, so far in addressing the physician workforce crisis, we have discussed the medical liability, the placement of doctors in locations of greatest need, and the financial concerns of encouraging young people to go into medical school in the first place and to remain in high-need areas in high-need specialties.

The next portion of this has to deal with perhaps the largest group of practitioners affected in this country and certainly the still-growing group of patients, our baby-boom generation, within the Medicare program.

The baby boomers, and we have already talked about it, as they age and retire, the demand for services has nowhere to go but up. And if the physician workforce trends continue as they are today, which is downward, we may not be talking about funding a Medicare program. We may be talking about what are we going to do to take care of our senior citizens when there is no one there to take care of them? I often tell people if you see a train wreck coming, you have two options. One is to stop the wreck and avert the wreck from happening in the first place; and the other is to run home and get your video camera and be the first to get it up on YouTube. I believe the responsible approach is to avert the crisis in the first place.

Year after year there is a reduction in reimbursement payments from the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services to doctors for the services they provide to their Medicare patients. This is not a question of doctors wanting to make more money; it is about a stabilized payment system for the services that are already rendered. And it isn't just affecting doctors. It affects patients. It becomes a real crisis of access.

Not a week goes by that I don't get a letter or fax from some physician who says, you know what, I have just had enough, and I am going to retire early. I am no longer going to see Medicare patients in my practice, or I am going to restrict the procedures that I offer to my Medicare patients. Unfortunately, I know this is happening because I saw it in the hospital environment before I left the practice of medicine to come to Congress, but I also hear it in virtually every town hall that I do back in my district. Someone will raise their hand or come up to me after the town hall is over and say, how come on Medicare, when you turn 65, you have to change doctors? And the answer is because their doctor found it

no longer economically viable to continue to see Medicare patients because they weren't able to keep up with the cost of delivering the care. They weren't able to cover the cost of providing the care because of the cuts that are happening year over year in the Medicare reimbursement formula.

Now, Medicare payments to physicians are modified annually using a formula called the sustainable growth rate. Because of flaws in the process, the sustainable growth rate formula has mandated physician fee cuts in recent years that have only been moderately averted by last-minute activity by Congress. If no congressional action is implemented, a cut goes through. And if no long-term action is taken, the SGR will continue to mandate fee cuts for physicians. And unlike hospital reimbursement rates, which closely follow the Medicare Economic Index, a cost of living index, if you will, which measures the increasing cost of providing care, physician reimbursements don't do that. In fact, Medicare payments to physicians cover only about 65 percent of the actual cost of providing patient services. Can you imagine any other industry or service or company that would continue in business if they received only 65 percent of what they spent to deliver the service? Not 65 percent of what they needed to make a profit; 65 percent of what they need to simply keep the doors open in the first place. Currently, the sustainable growth rate formula links physician payment updates to the gross domestic product, which has no relationship to the cost of providing patient services.

But the simple repeal of the sustainable growth rate formula can't happen, or we are told it can't happen, because it is too cost-prohibitive. Two hundred and eighty billion dollars is what it would cost this year to repeal the sustainable growth rate formula.

But perhaps if we approached it as something we could do over time, we could bring that cost level down to an area that is manageable. And paying physicians fairly will extend the careers of many physicians who are now in practice who would either opt out of the Medicare program, seek early retirement, or restrict those procedures that they offer to their Medicare patients. It also has an effect on ensuring an adequate network of doctors available to older Americans in this country that make the transition to the physician workforce in the future.

In the physician payment stabilization bill that I will introduce, the SGR formula would be repealed in 2010, 2 years from now, and provide incentive payments based on quality reporting and technology improvements. These incentive payments would be installed to protect practicing physicians against the program cuts that are likely to occur in 2008 and 2009. The incentive payments would be voluntary. No one would be required to participate in a quality program or the technology

improvement, but it would be available to those doctors or practices who wanted to offset the proposed cuts that will occur in physician reimbursement in the 2 years until a formal repeal of the SGR happens.

Now, I do know from talking to my friends who are physicians and my friends in organized medicine that it is an alarming thought that we would have to wait for any period of time before repeal of the SGR.

□ 2000

If we step back and look, in terms of a long-term solution, the only practical approach is, in fact, to deal with it on a long-term basis. The reason we are in the deep depression we find ourselves in is because year over year we've only provided these last-minute fixes, which have only served to exacerbate the problem, not solve the problem.

Well, why not just do away with the SGR once and for all and get it done? Remember, the cost for doing that is going to be about \$280 billion. One of the problems that we have in Congress is the Congressional Budget Office is the group to which we must petition and the group to which we must look for advice about how much things are going to cost. If we are going to be spending the taxpayers' money, how much are we going to spend, over what time will we spend it? Because of some of the constraints of the Congressional Budget Office, we are not allowed to say, look, we are doing things so much better now within the system that give us credit for that going forward so we can, in fact, reduce that number from \$280 billion down to something that is more reasonable.

We all saw the Medicare Trustees Report from about 2 weeks ago. It said that in the year 2005, there were 600,000 hospital beds that were not filled as a result of improvements that have occurred because of disease management, because of doctors doing things more efficiently. These are dollars that have been saved out of the part A portion of Medicare, but it's because of work done in the part B part of Medicare, and that is, after all, where we are all focused within the part B world.

By postponing the repeal of the SGR by 2 years' time and taking the savings that occur during those next 2 years and applying it back to the SGR formula, we may actually get a number that is doable as far as releasing the SGR and replacing it with the full Medicare economic index so we can pay doctors the same way hospitals, HMOs and drug companies are reimbursed.

One of the main thrusts of this bill is to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services to look to their top 10 conditions that drive the highest percentage of payment. It's the old Willie Sutton argument: He robbed banks because that's where the money is. Let's look at the top 10 drivers of health care expenditures in this country, and look at ways where we can im-

prove the care that is delivered in those 10 areas, and look to those areas to give us the savings that will, in fact, deliver the benefit towards the ultimate repeal or retirement of the SGR.

The same conditions actually apply to the Medicaid program as well. It will be a useful exercise. It helps not only Medicare, but would also help CMS with the Medicaid expenditures as well, and will just help physicians in general provide better care for their patients.

It will include some reporting back to doctors and back to patients as to their utilization amounts; these numbers will not be made public generally, but will allow doctors to individually modify their own practices if they see there are ways where they may improve.

Health information technology, it is something which, I will admit, I have been slow to come to the table with as far as looking for improvements in health information technology to provide substantial savings. And I will tell you what changed my mind on that.

In January of 2006, with our Oversight and Investigations Committee down in New Orleans, Louisiana, to look at the recovery from the hurricane as it impacted the health care system in that part of the world, this is the medical records department at Charity Hospital, one of the venerable teaching institutions in our country. When the city of New Orleans was flooded, these records were completely under water.

Now the basement has been all but completely emptied of water. There is probably about a foot of standing water that doesn't show up in the photographs. But look at the records. This is not smoke or soot damage, this is black mold growing on these records. So how do we know that there is a patient in there that is on dialysis waiting for a kidney transplant? We will never know.

We couldn't ask anyone to go in there and go through those records, it would be hazardous to their own health. How do we know about where a person was in their cancer treatment? We will never know that information; that information has been lost to the ages. This is the kind of problem that you can get into with paper records.

You know, the youngsters of today, the college students of today, indeed, the young physicians of today, they understand this very well. They are connected, they are wired in, they all have flash drives and zip drives. They would no more imagine preparing a term paper for one of their classes and then only keeping one paper copy. No. They've got it on their hard disk. They've got it on a floppy disk. They've got it on a flash drive. They have probably e-mailed it to someone back home. The old adage of "The dog ate my homework" just won't wash anymore. We need to evolve into the 21st century when it comes to medical record keeping.

It costs money to do this. It is going to require a big push from both the

public and the private sectors. I prefer to think of the bonus payment as being an inducement and enticement for physicians offices to participate in this program. But on the face of it, it's just good medicine, it's just good patient care.

Now, we all heard about the troubles at Walter Reed Hospital a few months ago. I went out to Walter Reed shortly after the story broke in the Washington Post, and here is Master Sergeant Blades. And he took me around building 18, and yeah, it was a crummy building. We could certainly have done a lot better than we were doing for our soldiers on medical hold in building 18.

But the real thing that bothered Master Sergeant Blades was the fact that they had to wait so long to get in to see someone. And when they did, oftentimes their records that they had worked on and they had prepared and they had organized, sometimes those records, after they delivered them to the appropriate clinic, their records would get lost. His specific complaint to me was, I can spend 20 man-hours putting together my medical record and highlighting the areas that are of significance and importance to me. This goes over to one of the clinics. It sits on someone's desk until it is no longer retrievable, and I have to start all over again.

Now, the VA has been very forward thinking in its embrace of electronic medical records and its investment in medical technology. The problem is the Department of Defense medical records do not interface with the Vista system at the Department of Veterans Affairs. So if delivering value to the patient is of paramount importance, it is critical that we make this type of service generally available to our patients.

Mr. Speaker, I was also going to address some of the issues on health care transparency; I probably don't have time to do that. I will simply mention that I have introduced a bill dealing with health care transparency that provides for keying off what is happening in the States, and making certain that every State would have at least some level of transparency in health care pricing.

In Texas, up on the Web right now, and I realize it is going to go through several different iterations and it will evolve considerably over time, but TXpricepoint.org, available on the Internet, allows patients to compare prices on hospitals in their area.

Again, a lot of things we have to consider when we work on the transformation of the health care system in this country. There are good things as far as the public system, there are good things as far as the private system. We have got to be certain that we build on the good things present in both systems, and that we stop doing the things that no longer deliver value to our patients.

U.S. TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the Speaker for affording me this opportunity. And to the new Democratic coalition, to have an opportunity to speak a few moments on the new template that has been created as we move forward on trade here in the House of Representatives.

I want to take this opportunity again to applaud the Chair of the Ways and Means Committee, my chairman, Mr. RANGEL, as well as chair of the Subcommittee on Trade, Mr. LEVIN, as well as the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, and the entire Democratic leadership for what I believe was forcing the Bush administration to agree to a framework that will encompass all future trade agreements, a framework that will ensure that our trade pacts with other nations respect labor, both here in the United States and abroad; that respect the environment both here and abroad; and respect our Nation's future economic success. And specifically, the new Democratic majority achieved a long sought-after goal that our trade agreements will include enforceable labor and environmental standards.

I think it is incredible that our caucus, that charged our leadership and Mr. RANGEL with the authority to negotiate on behalf of our caucus with the administration, with the USTR, the principles that we laid out for him and for our leadership. And what is remarkable is the success that Mr. RANGEL and our other leaders met in those negotiations.

This new framework, this new template, as I said before, illustrates how Democrats, in response to public demands to work in a bipartisan way, how we were able to achieve our goals by working cooperatively with Republicans without compromising what we stand for as Democrats—and that, in large contrast to the stalemates that we saw in recent past Congresses.

I think it is a new day in many respects for the Ways and Means Committee and for the House of Representatives. I hope it goes beyond this new template for fair and free trade agreements: that this can be used as an example in other areas; that we can hopefully work in a more bipartisan spirit, not always agreeing, not always getting along, but working in the spirit of cooperation on behalf of all our constituents, be that Democrat, Republican or Independent.

This new trade policy achieves the core Democratic principles and goes far beyond the provisions in any previous free trade agreement. All pending free trade agreements will be amended to incorporate key Democratic priorities and will be fully enforceable. Key demands that were met are fundamental labor and environmental protections

included in trade agreements that are fully enforceable.

I think it is important to note here, after years of opposition, this administration and the former Republican-controlled Congress agreed to include in the text of the agreement the five ILO worker rights: first, the right to association. Secondly, the right to collectively bargain. It also prohibits child labor. It prohibits slave labor. It prohibits discrimination. For the first time, environmental standards cannot be lowered, and will be fully enforceable in free trade agreements going forward.

The agreement upon framework expands access to life-saving medicines in developing countries as well. Trade agreements with South Korea and Colombia present additional and distinct obstacles that need to be addressed. This is a framework; it is not *carte blanche* for every free trade agreement moving forward.

The framework is about leveling the playing field for America's workers, for our farmers and businesses, and promoting a trade policy that advances U.S. economic interests around the world, but also advances what we stand for as Americans.

Democrats will continue to work across the aisle to make sure our country stays in the forefront of this globalizing economy and this globalizing world. Working across the aisle, Democrats will educate our youth and upgrade worker skills on the job, and stimulate science, education and research as we move forward.

Democrats are committed to moving beyond the current trade adjustment assistance, TAA system, to provide meaningful support, training and revitalization programs for entire communities which have been hurt by the effects of trade and technology. This bipartisan framework will keep America as a global economic leader and a champion for the principles Americans all believe in.

I am so happy to be joined this evening by a fellow member of the New Democratic Coalition, ALLYSON SCHWARTZ from Philadelphia, who would also like to share her thoughts about this new template that we have been able to create here in the House of Representatives.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I thank Congressman JOE CROWLEY from New York, who has been a leader in the New Democratic Coalition. He has really been, as a member of both the coalition and of the Ways and Means Committee, as I am, really out front and really working to make sure that we are as economically competitive as we need to be in this country. And that means all American workers being given new opportunities. And that really does involve making sure that we get these trade agreements right.

So I want to thank the Congressman, and thank him for asking me to join him this evening.

What I want to do is to add my words, some of them will be similar, I

share some of the same feelings you do, about how important it is for us as new Democrats to participate and to push to make sure that we get trade policies in this country that, in fact, are committed to advancing sustainable and responsible trade between ourselves and the rest of the world.

We recognize that this is a new day in the way we work. It is a global marketplace. We need to recognize that, we need to recognize these new marketplaces.

I, too, want to recognize our leadership on the Democratic side, Speaker PELOSI and Chairman RANGEL and SANDER LEVIN, who really are absolutely committed to doing these trade agreements differently and bringing a Democratic perspective to some of the goals and ambitions that we have for our constituents and for the American people to really try and do things differently.

□ 2015

But let me also say that I understand very clearly, as I think all of us do here in Congress, that the new global economy has created real challenges for American businesses, for American workers, for American consumers and for American families, and that we need to do things differently in the 21st century. We need to recognize the competition that we are in, and we need to do a number of different things. Trade agreements are one piece of what we have to do, and do them in a way that recognizes how difficult this issue is for so many Americans. But it is not all we are going to do.

So we are going to talk specifically about trade this evening, but I think as you started to speak to towards the ends of our remarks, the fact is as New Democrats, and I hope for all of us in Congress, we need to work together to make sure that Americans are well prepared for the jobs of the 21st century, and that means investing in education, demanding more from our educational systems, demanding access to higher education and job training. It means making sure that people displaced by globalization, by the changing marketplace, have access to continuing education and job training, and that they are trained for jobs that are family-sustaining, that help them be able to do all they want to do for their families, and that we help American businesses be as innovative and as technologically advanced as they possibly can.

Our support as New Democrats for research and development, for ways and means, for tax credits that help advance the use of technology in our businesses and to make sure that we are competitive are all things that we need to do, in addition to making sure that our trade policies are really going to work for American businesses and American workers.

You went into some detail, and I think that was important, but let me certainly say that what we have done

and what has been put forward by Chairman RANGEL and by Congressman SANDY LEVIN really is an enormous change over the agreements that we have seen in the last 6 years in particular. I want to say I am very proud of the fact that they held really firmly on putting forward, making sure that we and other nations really meet international labor standards. They were missing in our trade agreements.

If we are going to bring up the standards of workers in other countries, if we are going to be able to compete with workers and businesses in other countries, we need to have them make a commitment to those ILO standards, to the international labor standards.

We also stood firmly on making sure we were going to demand that other nations work on environmental protections. That means when we are dealing with Peru, we are talking about logging and making sure that they meet commitments.

Of course, we will need to make sure on an ongoing basis that language that is written in these trade agreements is enforced. It does not help us to write good language, although that is the first step; we must make sure there is an enforcement. I think many Democrats, and I hope that it is true for all of us, are concerned about the lack of enforcement that has gone on in the last 6 years. I myself have raised some of those questions in the Ways and Means Committee hearings.

So we are not finished by any means, even by speaking tonight. This is a broad template. We are referring to it as a new trade policy for America. But we feel very strongly, I certainly do, that we have made an enormous step forward here in making sure of the trade agreements, and we expect the template to be first used in our pending agreements with Panama and Peru.

There are obstacles and other issues that have to be dealt with in our trade agreements. This is just part of the special ones that often have to be dealt with. They certainly will be with Colombia, with South Korea, that are not spoken to in this template that will be very specific.

But the fact that this framework requires and demands that we will see higher labor standards in other countries, that we will see higher environmental standards, that we will see a commitment to really meeting these international standards, is a commitment that I think we have made to American workers. As I say, it is a piece of helping to make sure that American businesses and American workers can meet the challenges of the 21st century.

We will continue to, I certainly will, make sure that we do everything we can to make sure our workers are well-trained and prepared for the jobs of the next century, that those jobs are here in America, that we can complete in an international global marketplace.

This is really our responsibility in Congress is to be able to say what we

expect of these trade agreements, to put language in those trade agreements. But the fact that we can work with this administration; you know, it has been hard to work with this administration on a lot of issues. The fact is this has been a breakthrough on trade.

The administration wants to see these trade agreements, but we weren't willing to relent without these high standards on labor and on the environment, and, again, I am going to add on enforcement.

I will say also that we fully expect that the work that we are going to do on education and on research and development and on innovation really is going to, I hope, put ourselves forward in making sure that we are going to be as competitive; that we add the work we are going to do on energy, bringing down the cost of energy; that we can add what we hope to do on health care and bringing down the cost of health care for our businesses and creating more access to health care.

We are really looking long term, because this is long term, in making sure that America continues to be the leading industrialized Nation in the world, that our people live at the highest standards, and that they can compete in a global marketplace in a way that we have always been proud of American products, and we will always be, and that we will, in fact, be able to make sure that our workers have the access to jobs, and that around the world we see all of the economies grow and expand and create new markets for us as well.

So I yield back. I will be happy to go into, as I know Mr. CROWLEY will be, into some of the specifics about some of these standards. But, really, I think what we want to do tonight is say as Democrats, we believe in the American worker. We believe in American business. We know we can compete. We need fair trade agreements that are enforced by this administration, and I know we will stay right on it to make sure that happens.

Mr. CROWLEY. One of the things that I think is remarkable about the template is that this is the base. This is not the ceiling. This is where we start from. And it is also precedent-setting. We have been asking, I wouldn't say begging, but we have been pleading with the other side to include these ILO declarations for many, many, many years now.

Unless you have served in the House for the past few years, you may not have the same appreciation for the dysfunctionality of the Ways and Means Committee and how it was or was not working in the past. It was either you take the agreement and you vote for it, or you don't. That is not a way, I think, to build bipartisanship. That is not a way to build consensus on any issue, let alone an issue that is as contentious as trade is for both Democrats and Republicans.

I think the American people, Allison, I think you will agree, want to see us

working together. It doesn't mean we always have to agree on everything, but they want to see us working together and crafting a template like this, that there is a give and take on all sides. I think when anyone enters into negotiation on behalf of any party, the understanding is there will be some give and take.

There will be some who are not entirely happy with every aspect of an agreement, but I think on the whole, we have to look at what Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LEVIN have been able to craft here and understand that just about everything we wanted as Democrats is in this template.

It doesn't mean that we will all, either Democrat or Republican, support all of the free trade agreements moving forward, but it is the floor and not the ceiling, and it gives us a great place, I think, to start.

One thing to also recount is that many of the nations that we have talked to, whether it was Peru or Panama or even Colombia, have said they have no problem with us including these provisions. They had no problem if the former Congresses would have included them, but they didn't include them.

Under this new Congress, this new Democratically controlled House and Senate, we said, no more. It will no longer be the way it used to be. It will no longer be a rubber stamp. We are going to impose a new template that incorporates some of the things that we believe are core standards for the American worker, but also for us as Democrats and for the environment.

We have been joined as well by our colleague from Wisconsin Mr. KIND, a cochair of the New Democratic Coalition. I know he would like to participate.

Mr. KIND. If the gentleman will yield, I am very, very glad my colleagues here tonight are taking time to try to explain what all the news has been about the last couple of weeks, and this is a very important template of trade that has been reached with the Democratic leadership here in Congress, with the Bush administration.

Let me congratulate both of you for the leadership you have shown on the Ways and Means Committee on this issue and so many other economic issues that affect all of our constituents across the country.

I also want to commend Chairman RANGEL, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; and SANDY LEVIN, who is the chair of the Trade Subcommittee; and Speaker PELOSI for the negotiation and hard work that they put into this template of how we move forward on trade agreements in this country.

For the first time I believe that the values of this Nation are finally starting to be recognized and reflected as a basis of these trade agreements; the attempt to try to elevate standards upwards, rather than having a race to the bottom when it comes to trade rela-

tions, because so many of our constituents have felt for some time, and we have heard it in our own congressional district, that the trade agreements really don't speak to their needs, that they are competing on an uneven playing field in relation to the rest of the world.

That is really what this agreement was about, was trying to level the playing field, to try to elevate standards globally, not only influencing and recognizing the needs of our workers here in America, but trying to influence and recognize the needs of workers throughout the rest of the world by having basic principles as part of the trade agreement, core international labor standards as part of these trade agreements as we move forward, environmental protections, all on an even par of enforcement with other important provisions that are part of the trade agreement.

But let me also admit the sheer political fact, and that is there is very little political upside in supporting trade in Congress these days because it is so unpopular back home. I think because of that, because of the growth of globalization and the interrelationship that we have now in the world economy, very few workers feel that there has been a real upside to them.

That is what we are trying to accomplish in this trade agreement is a recognition that they, too, have a place at the table when this comes to trade; that they do have rights that need to be protected and assured; that we should be a Nation that stands up in opposition to the exploitation of child labor or slave labor; that other workers around the world, as they do in the United States, have the right to collectively bargain so they have better leverage in negotiating decent, fair working conditions and compensation for themselves and their families, wherever they may be living in this planet.

But, to me, trade has been more than just goods and products and services crossing borders, although that is what most people think about as trade. Trade is also an important tool in our diplomatic arsenal. It is also about how we, the United States, chooses to engage the rest of the world, whether it is a negative engagement or a positive engagement.

Nothing could be more positive than having a healthy trade relationship with rules in place that everyone has to live by. I happen to believe something that Cordell Hull, who was FDR's Secretary of State, said many, many years ago, and that is when goods and products cross borders, armies don't. There is so much conflict, and there are so many rivalries, and there is so much violence in this world today that trade, if used right, with the right rules of engagement, can be a positive experience not only for our own economic needs here in the United States, but also abroad. To me, that is what this agreement really speaks to is in-

corporating these types of values now as we move forward.

We have got a few trade agreements that we are trying to work on; Panama and Peru, for instance. Colombia and South Korea may need some more work in talking to a lot of our colleagues, but at least we are establishing what those rules need to look like. Now we can get down and haggle out the details as we do move forward.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. If the gentleman will yield, I think the way you put it, I wanted to just echo that. What trade agreements really are are setting the rules. I think you are right. There has been, I hear it, I think we all hear it. We go in our districts and people say trade is ruining us. Yet many of those same people work in companies that sell products overseas and are proud of the work that they do. They realize how specialized, how important the work is that we do, and how we often are still setting the standards in the world marketplace.

But the reason to set these rules and to set the rules as strongly as we can, and we are setting them now, it doesn't mean they won't be changed at some point. They may need some tweaking, which is why you renegotiate these agreements. They don't go on forever. It is a dynamic marketplace we are in.

But it also means we can then go enforce those rules. And when we see lack of enforcement, I understand that frustration. I have businesses come to me, and I have tried to advocate on their behalf to say, wait a minute, it is in the rules, and we are unfairly disadvantaged. Is there something we can do? Sometimes there is.

We have seen dumping of steel. We are concerned about currency manipulation in China. These are complicated issues. In some ways, I am learning some of them myself.

But the fact is there are such different systems in these different countries, and we need to recognize that. But there are so many nations now that want to have a capitalist system and be able to have private investment and to be able to compete with us. At the same time there are very different rules in some of these countries, so we have to have a mechanism for interpreting what is fair and what is not.

□ 2030

That is part of the reason we do these trade agreements. So if there is unfair manipulation, if there is dumping and State support for a company that makes it very difficult for us to compete, we have the rights within these agreements to bring forward those complaints and to have a fair hearing.

Mr. KIND. We had a very important caucus meeting earlier today, the Democratic Caucus, talking about the provisions of this trade agreement.

What I heard in that caucus, and I am not going to speak on behalf of those who spoke, but there was a lot of pent-up frustration. For the last 6 years with one-party control, our

ideas, thoughts and values were excluded in terms of the template of trade agreements and what was in these bilateral regional trade agreements coming before Congress.

But also, as you just recognized, there is a big concern about the lack of enforcement of existing trade agreements and the likelihood of enforcement being done by this current administration in future trade agreements when they come before Congress asking for our ratification. That is a legitimate concern, a concern that I hear back home from a lot of my constituents as well.

Unless the administration wants to step up and start enforcing these trade agreement and say we entered into these trade agreements for a reason, and that is to uphold the terms of the agreements and make sure everyone is playing by the same rules, trade confidence in this country is going to continue to ebb, and it is going to get worse. I think that would be disastrous ultimately for our long-term national economic growth and for helping our workers and expanding economic opportunities both at home and abroad.

So there is a big question mark with the majority of the people in this Congress with regard to the administration's willingness to enforce these agreements.

Mr. CROWLEY. I think one of the aspects of the template that we are talking about this evening, dealing primarily with the environment, for instance, is something that has not gotten as much attention as the labor and the ILO declaration has gotten in terms of its incorporation within the template.

But I think it is important to note for the RECORD that the policy, as it moves forward under this template that the Democrats have created, will require our trading partners to enforce environmental laws already on the books, that they have agreed to, and comply with several multilateral environmental agreements, MEAs, which would include: the Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species; the Montreal Protocol on Ozone Depleting Substances; Convention on Marine Pollution, the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Convention; the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands; the International Whaling Convention; and the Convention on Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources.

The U.S. is a signatory to all of these agreements, and I believe that free trade agreements cannot be used to undermine any of these MEAs. I think we all agree, as Democrats, that protecting the environment and protecting our planet is something that is an important element in any free trade agreement.

Mr. KIND. I look forward to working with my colleague here who, I think, appreciates this. As we go forward with this new template, we also need to focus on capacity building in a lot of these nations that we are trying to

enter into agreements with, countries like Panama and Peru that aren't exactly wealthy and have a lot of resources, but to enable them to establish the institutions so they can do a better job of policing labor standards or environmental standards within their own countries. I think there is a great need and calling for us to do that.

But, ultimately, there has to be a willingness on our part and the administration's to take these agreements seriously and to enforce them seriously.

We all hear it back home; when you see someone losing their job or a plant closing down, it is usually laid at the doorstep of one of two factors. Either it is bad trade or it is illegal immigration. It is obviously more complex than that, but we need to have a broader discussion within the context of trade, as well, in regard to worker empowerment so that when people do lose a job, they don't have to make a showing of trade relation in order to get any assistance from the government. When a factory closes, it does not matter to the family affected whether it is trade related or some other circumstance, because they feel the pain the same way.

We have to step up our efforts in education and worker training in this country so our workers have the skills to compete in a 21st century economy and so they can be full participants. We should also be talking more about portability of health care and pension and retirement security, so it is not necessarily tied to a single job or occupation; and when they lose it, they lose all of that, the whole fabric of supporting their family is destroyed overnight.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. We spoke before about all of the other things that we need to do to ensure that our businesses and workers are fairly able to compete and excel.

One of the other things that I was going to say is that when we look at these new environmental standards, it also creates opportunities for American businesses. We have been speaking in a different context about the way we are going to create more energy-efficient businesses and products. And I am sure you have been visited, as I have been visited, by entrepreneurs across this country who have great ideas and are trying to move to market with solar and wind and biofuels and are ready to go.

When you think about these other countries that are trying to move very quickly to gear up and create new businesses, they are going to be looking for that technology and they are going to be looking for the scientists and the engineers. Hopefully, we will do a little patent protection and intellectual property protection, but this is where America has been so great, have that innovation and be on the cutting edge to do the very next thing that will then be bought by not only other American companies, but by other nations' com-

panies as well. I think there is a hunger across this globe for that kind of interaction and cooperation. Market working, that is really what this is about, and trade capacity.

So what this does, and it is not the end-all and be-all. I think that is something we want the American people to understand. These are trade agreements, some of the rules and trying to make sure that it is fair for American businesses and American workers, and then are enforced. But we have a lot of other work to do on education and health care and research and development and some of our tax laws to, in fact, make sure that we can compete and it is fair.

But I think we, as new Democrats, in particular, are very excited about this challenge. It is scary. We hear from families who are committed to making some of those other changes, particularly in trade assistance adjustment. I think we will. So we recognize how difficult this is. There have been certainly some serious bumps, and those are very, very hard for families.

But we also have seen businesses grow and thrive and we have seen individual workers go on to do remarkable work as well. That is what we are trying to do with not just the trade agreements, but with all of the work that we are trying to do in here in the Congress.

Mr. CROWLEY. We have been joined by another member of the New Democratic Coalition, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) who has a keen understanding of a number of the issues we just spoke about, trade being one, and immigration being another. That may be a subject for another evening for us to talk about.

HENRY. I know you want to weigh in a bit as well on the trade template that the new Democratic leadership has been able to forge.

Mr. CUELLAR. Thank you, Mr. CROWLEY. I certainly appreciate the hard work of Speaker PELOSI and Chairman RANGEL and the ranking member, Mr. MCCRERY, as well as SANDY LEVIN, working with the administration to come up with an agreement. This is very important.

Let me give you some of my personal experience. I am from Laredo, Texas, which is the largest inland port in the U.S. If you want to see trade, go to a place like Laredo, Texas. I have seen not only the primary jobs that are created, but also the secondary jobs it creates when we talk about international trade.

When you look at the U.S. economy, the \$12 trillion economy is bolstered by trade, which is a pillar of our American economic power. In 2005, U.S. exports to the rest of the world totaled \$1.2 trillion and supported one in five of the U.S. manufacturing jobs we have. Jobs directly linked to the export of goods pay 13 percent to 18 percent more than the U.S. jobs that we have.

Agriculture exports hit a record high in 2005 and now account for 926 jobs

that we have. So trade creates jobs, and I think the balanced approach of the new Democrats plays a role in developing this and is something that is so important to us.

I believe in trade for several reasons. It is not only the economics, but the other thing is, we have to stay engaged in the dialogue. If, for whatever reason, the United States would turn against trade, that is not going to stop the world. Other countries are going to continue entering into their own trade agreements. That is why it is important that the United States continues trade negotiations and stays in the dialogue.

If I can say one thing, and then I will leave it open, one of the things that I have seen is ever since President John F. Kennedy talked about the Alliance for Progress, he looked at countries like Peru and Colombia, to make sure that we have that dialogue with them because if we are able to do that, then we can bolster those economies. And again, talking about immigration just briefly, but the more jobs you create in those countries, hopefully the fewer people will come to the United States. Being on the border, we see those people trying to get better jobs in the United States.

Mr. KIND. I think you are exactly right. I would submit that in a short while we will be engaged in a immigration reform debate in this Congress. But as long as we have a huge economic disparity right across our border and throughout the Western Hemisphere, really we will be battling the issue of people wanting to come to the United States to realize the hope and the promise of our country and a better way of life for themselves and their families.

Trade is a way to try to elevate people's standards upwards and create job opportunities across the globe. Or we will always be at the losing end of the immigration proposition because of what the United States has to offer and the temptation to enter this country either legally or illegally for a better way of life.

Mr. CROWLEY. We are talking about uplifting these other countries, as well, by transposing our core values as it pertains to labor standards, as it pertains to the environment. I think that is something that should not be lost on anyone when we look at what we are attempting to do here.

Talking about Kennedy, talking about anyone who has looked to the hemisphere that we are in, as well as the Southern Hemisphere, in many respects you cannot move that hemisphere elsewhere. We are connected by land mass.

I think as we move forward on the immigration debate and we discuss this more and more, many of us believe we should be helping those countries with direct aid and assistance, to help them become better democracies or become democracies.

We see what is happening in some of those countries in South America that

are trying to experiment with other forms of government that we don't necessarily agree with. It is not the way that we would prefer to see South America move. I think that is why being able to bolster some of those countries down there and show that there is a positive benefit to be gained by having a positive relationship with the United States in this template in trade and moving forward could very well be an example that could be set for other countries in the region.

We have been joined by our friend and colleague from New York, Congressman MEEKS, who has certainly been engaged on many trade and immigration issues, and has worked with Venezuela and other countries.

And I would love to have your input as well.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. You are exactly right, Mr. CROWLEY. Some people would like to say individuals, particularly in our hemisphere, that globalization and trade is taking advantage of them, that they are poor. Yet these individuals, long before globalization existed, were poor and taken advantage of. Here is an opportunity because of globalization to give them a hand up.

Part of the problem has been that people have turned their backs on them. When we trade and create jobs and opportunities for them in their country, as well as making sure that we are creating jobs and opportunity in our country, we have what is called a win/win situation.

For example, there is something called FedEx. For every 40 packages that FedEx sends someplace else, we create a job in the United States of America.

Mr. CROWLEY. If the gentleman would yield, I prefer to say for every 40 packages UPS delivers, we create one additional union job.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. And I concur. We are creating opportunities for individuals here in the United States of America, as well as giving individuals an opportunity for jobs in these foreign countries.

Many of the people are in the informal sectors in their communities right now. When you go to South America, you can talk about Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Brazil, they are in the informal sector. What we are doing is creating a formal sector where they can get health benefits and talk about creating a future with pensions for their kids for tomorrow. We are talking about giving them a hand up which they don't have now in the informal sector.

□ 2045

Mr. CROWLEY. We're also talking about trade capacity building.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Absolutely.

Mr. CROWLEY. They are going to want to afford our products the more they can afford our products.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. As a result of that, and I'm direct evidence of it, what they will do is then they will

begin to educate their kids so that they can now send their kids to school. And that becomes their focus—to make sure that the next generation is better than theirs as far as education is concerned and health care. It's exactly what we've done in this country. So why should we just say it's exclusively for us and not want to share the benefits of what we've gained in this country with others? That's what leadership is all about, and that's all that we're doing here.

We're not saying that we're going to turn our backs on other individuals, say we're going to help them, and we're going to help yourselves, because you know what, the number one jobs, when you look about creating jobs in America, it's services. The services are creating jobs over and over and over and time and again. And what we're doing also by, you know, trading with our services in other areas, we're creating jobs and opportunities, and, in fact, our businesses. I often say this, become our best ambassadors because they look at the jobs that Americans have created, and they say, well, thank you for lifting us up, thank you, for showing us that you are not turning your backs on us, thank you, because we're the only superpower in the world. So folks are looking at us to be leaders in that regard, and if we turn our backs on them, leaving these individuals not to have hope and opportunity for tomorrow, then we will become the ones that's isolated them, and we should not.

It's good foreign policy. It's good domestic policy, and it just makes overall, good moral sense.

Mr. KIND. There are a lot of positive features to trade, but the congressional district I represent, western Wisconsin, is still heavily manufacturing, a lot of agriculture, and there's been a lot of displacement and a lot of jobs lost.

And I don't think any of us here on the floor tonight are promising that with this new template of trade that we're going to be able to guarantee everyone's job in this country. You just can't do it. In fact, each generation of Americans have had to wrestle with their own transition and economic displacement that's occurred at that time period. Whether we're moving from the agrarian to the industrial age, from the industrial age to the information age, to the next new thing, there are going to be displacements.

As long as we can remain the most innovative and creative Nation in the world, which we've been able to sustain for some time, we're going to be able to make those adjustments probably a lot easier than other people around the globe.

I don't think anyone's here to offer this hope or promise that everyone's job is going to be guaranteed with this new template right now. We can't do that any more than we can shut down the information age or shut down the World Wide Web and the Internet. Now with the push of a button, we've got services crossing borders and collaborations being created that we've never

imagined before, and that's a large part of globalization today.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I just want to make a point here that when you talk about lifting up, I want to make sure that people understand what trade agreements really are about. This is not the foreign aid bill, and we will discuss it in another moment, and I think there's important work that we do through some of that.

This is also saying to the countries, if you're going to be our trading partner, you have to allow certain labor standards. Some of them are really very well known. We'll not allow child labor or slave labor. But we're also saying that your workers have a right to organize, have a right to bargain, and to be able to have workers in some countries that have not had this opportunity to be able to band together.

We know how important it is, as part of our own history continues to be in speaking up on behalf of workers and making sure they're paid fairly and treated fairly, that our rules are fair.

Mr. CROWLEY. Free from physical harm.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Exactly. We know there's a huge struggle.

So part of what we're saying is if you're going to be our trading partner, then there's certain expectations about the way you treat people, and that is true in the workplace. And once we're partners, there are also broader issues, of course, about human rights and about rule of law, and, you know, we have some deep concerns about this as well. And this becomes sometimes complicated, but having that trade agreement often allows the beginning debate and engages us to be able to make, in some ways, some of these other expectations for themselves and for us as well to be part of the world community, to be part of the world economy.

And part of it is we don't want our own people to be disadvantaged, but because we understand they have a right to organize, they have a right to speak up, and if we have some kind of engagement with them, then their standard of living will improve and, of course, hopefully their human rights.

Mr. KIND. I think you're exactly right. One of the forces, quite frankly, that we are contending with in the United States, in this hemisphere, especially in South America, is a gentleman by the name of Chavez, the President of Venezuela, who's been fond of traveling around, spending his petrodollars all around, and delivering a very anti-American message.

I think one of the reasons that message is starting to resonate, much to our concern, is because a lot of the workers in those countries where he's visited have felt excluded and left out of trade agreements. What's in it for them? And finally, for the first time, with this agreement, we're starting to address our concern for their needs as well.

Mr. CROWLEY. If I could interject, no longer will our trade agreements be

negotiated by our government on behalf of and solely for the benefit of multinational corporations. This is also under this template an opportunity to negotiate and have the American worker be a part of those negotiations, at least have a sense that someone here on the Democratic Caucus is looking out for their interests and for the interests of the poor people of the countries we're talking about.

Mr. CUELLAR. Let me just follow up on the points that they make.

First of all, for the people, like the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania said, if people are interested in labor standards, the environment, raising up the wages of certain countries, the only way we can do this is by having some sort of dialogue. If we retreat back, then there's no vehicle to use to raise those standards, and this is why those trade agreements are very, very important.

The second point is, and Mr. CROWLEY mentioned this, if you're interested in the rule of law, if you're interested in the principles of democracy, if you're interested in the economics, like the gentleman from New York said, we have to have some sort of vehicle to engage those countries, because if we don't engage them like you said, other countries will do it. So either we get engaged, or somebody else is going to do it.

Let me just give you a brief history about what happened to us in Central America a few years ago. We decided to turn our back to a lot of those countries. What happened? In the 1980s, you'll recall the Communists, Nicaragua, the sandanistas all came in, and all of a sudden the United States said, oh, you know what, we better get engaged. So, instead of having trade agreements, we started sending arms to those countries.

The response to that was the Caribbean-based initiative, and, of course, we saw what happened with the other trade agreement we did. This is why history should teach us that if we don't get engaged with countries, then somebody else is going to fill the vacuum, whether it's Chavez, like you mentioned a while ago, or it's going to be Castro or somebody else. But if we don't stay engaged, we're going to lose this. So this is why it's so important that we stay engaged in these trade agreements.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. You're absolutely right, and here's another reason why trade agreements are important, because if you look at particularly our recent trade agreements, what they do is they level the trade balance. Because a lot of these nations, when you talk about Central America, they were already open to come to our market. They were open to come to the United States. We didn't have access to theirs. So we were able to level the trade imbalances.

And, in fact, when you talk about where we have the biggest imbalance, happens to be with China, but you

know what the fact of the matter is? We do not have an FTA agreement with China. We don't even have one with India. We've negotiated them. We were able to negotiate them so that we can balance it so that it's fair to both sides as opposed to it being unfair on one side.

You use the FTAs as an agreement to balance the playing field, to balance the trade imbalances to a large degree as well, as well as create hope and opportunity for people both abroad and at home.

Some folks say they don't like trade at all. Well, I challenge them, especially if you're poor. I come from the southeastern Queens in New York. I was raised in public housing. There's certain things that we can't afford, and I look at poor people, a number of them, some of the trade has helped them because they can now buy some goods that they may not have otherwise been able to afford. So we've got to look at both sides of this. It has created some jobs.

Where we've got to make sure that we're focused in the country is the competitiveness issue. So we've got to make sure that we're educating our young people so that they can take the jobs, the high-paying jobs that, I might add, that globalization and us being a leader in technology and information technology in particular and the services, that we can create opportunities for them.

So, yeah, are there some dangers. If we allow our public educational system to continue to go downhill, and we don't now focus on it, and we don't make sure that our people are educated so that they can take the high-paying jobs that are being created, then, yes, we're in danger of succeeding as a country, period. Education is our greatest resource, and competitiveness is where we've got to go, and that's what our focus should be.

We should be working out together to make sure that we're competitive with the rest of the globe because otherwise we lose out on this. It's not as if to say globalization is a bad thing that's going to go away tomorrow. Obviously it's not, and it's helping millions of people.

There are 6 billion people in the world, 6 billion people in the world. There's only 300 million of us in the United States of America, 300 million. And of the 6 billion people in the world, over 3 billion of them live on less than \$2 a day. Why? They're in the informal sector. Why? There's no hope and opportunities for them.

Don't you think that as we being the only world superpower, that we can do something better; being humane, being the country that we are, we could do something better for them?

Mr. KIND. You're exactly right. We're less than 4 percent of the world population, and we can no sooner turn ourselves into a fortress of solitude and hope to maintain economic progress and opportunity in our own country.

But the Democrats in Congress haven't been dealing with trade in a vacuum. We've been promoting this innovation agenda for some time. We have had legislation on the floor to try to enhance further fields of study in those crucial fields of math, science, engineering, technology, those fields that will enable our students and workers to be innovative and creative and develop into high-paying jobs that we hope to see here in the United States.

We've been moving that legislation forward, working with our Senate counterparts. We're trying to increase research investment in the National Institutes of Health, for instance, so we can be at the cutting edge of medical and scientific breakthroughs. All this is interwoven into the economic agenda the Democrats have been standing for that the New Democratic Coalition has been a big part of in helping to formulate that agenda.

That's, I think, the direction we need, and I think the American people want to hear that type of message and see that type of agenda. Our concern is there's a lot of economic anxiety throughout the country, and they want to know what their role is going to be in this global marketplace. Perhaps more importantly, they want to know what kind of future their children have to look forward to.

The Democrats for the first time have been able to get legislation to the floor that speaks to those needs, that starts speaking to those anxieties. Will it solve all those problems? No, but I think it's the best hope that we have to make sure that our country is well positioned to stay competitive globally.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I know we're concluding our hour, but I just think that's a great note, as New Democrats, for us to end on.

It is important for us to move forward on these trade agreements. I think all of us would say this is a major breakthrough for the Democrats to see this kind of labor and environmental standards and kind of enforcement and commitment to do that.

But the real question is, this is just a piece of the puzzle. This is only one part of it, and we're committed to a much broader agenda of making sure our young people are prepared for the future, that some of our slightly older people also have the enormous opportunities for new directions for them as well, and that our businesses can be competitive.

So we've a lot of work to do to making sure that our tax policy and our trade policy and our education and health care policies and energy policies all contribute to making sure that America has that economic capacity and opportunity for all of our people.

Mr. CUELLAR. Let me just make two points to conclude.

First one, let's talk about the Constitution. Why are these trade agreements different? Why are they going to be different; whether it's Peru, Colombia, Panama or Korea, why are they

going to be different? First of all, in the past, the President pretty much negotiated the agreement, and it was an up-or-down deal. This time, the Congress, through our leadership, through the New Democrats, we're asserting ourselves through the commerce clause. That is, we have the right to assert ourselves to make sure that we're part of the process so we can set up the framework. And this is why these trade agreements from now are going to have a different type of framework, because Congress is getting involved in the development of that trade policy, number one.

Number two, I will conclude with this. In 2005, the U.S. exports to the rest of the world totaled \$1.2 trillion. Think about that, \$1.2 trillion. Jobs have been created all across the country not only by big companies, but also by the medium and small companies.

Second of all, jobs that are directly linked to the export of goods pay 13 to 18 percent more than the other U.S. jobs. I have seen this personally in my hometown where we have this trading community. It works, and we have to stay engaged, and this is why this new framework that the New Democrats have developed along with our leadership will provide the pathway for new agreements in the future.

And thank you again for all the work that y'all have done.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Let me conclude with this.

Number one, I want to just compliment Chairman RANGEL and Chairman LEVIN. They have done a great job. I mean, it's something the Democrats have been asking for since the 1990s, I've been in Congress, to make sure it's been included in every trade bill. They've done a fantastic job to make sure that we protect environmental rights and labor rights, et cetera.

We care about those individuals that we know are going to be hurt, because in any agreement there are people that get hurt, and when we talk about we've got to do a real comprehensive program so people can be retrained and go back to work.

□ 2100

Now that's even more than just trade agreements, because, you know, if you check it out, really, more people have lost their jobs through efficiency and technology. Think about it.

How many people does it take to produce a car today than it did yesterday. When you need a telephone operator, does anyone pick up? It's technology that picks up the telephone. You know, EZPass, and all the conveniences that we currently have. We better do a better job.

I think that Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LEVIN have put that in that we will do a better job, and retraining Americans who are hurt, not only because of trade, but who are out of the job for any reason, whether it's technology or because of a trade agreement.

As Democrats, we are focused on that. We can do that. We can do good

by our folks at home, but we also can do good by the people abroad so that we can be the leaders of the Nation. We are the world's only super power.

Mr. KIND. I also want to commend JIM MCCREERY, who is ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Republican colleagues on Ways and Means who are also embracing this template to go forward on trade agreements. But as Chairman RANGEL reminded all of us today in caucus, this new template doesn't commit any single member on future trade agreements. We will still have the opportunity to review them when the President formally submits them for our consideration. We will see if they are the best deal struck for our Nation and for our constituents' best interest.

I think now, with this agreement, the template is finally shaping up to where we can get wider bipartisan support. There is still a lot of work that needs to be done. We can't hold this out as the silver bullet to the challenges that our workers are experiencing day in and day out, but trade is going to be an important part of our economic equation, whether we like it or not, because of the effects of global warming and the ease of transporting goods and products, services, across borders, all that is breaking down.

The question is, whether we roll up in a fetal position and pretend it's not happening and try to pursue neo-isolationist policies, or whether we embrace this change and try to make the changes that we have to, to be in the best position to stay competitive.

That's really, I think, what the discussion will be about in the coming weeks when we start analyzing these trade agreements coming forward. I want to thank my colleagues for taking some time this evening to discuss a very important issue on the floor. Hopefully, we will have some more discussions in the future.

Mr. CROWLEY. Let me close by just saying thank you, thank you to the gentledady of Ohio for chairing this hour of debate, as well as all my colleagues for being here this evening and participating in this free-flowing discussion on this new template.

This new template, as we go forward, it really is a new day in terms of trade negotiations, and the relationship between the minority and the majority here in the House of Representatives, the comity that has now been brought back, I think, to the Ways and Means Committee, to the House in some respects. Hopefully, this can be an example of other things we can work on in the future on behalf of all of our constituents, again, Democrat, Republican, Independent and the like, to move the agenda of America forward.

I want to thank each of my colleagues for participating this evening.

PATRIOTISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SUTTON). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, for some, patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel. For others, it means dissent against a government's abuse of the people's rights.

I have never met a politician in Washington or any American, for that matter, who chose to be called unpatriotic. Nor have I met anyone who did not believe he wholeheartedly supported our troops, wherever they may be.

What I have heard all too frequently from the various individuals are sharp accusations that, because their political opponents disagree with them on the need for foreign military entanglements, they were unpatriotic, un-American evildoers deserving contempt.

The original American patriots were those individuals brave enough to resist with force the oppressive power of King George. I accept the definition of patriotism as that effort to resist oppressive state power.

The true patriot is motivated by a sense of responsibility and out of self-interest for himself, his family, and the future of his country to resist government abuse of power. He rejects the notion that patriotism means obedience to the state. Resistance need not be violent, but the civil disobedience that might be required involves confrontation with the state and invites possible imprisonment.

Peaceful, nonviolent revolutions against tyranny have been every bit as successful as those involving military confrontation. Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., achieved great political successes by practicing nonviolence, and yet they suffered physically at the hands of the state. But whether the resistance against government tyrants is nonviolent or physically violent, the effort to overthrow state oppression qualifies as true patriotism.

True patriotism today has gotten a bad name, at least from the government and the press. Those who now challenge the unconstitutional methods of imposing an income tax on us, or force us to use a monetary system designed to serve the rich at the expense of the poor are routinely condemned. These American patriots are sadly looked down upon by many. They are never praised as champions of liberty as Gandhi and Martin Luther King have been.

Liberals, who withhold their taxes as a protest against war, are vilified as well, especially by conservatives. Unquestioned loyalty to the state is especially demanded in times of war. Lack of support for a war policy is said to be unpatriotic. Arguments against a particular policy that endorses a war, once it is started, are always said to be endangering the troops in the field. This, they blatantly claim, is unpatriotic, and all dissent must stop. Yet, it is dis-

sent from government policies that defines the true patriot and champion of liberty.

It is conveniently ignored that the only authentic way to best support the troops is to keep them out of danger's undeclared no-win wars that are politically inspired. Sending troops off to war for reasons that are not truly related to national security and, for that matter, may even damage our security, is hardly a way to patriotically support the troops.

Who are the true patriots, those who conform or those who protest against wars without purpose? How can it be said that blind support for a war, no matter how misdirected the policy, is the duty of a patriot?

Randolph Bourne said that, "War is the health of the state." With war, he argued, the state thrives. Those who believe in the powerful state see war as an opportunity. Those who mistrust the people and the market for solving problems have no trouble promoting a "war psychology" to justify the expansive role of the state. This includes the role the Federal Government plays in our lives, as well as in our economic transactions.

Certainly, the neoconservative belief that we have a moral obligation to spread American values worldwide through force justifies the conditions of war in order to rally support at home for the heavy hand of government. It is through this policy, it should surprise no one, that our liberties are undermined. The economy becomes overextended, and our involvement worldwide becomes prohibited. Out of fear of being labeled unpatriotic, most of the citizens become compliant and accept the argument that some loss of liberty is required to fight the war in order to remain safe.

This is a bad trade-off, in my estimation, especially when done in the name of patriotism. Loyalty to the state and to autocratic leaders is substituted for true patriotism, that is, a willingness to challenge the state and defend the country, the people and the culture. The more difficult the times, the stronger the admonition comes that the leaders be not criticized.

Because the crisis atmosphere of war supports the growth of the state, any problem invites an answer by declaring war, even on social and economic issues. This elicits patriotism in support of various government solutions, while enhancing the power of the state. Faith in government coercion and a lack of understanding of how free societies operate encourages big government liberals and big government conservatives to manufacture a war psychology to demand political loyalty for domestic policy just as is required in foreign affairs.

The long-term cost in dollars spent and liberties lost is neglected as immediate needs are emphasized. It is for this reason that we have multiple perpetual wars going on simultaneously. Thus, the war on drugs, the war

against gun ownership, the war against poverty, the war against illiteracy, the war against terrorism, as well as our foreign military entanglements are endless.

All this effort promotes the growth of statism at the expense of liberty. A government designed for a free society should do the opposite, prevent the growth of statism and preserve liberty.

Once a war of any sort is declared, the message is sent out not to object or you will be declared unpatriotic. Yet, we must not forget that the true patriot is the one who protests in spite of the consequences. Condemnation or ostracism or even imprisonment may result.

Nonviolent protesters of the Tax Code are frequently imprisoned, whether they are protesting the code's unconstitutionality or the war that the tax revenues are funding. Resisters to the military draft or even to Selective Service registration are threatened and imprisoned for challenging this threat to liberty.

Statism depends on the idea that the government owns us and citizens must obey. Confiscating the fruits of our labor through the income tax is crucial to the health of the state. The draft, or even the mere existence of the Selective Service, emphasizes that we will march off to war at the state's pleasure.

A free society rejects all notions of involuntary servitude, whether by draft or the confiscation of the fruits of our labor through the personal income tax. A more sophisticated and less well-known technique for enhancing the state is the manipulation and transfer of wealth through the fiat monetary system operated by the secretive Federal Reserve.

Protesters against this unconstitutional system of paper money are considered unpatriotic criminals and at times are imprisoned for their beliefs. The fact that, according to the Constitution, only gold and silver are legal tender and paper money outlawed matters little. The principle of patriotism is turned on its head. Whether it's with regard to the defense of welfare spending at home, confiscatory income tax, or an immoral monetary system or support for a war fought under false pretense without a legal declaration, the defenders of liberty and the Constitution are portrayed as unpatriotic, while those who support these programs are seen as the patriots.

If there is a war going on, supporting the state's effort to win the war is expected at all costs, no dissent. The real problem is that those who love the state too often advocate policies that lead to military action. At home, they are quite willing to produce a crisis atmosphere and claim a war is needed to solve the problem. Under these conditions, the people are more willing to bear the burden of paying for the war and to carelessly sacrifice liberties which they are told is necessary.

The last 6 years have been quite beneficial to the health of the state, which

comes at the expense of personal liberty. Every enhanced unconstitutional power of the state can only be achieved at the expense of individual liberty. Even though in every war in which we have been engaged civil liberties have suffered, some have been restored after the war ended, but never completely. That has resulted in a steady erosion of our liberties over the past 200 years. Our government was originally designed to protect our liberties, but it has now, instead, become the usurper of those liberties.

We currently live in the most difficult of times for guarding against an expanding central government with a steady erosion of our freedoms. We are continually being reminded that 9/11 has changed everything.

Unfortunately, the policy that needed most to be changed, that is our policy of foreign interventionism, has only been expanded. There is no pretense any longer that a policy of humility in foreign affairs, without being the world's policemen and engaging in nation building, is worthy of consideration.

□ 2115

We now live in a post-9/11 America where our government is going to make us safe no matter what it takes. We are expected to grin and bear it and adjust to every loss of our liberties in the name of patriotism and security.

Though the majority of Americans initially welcomed the declared effort to make us safe, and we are willing to sacrifice for the cause, more and more Americans are now becoming concerned about civil liberties being needlessly and dangerously sacrificed.

The problem is that the Iraq war continues to drag on, and a real danger of it spreading exists. There is no evidence that a truce will soon be signed in Iraq or in the war on terror or the war on drugs. Victory is not even definable. If Congress is incapable of declaring an official war, it is impossible to know when it will end. We have been fully forewarned that the world conflict in which we are now engaged will last a long, long time.

The war mentality and the pervasive fear of an unidentified enemy allows for a steady erosion of our liberties, and, with this, our respect for self-reliance and confidence is lost. Just think of the self-sacrifice and the humiliation we go through at the airport screening process on a routine basis. Though there is no scientific evidence of any likelihood of liquids and gels being mixed on an airplane to make a bomb, billions of dollars are wasted throwing away toothpaste and hair spray, and searching old women in wheelchairs.

Our enemies say, boo, and we jump, we panic, and then we punish ourselves. We are worse than a child being afraid of the dark. But in a way, the fear of indefinable terrorism is based on our inability to admit the truth about why there is a desire by a small

number of angry radical Islamists to kill Americans. It is certainly not because they are jealous of our wealth and freedoms.

We fail to realize that the extremists, willing to sacrifice their own lives to kill their enemies, do so out of a sense of weakness and desperation over real and perceived attacks on their way of life, their religion, their country, and their natural resources. Without the conventional diplomatic or military means to retaliate against these attacks, and an unwillingness of their own government to address the issue, they resort to the desperation tactic of suicide terrorism. Their anger toward their own governments, which they believe are coconspirators with the American Government, is equal to or greater than that directed toward us.

These errors in judgment in understanding the motive of the enemy and the constant fear that is generated have brought us to this crisis where our civil liberties and privacy are being steadily eroded in the name of preserving national security.

We may be the economic and the military giant of the world, but the effort to stop this war on our liberties here at home in the name of patriotism is being lost.

The erosion of our personal liberties started long before 9/11, but 9/11 accelerated the process. There are many things that motivate those who pursue this course, both well-intentioned and malevolent, but it would not happen if the people remained vigilant, understood the importance of individual rights, and were unpersuaded that a need for security justifies the sacrifice for liberty, even if it is just now and then.

The true patriot challenges the state when the state embarks on enhancing its power at the expense of the individual. Without a better understanding and a greater determination to rein in the state, the rights of Americans that resulted from the revolutionary break from the British and the writing of the Constitution will disappear.

The record since September 11th is dismal. Respect for liberty has rapidly deteriorated. Many of the new laws passed after 9/11 had, in fact, been proposed long before that attack. The political atmosphere after that attack simply made it more possible to pass such legislation. The fear generated by 9/11 became an opportunity for those seeking to promote the power of the state domestically, just as it served to falsely justify the long plan for invasion of Iraq.

The war mentality was generated by the Iraq war in combination with the constant drumbeat of fear at home. Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, who is now likely residing in Pakistan, our supposed ally, are ignored, as our troops fight and die in Iraq and are made easier targets for the terrorists in their backyard. While our leaders constantly use the mess we created to further justify the erosion of our con-

stitutional rights here at home, we forget about our own borders and support the inexorable move toward global government, hardly a good plan for America.

The accelerated attacks on liberty started quickly after 9/11. Within weeks, the PATRIOT Act was overwhelmingly passed by Congress. Though the final version was unavailable up to a few hours before the vote, no Member had sufficient time. Political fear of not doing something, even something harmful, drove the Members of Congress to not question the contents, and just voted for it. A little less freedom for a little more perceived safety was considered a fair trade-off, and the majority of Americans applauded.

The PATRIOT Act, though, severely eroded the system of checks and balances by giving the government the power to spy on law-abiding citizens without judicial supervision. The several provisions that undermine the liberties of all Americans include sneak-and-peek searches, a broadened and more vague definition of domestic terrorism, allowing the FBI access to libraries and bookstore records without search warrants or probable cause, easier FBI initiation of wiretaps and searches, as well as roving wiretaps, easier access to information on American citizens' use of the Internet, and easier access to e-mail and financial records of all American citizens.

The attack on privacy has not relenting over the past 6 years. The Military Commissions Act is a particularly egregious piece of legislation and, if not repealed, will change America for the worse as the powers unconstitutionally granted to the executive branch are used and abused. This act grants excessive authority to use secretive military commissions outside of places where active hostilities are going on. The Military Commissions Act permits torture, arbitrary detention of American citizens as unlawful enemy combatants at the full discretion of the President and without the right of habeas corpus, and warrantless searches by the NSA. It also gives to the President the power to imprison individuals based on secret testimony.

Since 9/11, Presidential signing statements designating portions of legislation that the President does not intend to follow, though not legal under the Constitution, have enormously multiplied. Unconstitutional Executive Orders are numerous and mischievous and need to be curtailed.

Extraordinary rendition to secret prisons around the world have been widely engaged in, though obviously extralegal.

A growing concern in the post-9/11 environment is the Federal Government's list of potential terrorists based on secret evidence. Mistakes are made, and sometimes it is virtually impossible to get one's name removed even though the accused is totally innocent of any wrongdoing.

A national ID card is now in the process of being implemented. It is called the REAL ID card, and it is tied to our Social Security numbers and our State driver's license. If REAL ID is not stopped, it will become a national driver's license ID for all Americans. We will be required to carry our papers.

Some of the least noticed and least discussed changes in the law were the changes made to the Insurrection Act of 1807 and to posse comitatus by the Defense Authorization Act of 2007. These changes pose a threat to the survival of our Republic by giving the President the power to declare martial law for as little reason as to restore public order. The 1807 act severely restricted the President in his use of the military within the United States borders, and the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878 strengthened these restrictions with strict oversight by Congress. The new law allows the President to circumvent the restrictions of both laws. The Insurrection Act has now become the "Enforcement of the Laws to Restore Public Order Act." This is hardly a title that suggests that the authors cared about or understood the nature of a constitutional Republic.

Now, martial law can be declared not just for insurrection, but also for natural disasters, public health reasons, terrorist attacks or incidents, or for the vague reason called "other conditions." The President can call up the National Guard without congressional approval or the Governors' approval, and even send these State Guard troops into other States.

The American Republic is in remnant status. The stage is set for our country eventually devolving into a military dictatorship, and few seem to care. These precedent-setting changes in the law are extremely dangerous and will change American jurisprudence forever if not revised. The beneficial results of our revolt against the King's abuses are about to be eliminated, and few Members of Congress and few Americans are aware of the seriousness of the situation. Complacency and fear drive our legislation without any serious objection by our elected leaders. Sadly, though, those few who do object to this self-evident trend away from personal liberty and empire building overseas are portrayed as unpatriotic and uncaring.

Though welfare and socialism always fails, opponents of them are said to lack compassion. Though opposition to totally unnecessary war should be the only moral position, the rhetoric is twisted to claim that patriots who oppose the war are not supporting the troops. The cliché "Support the Troops" is incessantly used as a substitute for the unacceptable notion of supporting the policy, no matter how flawed it may be.

Unsound policy can never help the troops. Keeping the troops out of harm's way and out of wars unrelated to our national security is the only real way of protecting the troops. With

this understanding, just who can claim the title of "patriot"?

Before the war in the Middle East spreads and becomes a world conflict for which we will be held responsible, or the liberties of all Americans become so suppressed we can no longer resist, much has to be done. Time is short, but our course of action should be clear. Resistance to illegal and unconstitutional usurpation of our rights is required. Each of us must choose which course of action we should take: education, conventional political action, or even peaceful civil disobedience to bring about necessary changes.

But let it not be said that we did nothing. Let not those who love the power of the welfare/warfare state label the dissenters of authoritarianism as unpatriotic or uncaring. Patriotism is more closely linked to dissent than it is to conformity and a blind desire for safety and security. Understanding the magnificent rewards of a free society makes us unashful in its promotion, fully realizing that maximum wealth is created and the greatest chance for peace comes from a society respectful of individual liberty.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, a tsunami of illegal aliens is sweeping into our country, crowding our classrooms, closing our hospital emergency rooms, unleashing violent crime, and driving down wages.

This is not theory. It is a harsh, threatening reality borne out not by numerous academic studies, but by the life experiences of the American families from California to Georgia and from Iowa to New Jersey.

Our middle class is being destroyed. Our communities are not safe. Our social service infrastructure is collapsing. And, yes, it has everything to do with illegal immigration, illegal immigration which is out of control. And year after year, while our schools deteriorate and our jails fill and our hospital emergency rooms shut down, the elite in this country turns a blind eye to the disaster that is befalling the rest of us, their fellow Americans. The elites obscure the issue and maneuver to keep in place policies that reward illegal immigrants with jobs and benefits, and now, of course, being rewarded with citizenship.

This country, the upper class says, can't function without cheap labor.

□ 2130

Well, cheap to the captains of industry and the political elite, but painfully expensive to America's middle class. It's our kids whose education is being diminished, our families who are paying thousands more in health insur-

ance to make up for the hospital costs of giving free service to illegals. It's our neighborhoods who suffer from crime perpetuated by criminals transported here from other countries. And, yes, our livelihoods are being dragged down as wages are depressed and anchored down by a constant influx of immigrants, mostly illegal, some with H1B visas, willing to work at a pittance.

Big business, with its hold on the GOP, in an unholy alliance with the liberal left coalition that controls the Democratic Party, have been responsible for this invasion of our country, this attack on the well-being of our people. This coalition gives the jobs and passes out the benefits that lured tens of millions of illegals to our country. It's no accident. This predicament was predictable. It's been over 20 years of bad policy in the making. If you give jobs and benefits, the masses of people over there will do anything to get over here. And that's what we've been doing. Give it and they will come. Surprise, surprise.

Now the out-of-touch elite has introduced yet another piece of legislation, this so-called comprehensive reform bill that they claim will fix our illegal immigration crisis once and for all. Of course, this is a crisis they created. They are trumpeting the supposedly new enforcement measures and security measures that will be initiated in this bill, the border fence, new agents, new employer sanctions, if only we will swallow hard and give amnesty to those law-breakers who are already here.

Like Lucy holding out the football for Charlie Brown to kick, the bill is yet another effort to trick us. It's an illusion, a scam that will make things worse, not better.

The Senate legislation now being touted by Senator KENNEDY and a few Republican Senators immediately legalizes the status of 15 to 20 million illegals, while offering more border control, yes, fences and Border Patrol agents and such, as sweeteners aimed at getting us to accept this deal.

But we've already passed legislation addressing border security. It's already into law. It's already against the law, for example, to hire illegals. We've already mandated a stronger fence and more Border Patrol agents. So, in reality, this legislation isn't about those other things which they're trying to get us to support the legislation about; this is only about legalizing the status of 15 to 20 million illegals and then finding new ways to get more immigrants into our country. It has nothing to do with controlling the flow of illegals and controlling the flow of immigrants into our country, as much as it is expanding the number of immigrants, legal and illegal, coming into our country.

In such situations as we find ourselves in today with this legislation, it's fashionable on Capitol Hill to say "the devil is in the details". And this

bill has enough demons to open up a whole new level of hell.

Let's start, first and foremost, with the most obvious lie, the claim that this bill does not give amnesty to illegal aliens. President Bush has done great damage to his credibility by playing such word games. My friends, the first thing this bill does is legalize 15 to 20 million people who now illegally reside in our country. I don't care what the President calls it, it immediately legalizes the status of millions who are here illegally.

Under the proposed legislation, this amnesty, and that's exactly what it is, is now called a probationary Z visa. Upon passage of this bill, every illegal alien who can claim they were here in the United States by January 1 of 2007 can apply for a probationary Z visa that grants them immediate legal status to be in the United States.

Listen carefully. Immediately upon this bill's passage, there is no waiting for triggers or clarification or bureaucratic benchmarks, their status is immediately legalized. It is very straightforward. These probationary visas are available immediately upon the passage of this bill, 15 or 20 million illegals immediately legalized in their status here.

What message does this send to the 100 million or so people who are waiting overseas? The 15 to 20 million newly legalized immigrants will be quickly followed by 50 to 100 million more illegals flooding our system beyond the point of return. If we let that happen, this will be a catastrophic event of historic proportions. More importantly, for the American people, it will be a calamity for their communities and for their families.

According to this so-called immigration reform bill, how does an illegal become legal? Well, first of all, he temporarily, right off the bat, becomes legal once this bill passes. Very simple, if he wants to make himself legal, then beyond that, he or she walks in and applies. Or he or she just, they don't have to pay back taxes; they don't have to do anything else.

If this bill passes, he or she doesn't have to go through health checks. They don't have to have any other process. They will be granted, immediately after the passage of this bill, legal status to be here, legal status that is supposedly temporary. Supposedly. The illegal pays a fine of \$1,000 for this probationary visa, not the \$5,000 that we've all heard about. It's \$1,000. And for \$1,000, one can obtain the legal right to work in this country, to participate in our Social Security system, to be protected by our laws, and given benefits from our government, a plenty good bargain for them.

But for the taxpayers it's worse than a raw deal. Yes, out of the shadows will come 15 to 20 million people who will now be demanding equal rights to live here freely, to get jobs, to consume resources that they are not now entitled to consume because they are now here illegally.

There is another detail that makes this process dangerous and unworkable. The government, according to this legislation, has only 1 business day to act once an application has been submitted, and that is just 1 day to look over that application and to approve it. After 1 business day, that's 24 hours, the government must issue the amnesty to that applicant.

Is there anyone who doesn't understand that this means huge numbers of criminals and, yes, terrorists, who will obtain the legal right to live and work here in the United States under this rule because of this legislation? One day to oversee this applicant?

One needs to ask, who is writing such obvious insanity into Federal legislation? Obviously, whoever is insisting on a 1-day review, that must be followed by an approval if one doesn't object; 1-day review, obviously, the person who's advocating this doesn't care about us at all. He's looking to make sure that we treat those people who are in this country illegally better. This person obviously doesn't care, who's written this into our Federal law, or is trying to, doesn't care if Americans are victimized by criminals who should never have been permitted to come here, but will come here because we're only requiring 1 day to determine if they can be approved or not.

Now, you think that criminals throughout the world and even terrorists don't see this as a vulnerability? Who's trying to foist this off on us? Who's trying to write this into Federal law? They're not watching out for the interests of the American people.

This Z visa gives illegal aliens exactly what they want, the legal right to work in the United States, and the Z visa is renewable every 4 years, without limits. The way this bill is written, you can live in the United States until you die by renewing your Z visa every 4 years.

Fellow Americans, who love this country, word games aside, this is amnesty of the worst possible sort. Millions of illegals who broke the law will be granted legal status and can stay in this country as long as they please. In fact, I predict millions of people who are currently holding valid student and tourist visas will immediately apply for the Z visa. And why not? Student and tourist visas expire. The Z visa won't expire; every 4 years you can just renew it.

Only if the alien wishes to become a citizen do the increased fines, that \$5,000 we've heard about, only if they want to become a citizen do these fines and other requirements come into play.

No serious person in the immigration reform movement has ever said that it is citizenship that defines amnesty. Amnesty is not being held to account for breaking the law. This Z visa goes beyond not punishing law breakers. It actually rewards law breakers.

Wake up, America. Someone is giving away our country. Someone is betraying the interests of the American peo-

ple. The perpetrators of this crime want low wages for the benefit of business and they want political pawns for the benefit of the liberal left.

This legislation will make a bad situation that we all know exists in this country, it'll make it dramatically worse. Is this what the American people are calling for when they want comprehensive immigration reform? They want something that will make it worse than we have it today?

I don't understand how we can stand and let this happen to our country. It is up to us to make sure that it doesn't.

This legislation is a declaration of war on the American middle class. And not only will this legislation increase illegal immigration, a clause in the bill will create a rush to the border. Section 601H5 states that anyone arrested trying to cross into our country, who then claims to have formerly lived in the United States will be allowed to apply for a Z visa; which means they can be approved in 1 day.

This is a mind-boggling incentive for fraud. Who wouldn't want to come across the border on the chance that they could bluff their way into getting amnesty and becoming eligible for all our government programs and eligible for the jobs that should be going to Americans?

Expect to hear ballyhoo about the tough enforcement mechanisms and the "triggers" built into this bill. But don't believe it; it's just so much more fraud, more flim-flam. The triggers and other schemes in this bill are a farce.

There is no reason these safeguards against illegal immigration have not already been implemented. They are now simply being used as a ruse to disguise the one goal of the elite, and that is to legalize the status of those millions who are already here illegally and leading tens of millions more to come here.

The bill calls for 18,000 Border Patrol agents. That's one of the claims of why we have to support the bill. We're going to get 18,000 Border Patrol agents. But we already have 15,000 Border Patrol agents. And in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, it's required that there be 2,000 new Border Patrol agents each year through 2010. So this is simply smoke and mirrors.

What this new legislation does is simply reiterate hiring mandates that are already in the system, already mandated by law. This bill simply takes credit for the hard work that's already been done. Of course, they're doing that because, again, it's a cover for their attempt to legalize the status of 15 to 20 million illegals and, yes, to unleash a flood of millions more to come into our country.

On another level, how does anyone expect to actually meet the goal of increasing the ranks of the Border Patrol when this administration throws Border Patrol agents into prison and gives immunity to alien drug smugglers? This administration has lost the confidence of the Border Patrol.

And I submit at this time a statement by the Border Patrol Agents Council opposing this legislation. I would like to put this into the RECORD at this point, Mr. Speaker.

[From the National Border Patrol Council of the American Federation of Government Employees, May 17, 2007]

SENATE IMMIGRATION REFORM COMPROMISE IS
A RAW DEAL FOR AMERICA

More than a century ago, the philosopher George Santayana sagely observed that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." The United States Senate would do well to heed that advice as it once again debates immigration reform.

In 1986, Congress passed the Immigration Reform and Control Act. At that time, it was estimated that between three and four million illegal aliens were living in the United States. The bill promised to crack down on the businesses that hired illegal aliens and step up border enforcement efforts. Since those measures would finally solve the problem of illegal immigration, Congress reasoned, there would be no harm in establishing a pathway to citizenship for those who had been working in this country for a minimum period of time. It was assumed that about one-half million people would qualify for that benefit under those terms. In the final analysis, however, nearly three million illegal aliens became citizens, many of them through fraud. A large number of criminals and even a handful of terrorists were among the beneficiaries of that program.

Twenty-one years later, it is estimated that at least 12 million, and perhaps as many as 20 million, illegal aliens reside in the United States. Quite obviously, the promise of enforcement never materialized. Now, some elected officials are desperately trying to convince the American public that they are finally serious about keeping that promise, and to prove it, claim that they will add about 5,000 Border Patrol agents and 370 miles of border fencing, as well as an electronic employment verification system. While this represents a slight improvement over the current untenable situation, it will by no means stop, or even substantially slow, the current rate of illegal immigration.

As long as impoverished people can find work in this country at wages that far exceed those available to them in their native countries, millions of illegal aliens will continue to cross our borders every year. The only way to stop this influx is to eliminate the employment magnet by means of a fool-proof employment verification system. While the plan unveiled by the Senate takes a few small steps in that direction, it would do very little to actually hold employers accountable. In order to achieve that goal, every prospective worker must be required to present a single type of secure biometric employment-verification document whenever applying for a job, and every prospective employer must be required to electronically verify its authenticity. The logical choice for this document is the Social Security card, which every legal worker is already required to possess.

Those who claim that it would be impossible to arrest and deport millions of people ignore economic reality. If illegal aliens can no longer find work in this country because employers are afraid of the consequences for hiring them, they will go home of their own accord.

Unless Congress gets serious about work-site enforcement, it will be impossible to secure our borders. The Border Patrol is totally overwhelmed by the high volume of illegal traffic that streams across our borders

every day. Front-line agents estimate that for every person they apprehend, two or three slip by them. At the same time, Border Patrol agents need to be provided with the necessary tools and support in order to be able to intercept the criminals and terrorists who will continue to attempt to breach our borders.

T.J. Bonner, the president of the National Border Patrol Council, issued the following statement today:

"Every person who has ever risked their life securing our borders is extremely disheartened to see some of our elected representatives once again waving the white flag on the issues of illegal immigration and border security. Rewarding criminal behavior has never induced anyone to abide by the law, and there is no reason to believe that the outcome will be any different in this case."

"The passage of time has proven the 1986 amnesty to be a mistake of colossal proportions. Instead of 'wiping the slate clean,' it spurred a dramatic increase in illegal immigration. With the ever-present threat of terrorism, it is critical to take the steps necessary to immediately and completely secure our borders. Piecemeal measures will prolong our vulnerability, and are an open invitation to further terrorist attacks."

"Rather than the meaningless 'triggers' of additional personnel and barriers outlined in the compromise, Americans must insist that border security be measured in absolute terms. As long as any people or contraband can enter our country illegally, our borders are not secure. Sadly, the plan that the Senate is proposing falls woefully short by that yardstick, and needlessly jeopardizes the security of this Nation."

□ 2145

As we deliberate on this bill, it behooves us to remember that Border Patrol Agents Ramos and Compean are at this very moment languishing in solitary confinement in a Federal prison. These heroic border guards, one a 10-year veteran who was up to be Border Patrol Agent of the Year, another 5-year veteran, these people who were putting their lives on the line for us on a daily basis for years, interdicted a drug smuggler one day. This drug smuggler was transporting over \$1 million worth of narcotics into our country. Yet when all was said and done, and the drug smuggler had escaped, but his drugs were interdicted and seized, this administration turned what may have been just administrative paperwork and literally things not reported right on paper, mistakes that may or may not have been made by the agents, and I think that after looking at this, there weren't mistakes, but if there were, it was procedural mistakes, policy issues there that were being dealt with on paper, they turned that into criminal activity, charging our Border Patrol agents with felonies, putting them away for 10 to 11 years, while siding with the drug smuggler, giving the drug smuggler immunity to testify against the Border Patrol agents as they turned what would be minor mistakes into felonies rather than trying to say, well, you made some mistakes in this, but we will give you immunity, however, so we can get the drug smuggler who is trying to smuggle drugs in to our children and into our communities.

And then there are the cases of Gilmer Hernandez and Gary Brugman, two more law enforcement officers, jailed for stopping human traffickers. Again, the book was thrown at them, the maximum penalties sought, but no prosecution of illegal criminal aliens.

This indefensible inclination of the administration, of President Bush's leadership of the administration, has demoralized our protectors at the border. According to the National Border Patrol Council, the union representing 12,000 frontline Border Patrol agents, we are losing 12 percent of our Border Patrol agents a year right now. That amounts to 1,500 officers quitting their job every year. And we cannot replace the ones that we are losing. Why? Because this administration is not backing them up; because they feel that they are being abused by the people, by the government that they are serving. This is the administration that claims to be doing things in this legislation to help increase border security.

This administration, this President, has a miserable record of providing border security. Our defenders have been undercut and abused by a personal protegee of the President of the United States.

This isn't as if President Bush doesn't know this. Attorney General Johnny Sutton, a young man who has tagged his career to the President for the last 20 years, he personally decided to prosecute these people, these law enforcement people, to the fullest extent of the law. And he has demonstrated that he will show no mercy for these Border Patrol agents and law enforcement officers like Ramos and Compean. The White House and Johnny Sutton will not permit these Border Patrol agents to even go out on bond until their appeal is heard. And it was Johnny Sutton, the U.S. attorney, and prosecutors that decided to prosecute them and let the drug smugglers go, decided to throw the book at them, decided to give gun charges against these people even though it is their job to carry a gun in order to protect us.

Well, are we expected to believe that the legislation now pursued by the President, who is behind such nonsensical policies at the border, will help make our borders more secure, help stem the out-of-control flow of illegals into our country? How can we believe that that is what the purpose of this legislation is when at this time the administration is taking steps and has taken steps for the last 6 years to ensure that we would have a massive flow of illegals into our country? These people didn't just materialize into our country. They have come especially from across the southern border, but across our other borders as well, and there has been no attempt by this administration to get control of the people who are entering via airports from other parts of the world, people who then just overstay their visa.

Well, this administration has not done this and has attacked our Border

Patrol agents instead. So much for the idea that this legislation, backed by Senator KENNEDY and the President, will somehow strengthen the Border Patrol.

The next trigger that we are told about is similarly fraudulent. The bill requires U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to have the resources to detain up to 27,000 illegal aliens. How about that? But the Intelligence Reform and Terrorist Prevention Act of 2004 already requires almost double that number, 43,000 beds. Again, the bill is simply taking credit for legislation and for mandates that have already been passed into law. They are doing this to confuse the American people because they are using this as a cover to legalize the status of 15- to 20-million people who are here illegally, which will attract tens of millions more.

And what this bill doesn't do and what it doesn't require may be just as significant as what it does. It does not require worksite enforcement. In an amazing loophole. It only requires the Department of Homeland Security to have the tools to conduct worksite enforcement, but nowhere in the bill does it mandate the Department of Homeland Security to actually conduct worksite enforcement. Since millions of illegal aliens come here looking for work, worksite enforcement is imperative if we are to discourage illegal immigration.

If the Department of Homeland Security has the tools, but this so-called comprehensive package does not require them to use the tools, then we are right back in the situation that we are now. The law isn't being enforced. If it was, then the situation would not have gotten out of hand, as it is today.

One of the triggers in this legislation actually reduces border security. It cuts in half the border fence that Congress required to build on our southern borders. Now, remember we already passed the legislation requiring a fence. Everybody remembers that. Now those who ignored that mandate, the President and others who ignored that mandate, are telling us we must legalize the status of millions of illegals who are in this country in order for us to get what is already required by law. Now, what makes us think they are now going to obey the law, the agreement that they made?

What this bill doesn't do, as I said, speaks as loud as it what it does. It does not require the U.S. to have a verifiable exit system so we know that when visiting foreigners come into the U.S., then we have no idea if they have left. Someone who is coming into the United States on a visa can overstay their visa, and we don't know if they have left. How can we seek out and deport someone who has violated their visa if we don't even know if that person is in the country or not? There has been no effort on the part of this administration to try to fix that problem, and this bill does not mandate that.

Furthermore, it does not mandate checks on legal status in order for people who are here to get benefits. So those who oversee the limited resources that we have for our own people aren't expected to verify the legal status of those seeking to obtain services or benefits that are paid by the taxpayers. Our own people are going to suffer because of this. This is the comprehensive bill that is supposed to help our people; yet it leaves us vulnerable. Illegals are waved right through the system.

Let me give you an example. What I have learned is that there are hundreds of thousands of illegals throughout this country who are in Federal housing. Why? Because one member of their family, perhaps a child that was born here once they came to this country illegally, one child becomes a U.S. citizen, and if they have one child as a U.S. citizen, the whole family then gets to have housing benefits from the Federal Government.

Now, tell me this: The American people who are paying the bills, shouldn't they be getting this benefit rather than a family from overseas who has one child in this country who then supposedly becomes a citizen? What about our people who are barely making it, who can barely afford to pay their rent? They don't get the housing subsidy. What about our seniors who lose their income or they can't make it on what their retirement income is? They don't get the help. But illegals are being herded right through the system and given this help because they have a child that was born here.

We shouldn't even permit an illegal who has a child here to think that that child is going to be a legal citizen. That itself should be taken care of in this legislation, and that isn't being taken care of. And by letting anyone who is born here become a U.S. citizen, we have again opened up all these benefits to illegals, millions of them, and we have also invited millions to come here to make sure their children become citizens by being born here.

And, by the way, the triggers that we have heard about will unleash forces that they claim will make things better, but what about these triggers? How are these triggers going to be met? Well, the Secretary of Homeland Security, all he has to do to say that the triggers have been met is simply submit a written piece of paper that claims the triggers have been met. There is no actual reduction in illegal immigration required before there is a trigger which brings in all of these new immigrants and opens up the rest of the legislation. There is no decrease in, for example, those people who are involved in trying to get jobs through the match file system of Social Security. No, that would be measurable. Perhaps if we had a reduction in the number of illegal aliens in our prisons that could be noted, maybe that would be a good trigger, or anything else that can be objectively measured. No. That

might mean that we are actually making progress, and that is the real reason why you have triggers. No, the triggers are there to provide cover.

The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, all he has to do is simply sign a letter saying that the trigger elements are funded, in place, and in operation. So these supposed triggers, these supposed safeguards, they just have to be in place. They don't have to have any results, and at that point, that is when the rest of the safeguards don't make any difference at that point. That is when the meat of the bill goes into effect. The immigration spigot will be turned on by a simple piece of paper saying that something is in place, not necessarily working.

And as we have seen, several of these triggers that I have already mentioned have already been put in place by prior legislation. The wall, building the wall, and expanding the Border Patrol agents, they have already been mandated. So one can expect the trigger letters that we are talking about that they are saying we are going to hold off until this situation is under control, they will be issued almost immediately, and that is predictable.

And what happens when a letter certifying that we have gotten tough with border security is issued? Well, once that letter is issued, this legislation provides that a massive, and I mean a massive, guest worker program is then launched. You get that? Expanding the Border Patrol agents and the fence and these things, when they just say they are in place, all of a sudden the new guest worker program is brought out and launched into service.

The deep pool of illegals currently here is going to be boosted by a flood of new illegals who know that if they get here, they will likely be given amnesty just like we did in 1986 and just like people are trying to do right now.

□ 2200

The lies of the past are almost as blatant as the fraud we are now confronting. The unspoken truth is Senator KENNEDY wants extremely high levels of immigration. The truth is, President Bush wants extremely high levels of immigration. It hurts the well-being of the American people, but if it does, so be it. That's what Senator KENNEDY and President Bush want.

It isn't enough that we have a 15 percent unemployment rate among high school dropouts in this country, and millions of lower-income Americans who are seeing their wages buy less and less. It isn't enough that immigration has reduced the wages of low-skilled Americans by about \$2,000 a year. Apparently, we need to push them into abject poverty by importing 400,000 guest workers a year to compete directly with Americans. Yes, 400,000, and again, now, details matter.

While Y visas, which are designated for those who are in this new temporary guest workers program, while

they are supposed to be only temporary and only good for 2 years, a Y visa holder can eventually apply and get U.S. citizenship. They can also bring their spouse and children. They can stay for 2 years to work. Then they return home, and then they reapply for another 2-year visa. They can renew the Y visa this way up to three times.

Now, who in their right mind actually believes that these people, once they've uprooted their families and they brought all this and met these other requirements, that once they are here, that they are just going to go back? When we have millions of people swarming into this country because we've already given amnesty to everybody else, why won't these people in the guest worker program just melt right into the crowds, just go right there?

And, of course, they might go in and ask for green cards, which they can do, or they will just melt into the system, melt into our country. Why not?

Well, does this sound like it is a temporary guest worker's program, that 400,000 people are going to be here temporarily? Well, who gets hurt by this nonsense?

This bill allows employers to lay off American workers and replace them with Y visa holders as long as the Americans were fired 90 days before the petition of the foreign worker is filed. This is a huge subsidy to corporate America. It is both corporate welfare and an attack on the paycheck of hard-working Americans who are struggling to keep afloat.

We are told we must have these guest workers because Americans won't take the jobs, like in agriculture. Well, there are Americans who will pick fruit and vegetables. Don't tell me there aren't Americans who will go out and do this kind of labor in the fields. In fact, I've visited compounds where you have thousands of Americans, men, healthy men, between 18 and 40 years old, who would love to get out and earn some money. These are men in prison. These are prisoners who, after serving their time, 5 to 10 years, they get out with no work ethic, no money, \$50 in their pocket and a new suit; and people are surprised when they come back to prison after committing more crime.

Well, let's put these people to work, rather than wasting all of their time, not developing any work ethic, let's let them earn \$10,000, \$20,000, so when they get out, they will have some money in their hand and they will have a work ethic. And half of the money can be used to pay for their own incarceration.

When somebody like me says this in Washington, D.C., they make fun of that. They make fun of me for suggesting that prisoners should pick the fruits and vegetables. The people making fun of me, are they watching out for the American people? These prisoners, they will be given a chance if we let them earn a living, come out of prison with \$10,000 or \$20,000 that

they've earned, and they've paid some restitution in the meantime. So there are people who will do these jobs, even the agricultural jobs.

We are told we must have guest workers because Americans won't take the jobs, like agriculture and other jobs, because the guest worker program isn't just agricultural work. Look real close, Mr. and Mrs. America. This guest worker program includes a lot of other jobs rather than just agricultural work, cleaning hotel rooms and construction workers, for example.

Now, is it really true that Americans won't do that, or Americans won't be nannies for other people's children? No. Americans will do those jobs as long as they get pay commensurate for their work. No, they won't work like slave labor, like illegals who are pouring over the borders into our country to fill these jobs.

There are millions of American women who would love to drop off their children at school at 9 o'clock in the morning and go to work at these various hotels, cleaning the rooms and changing the sheets and then get off by 3 o'clock in order to pick up their kids at school. Yes, millions of American women would like to do that, but they're not going to work for a pittance, they're not going to work as slaves. They want benefits if they're going to work for the job. But with illegals pouring across the border, these millions of American women are left out.

There are millions of American women who would love to be a nanny for some rich people who would like to have a nanny for their children, or even some people who aren't so rich who would like to have some help with their children, but they're not going to work for a pittance. And all these rich people who have nannies from overseas and are paying them half as much as they would have to pay an American woman to help them, who is being helped? The rich lady or the rich woman who has the children are being helped.

Yes, those rich people are being helped. Maybe the immigrant, the illegal immigrant, probably woman, who is helping out as a nanny, she has helped a little bit. Who is the big loser are the American women, who could be earning a decent living to help their families by serving as nannies, because they are women who are mothers and they know about taking care of children. We have frozen them out of the market.

We are hurting the American family. We are making sure that families don't have the extra money, and that these hotel chains can pay people a pittance.

The guest worker program starts at 400,000, but it can be increased. This bill allows for adjustments every 6 months based on market fluctuation. Is there a doubt in anyone's mind that simply allowing the number of guest workers to go up and down will not result in the number of workers going up

and up and up? H1B visas and Y visa holders will be taking the jobs that Americans are willing to do, but they will be driving down wages.

In Orange County, I went to a function a few years ago and a fellow grabbed me by the arm and he said, Congressman, I am here to thank you. He had a newspaper clipping when we were debating H1B visas here on the floor of the House. He said Congressman, I read your quote. You said if we bring in these hundreds of thousands of people on H1B visas from India and Pakistan to work at our high-tech jobs, we are going to do nothing but depress the wages of the people in the electronics industry.

He said, I was laid off, and do you know what happened? I went back to get my old job back. They paid me \$80,000, and now they were offering the same job to me for \$50,000. And they looked at me and said, if you don't take this, we can get somebody with an H1B visa to take it, some Indian or Pakistani, so you'd better take it.

And he said, I did. He said, you know the difference, Congressman, between earning \$50,000 and \$80,000 is? I said, what is it? He said, you never dream of owning your own home if you make \$50,000 a year.

We are destroying the dreams of the American people in order to what? To bring down wages so that our business elite can prosper, and yes, so that we can bring millions of illegals into this country, millions of immigrants into this country, which the liberal left of the political spectrum thinks that they are going to use these people as pawns in their own political game. They are being exploited by the business community and exploited by the liberal left who control the Democratic party. This is obscene.

Who loses? Yeah, the immigrants are kind of losers, even though they're a little bit better off. The American people are the losers.

What happens to particular Americans isn't the worst of it. Not only do we greatly expand our guest worker program, we are actually increasing chain migration, even though they are telling us this bill will take care of that. Chain migration allows an immigrant to bring his spouse and children and the sisters and brothers and in-laws, grandparents, aunts and uncles.

One of the reasons the wait to migrate to America is so long for many people overseas is that the open slots that could become open to immigrate here legally are going to people who are bringing their relatives over, people who may immediately be on the dole, people who can't even support themselves, but they are family members.

The Senate claims this bill will move away from that, that it will point the system to a merit system, to those who have skills that America needs and will be able to come into the country before the relatives of those people are already here. Sounds pretty good in theory, doesn't it? Once again, there are

so many loopholes in this bill that the reality of this legislation is just the opposite for which it portends.

The bill, as written, for most of the next decade will dramatically increase chain migration. Well, how is that? How? Right now, chain migration is limited to 112,000 per year. This bill increases that. Get this: Chain migration is 112,000 a year; this bill would increase that number to 440,000 per year until the current backlog of applications is filled.

That backlog will take 8 years, get that, 8 years to fix, 8 years before the point system we are being told about will come into play, 8 years at a four-fold increase in chain migration during those 8 years.

Does anyone here really think that 8 years from now we will implement a merit system for chain migration? By then we will have 50 to 100 million new illegal immigrants here who have swarmed into our country, and we will be in the midst of chaos and confusion.

One might reasonably hope, after granting amnesty, establishing a new guest worker program, increasing chain migration and requiring trigger mechanisms that already are in place and aren't needed, that this bill might at least crack down on illegal immigrant criminals. Well, don't hold your breath. This bill imposes significant obstacles to removing dangerous alien gang members from our country.

This bill also narrowly defines criminal gangs so that many small gangs will be excluded from the bill. Further, the government must prove bad intent on the part of the alien gang member in order to remove the alien gang member. All a gang member has to do is sign a piece of paper saying he has renounced his gang affiliation and he can then get a Z visa. He is then getting a visa that will permit him legal status here, even though he's illegal and part of a criminal gang. Of course a gang member would never lie to us about that, would he? I guess not. Why are we putting out this welcome mat for criminals? This is madness.

Further, the bill weakens the law involving passport fraud and misuse. It actually reduces the punishment for illegal reentry by criminals into this country. The so-called comprehensive bill weakens restrictions that are already in place.

And shockingly enough, this bill does not make engaging in a terrorist activity proof that an immigrant is not of good moral character, the good moral character, of course, being a requirement to get a visa.

And the final insult, let's look at the highly touted electronic employment eligibility verification, the system allowing employers to make sure that the employees they hire are eligible for employment. It's a fraud. Why? First, because the bill permits the entire system to be changed by the Department of Homeland Security Secretary and the Social Security Administrator.

Second, while an illegal alien is appealing a finding of noneligibility for

employment, so if he is found not to be eligible for employment, while he is appealing that, he can appeal it administratively, and then he can appeal it in the courts. The illegal can't be fired while he is appealing that decision. That could go on for years, and so the mechanism is irrelevant.

In real-life scenarios, this bill would make that mechanism to check irrelevant. Forget whatever requirements are in the bill. There are over 40 pages of such requirements, such as, in section 302 of the bill, the Department of Homeland Security Secretary and the Social Security Administrator are given authority to change any requirement. Any of the supposed tough mandates can be administratively done and deleted simply by publishing these changes in the Federal Register.

What is the purpose of defining a system for page after page in this legislation and then saying, by the way, if you don't like it or get too much heat from greedy employers or a confused press, don't worry, you can change it? It can be changed easily without having to go back to the Congress.

□ 2215

This is not laying the foundation for meeting serious challenges. This is creating a phony facade to make people think that something else is happening.

The final slap? This bill legalizes in-state tuition for illegal aliens. If your child goes 100 miles to the next State, he or she must pay for out-of-state tuition. But an illegal alien who is smuggled 2,000 miles by their parents into this country can go to school cheaply and on your tax dollar.

This much vaunted compromise that we are talking about, this comprehensive bill, is in reality an amnesty for everyone; a new guest worker program so your employer can throw you out of work. It vastly expands chain migration. It guts enforcement provisions and makes it easier for illegal alien criminals to stay. If this is a compromise, I shudder to think what the other bill will look like. It would be more honest for the Senate to draft up a bill declaring war on the American people.

Robert Rector from the Heritage Foundation estimates the cost for the out-of-control flow of illegal immigration will be over \$2.5 trillion. That is trillion dollars with a "T." Baby-boomers retiring and the looming crisis in Medicare and Social Security are upon us. What rational person thinks that we can take on another \$2.5 trillion in obligations and not see the utter bankruptcy of our country? And what rational person thinks we can absorb tens of millions of new illegals who will be attracted to America once we legalize the status of this bunch who are here now?

This goes deeper than economics. Why are we officially endorsing the existence of a permanent class of illegal residents, because when those 50 to 100

million people get here, it will be over. A group of people who are not citizens, who have neither obligation nor benefits of being citizens, will be in our country forever. It will change the nature of the United States. It is changing the nature of the United States.

I strongly support legal immigration. Legal immigrants are the bulwark of our economy and our society. They are the most patriotic of Americans. But they have come here to be Americans. They have come here, legal immigrants have come here, to make sure they are healthy, yes, and they can work and they can actually take care of themselves, rather than be wards of the state. They have met these obligations. They want to speak English.

But they have come here with the premise, everyone comes here who comes to our country, they know, these legal immigrants, that they have to give up their allegiance to their old country and to truly become Americans, and they want to become Americans. I am proud of those legal immigrants who support me in my district. They deserve the rights and their families deserve the rights of every American, and no one should ever interpret this battle against illegal immigration with any attack on those wonderful American citizens who are here by choice and who have come here legally and come here through the process.

We have a huge group of illegal immigrants here now, and a growing number, who refuse to renounce their allegiance to their old country and to their old ways, but loudly insist on being granted the economic benefits of living in this country. This is a prescription for disaster. For disaster.

Legal immigration is a controlled process. We take in more than all the rest of the world combined. We have more legal immigrants into our country than all the other countries of the world combined, and we can be proud of that.

But it hasn't been enough for those who rake in higher profits when wages go down or for those in the liberal left who want to fundamentally change America and believe a mass of new immigrants will help them do it.

America is a wondrous dream. We are letting an elite clique of capitalists and leftists, as unholy an alliance as that is, to turn this dream into a nightmare. The American people need to step forward with a righteous rage. They are being betrayed. President Bush and Senator KENNEDY have an agenda that will destroy America's middle-class. Those who sign onto this legislation are not, not, representing the interests of the American people.

If we do not speak up, the Americans, the patriots, both legal immigrants and people who are born here, if we do not step up there will be another 50 to 100 million people here from abroad and they will live here a decade from now and it will be a different country. We will have lost our country.

Yet those supporting this invasion of America posture themselves as morally

superior. Cities declare “sanctuary” for illegals, these illegals who have broken our laws. These cities who are declaring sanctuary are never asked who is being hurt. They think they are helping people.

It is not just the American people being hurt, it is those people waiting in line overseas. Why should the person who has come here illegally, the people who have come here illegally, get the benefits? Why should the people who run the sanctuaries be on the side of those people who cheated and cut in line in front of all of those hundreds of millions of people waiting overseas?

The sanctuary cities are treating the good people who would immigrate here legally and are waiting to do so as a bunch of saps. Any time that we reward illegal conduct and these people who have come here illegally and we say we are reaching out to them, we are going to try to help them, what you are really doing is hurting the people overseas. You are hurting someone else who is a decent, hard-working person who would come here. So anybody who offers sanctuary and is reaching out to illegals is doing nothing but hurting other people overseas. Of course, they are hurting the American people. It is not enough to tell them that. They are also hurting these poor people overseas. These sanctuary cities are contributing to the breakdown of our society.

This “holier-than-thou” attitude is not humanitarian. It is phony. Those posers are rarely willing to sacrifice their own resources. They want to spend taxpayer dollars to take care of their humanitarian instincts. The Catholic Church, for example, demands that illegals be given healthcare and education benefits. Let the Catholic Church, if they are serious, pay the bill for the illegals. They can do it. They can provide schools and healthcare. There are a lot of Catholic properties that could be sold to pay for their healthcare. No, they want the American people, other people, to pay for it. The taxpayers. That is not humanitarianism. That is not Christian charity.

Then what happens when the next wave gets here, 50 to 100 million illegals? First and foremost, the American people should be loyal to each other. We must care for each other. This is not hate mongering. This is not being against people. Americans of every race, every religion, every ethnic background, we need to be compassionate to each other and each other's families. We must not drain the limited resources that we have for the Americans in order to give it to the other people who have come here illegally, because we must first care for our own people.

That is not hate. That is the right kind of love you have in your heart for your family and your neighbors. This is not humanitarianism, when we give this away to others and encourage millions more to come here. It will cause the collapse of our system and all of us will be worse off.

The immigration legislation being foisted upon us will create a different America with a permanent alien underclass, people who may or may not share our Democratic values and may or may not be loyal to America's ideals. It is time for patriots to act, to stand up and be heard. Be angry. Call on elected officials to be held accountable.

This supposed comprehensive immigration bill must be defeated, and I would call on my fellow Members of Congress and the American people to join in this fight. We need every patriot to be activated now to save America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KIRK (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for the week of May 21st on account of the birth of her son.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for Monday, May 21, and for today, May 22, on account of a family emergency.

Ms. BERKLEY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 4 p.m.

Ms. BORDALLO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family and official business in the district.

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. CROWLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes each, today, May 23 and 24.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, May 23.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 254. An act to award posthumously a Congressional gold medal to Constantino

Brumidi, to the Committee on Financial Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1907. A letter from the Regulatory Contact, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Official Fees and Tolerances for Barley Protein Testing (RIN: 0580-AA95) received May 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1908. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Addition of Areas in Virginia [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0171] received April 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1909. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0323; FRL-8122-8] received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1910. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Administrative Revisions to Plant-Incorporated Protectant Tolerance Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0116; FRL-7742-2] received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1911. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propiconazole; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0224; FRL-8121-2] received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1912. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Small Business Programs [DFARS Case 2003-D047] (RIN: 0750-AE93) received April 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1913. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Electronic Submission and Processing of Payment Requests [DFARS Case 2005-D009] (RIN: 0750-AF28) received May 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1914. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's report that no such exemptions to the prohibition against favored treatment of a government securities broker or dealer were granted during the period January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006, pursuant to Public Law 103-

202, section 202; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1915. A letter from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Federal Home Loan Bank Appointive Directors [No. 2007-01] (RIN: 3069-AB-33) received April 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1916. A letter from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Housing Financing Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Limitation on Issuance of Excess Stock [No. 2006-23] (RIN: 3069-AB30) received April 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1917. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — TERMINATION OF A FOREIGN PRIVATE ISSUER'S REGISTRATION OF A CLASS OF SECURITIES UNDER SECTION 12(g) AND DUTY TO FILE REPORTS UNDER SECTION 13(a) OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 [RELEASE NO. 34-55540; INTERNATIONAL SERIES RELEASE NO. 1301; FILE NO. S7-12-05] (RIN: 3235-AJ38) received April 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1918. A letter from the Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electrical Standard [Docket No. S-108C] (RIN: 1218-AB95) received April 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1919. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Laxative Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Psyllium Ingredients in Granular Dosage Forms [[Docket No. 1978N-0036] (formerly Docket No. 1978N-0036L)] (RIN: 0910-AF38) received April 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1920. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advisory Committee: Change of Name and Function — received April 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1921. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Substances Affirmed as Generally Recognized as Safe in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals: 25-Hydroxyvitamin D3 [[Docket No. 1995G-0321] (formerly 95G-0321)] received April 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1922. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anthropomorphic Test Devices; ES-2re Side Impact Crash Test Dummy 50th Percentile Adult Male [Docket No. NHTSA-2004-25441] (RIN: 2127-AI89) received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1923. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cooperative Agreements and Superfund State Contracts for Superfund Response Actions [FRL-8306-2] (RIN: 2050-AE62) received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1924. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Pursuant to the reporting requirements of

Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-30, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Iraq for defense articles and services, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1925. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's justification for determination under Section 530 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 and 1995, Pub. L. 103-236, regarding Iraq and Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1926. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-45, "National Capital Revitalization Corporation and Anacostia Waterfront Corporation Freedom of Information Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1927. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-43, "Closing of a Public Alley in Squares 739, the Closure of Streets, the Opening and Widening of Streets, and the Dedication of Land for Street Purposes (S.O. 06-221) Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1928. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-44, "School Modernization Funds Submission Requirements Waiver Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1929. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-42, "Solid Waste Disposal Fee Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1930. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-46, "Vacancy Conversion Fee Exemption Reinstatement Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1931. A letter from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act; Implementation [No. 2006-25] (RIN: 3069-AB32) received April 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1932. A letter from the OGE Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Removal of Obsolete Regulations Concerning the Inoperative Provisions Regarding Charitable Payments In Lieu of Honoraria and Conforming Technical Amendments (RINS: 3209-AA00, 3209-AA04 and 3209-AA13) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1933. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Office of the Executive Secretariat, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Petitioning Requirements for the O and P Nonimmigrant Classifications [CIS No. 2295-03; USCIS-2004-0001] (RIN: 1615-AB17) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1934. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suicide Prevention Program [BOP-1107-F] (RIN: 1120-

AB06) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1935. A letter from the Chairmen, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting the 2006 Annual Audit and the 2006 Annual Report of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps (NSCC), pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(39) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1936. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy and Department of the Interior, transmitting the Departments' study of issues regarding energy rights-of-way on tribal lands as defined in Section 2601 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, pursuant to Public Law 109-58, section 1813; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources.

1937. A letter from the Inspector General, Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting the April 2007 Quarterly Report pursuant to Section 3001(i) of Title III of the 2004 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan (Pub. L. 108-106) as amended by Pub. L. 108-375; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

1938. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting a copy of a draft bill to "establish a fee for processing applications for permanent employment certification for immigrant aliens in the United States, to enhance program integrity, and for other purposes"; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

1939. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of draft legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of certain National Forest System land and retain the receipts for certain purposes, including the acquisition of other lands and the temporary extension of payments to State and local jurisdiction impacted by reduced Federal timber revenue; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Oversight and Government Reform.

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. LANTOS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 957. A bill to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to expand and clarify the entities against which sanctions may be imposed; with an amendment (Rept. 110-163 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 65. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCURI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 429. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1100) to revise the boundary of the Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-165). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action omitted from the Record on May 21, 2007]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the Committees on Rules and House Administration were discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2316 referred to the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

[The following action occurred on May 22, 2007]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration of H.R. 957.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 957. Referral to the Committees on Financial Services and Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than June 29, 2007.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 2419. A bill to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WATSON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WU, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H.R. 2420. A bill to declare United States policy on international climate cooperation, to authorize assistance to promote clean and efficient energy technologies in foreign countries, and to establish the International Clean Energy Foundation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WALSH of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANK of Massa-

chusetts, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HODES, Mr. STARK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GORDON, Ms. BEAN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WU, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2421. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the United States over waters of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2422. A bill to require railroad carriers to prepare and maintain a plan for notifying local emergency responders before transporting hazardous materials through their jurisdictions; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATOURETTE (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. EHLERS, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 2423. A bill to provide for the management and treatment of ballast water to prevent the introduction of nonindigenous aquatic species into coastal and inland waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2424. A bill to repeal the Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990 and amendments to that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN:

H.R. 2425. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide enhanced penalties for marketing controlled substances to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. SALAZAR):

H.R. 2426. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to award funds to study the feasibility of constructing dedicated ethanol pipelines, to address technical factors that prevent transportation of ethanol in existing pipelines, and to increase the energy, economic, and environmental security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 2427. A bill to require that an independent review of the efficiency and effectiveness of all headquarters offices of USDA Rural Development and the Natural Resource Conservation Service be carried out before any county Rural Development office may be merged with a county office of the Natural Resource Conservation Service or any county office of the Natural Resource Conservation Service may be merged with a county Rural Development office; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS (for himself, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 2428. A bill to enhance the efficiency of bioenergy and biomass research and development programs through improved coordination and collaboration between the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, and land-grant colleges and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2429. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide an exception to the 60-day limit on Medicare reciprocal billing arrangements between two physicians during the period in which one of the physicians is ordered to active duty as a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 2430. A bill to amend the Department of Education Organization Act and the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to redesignate the Office of Vocational and Adult Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself and Mr. REHBERG):

H.R. 2431. A bill to authorize appropriations for border and transportation security personnel and technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 2432. A bill to extend for 3 months transitional medical assistance (TMA) and the abstinence education program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2433. A bill to prohibit the designation of any agency, bureau, or other entity of the Department of Homeland Security as a separate agency or bureau for purposes of post employment restrictions in title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DRAKE:

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide regular notice to individuals submitting claims for benefits administered by the Secretary on the status of

such claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HARE, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2435. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act to provide for criminal liability for willful safety standard violations resulting in the death of contract employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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 Ms. HOOLEY (for herself, Mr. WU, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2436. A bill to strengthen the capacity of eligible institutions to provide instruction in nanotechnology; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 2437. A bill to provide for the establishment of an energy efficiency and renewable energy finance and investment advisory committee; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself and Mr. ELLSWORTH):

H.R. 2438. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to deter public corruption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. ETHERIDGE):

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reward those Americans who provide volunteer services in times of national need; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CARNEY, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2440. A bill to reauthorize the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow public school districts to receive no interest loans for the purchase of renewable energy systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 2442. A bill to provide job creation and assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Financial 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. POE (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. HILL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to suspend the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to eliminate, consolidate, deconsolidate, colocate, or plan for the con-

solidation, deconsolidation, inter-facility reorganization, or colocation of, any air traffic control facility and services of the Administration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 2444. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide that it is especially appropriate to display the flag on Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2445. A bill to amend that Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to recognize Alexander Creek as Native village, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2446. A bill to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. POE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution noting the disturbing pattern of killings of dozens of independent journalists in Russia over the last decade, and calling on Russian President Vladimir Putin to authorize cooperation with outside investigators in solving those murders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FALGOMVAEGA, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution relating to the 40th anniversary of the reunification of the City of Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. KIRK):

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for a nationwide diversified energy portfolio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the fatal radiation poisoning of Russian dissident and writer Alexander Litvinenko raises significant concerns about the potential involvement of elements of the Russian Government in Mr. Litvinenko's death and about the security and proliferation of radioactive materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE,

Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H. Res. 426. A resolution recognizing 2007 as the Year of the Rights of Internally Displaced Persons in Colombia, and offering support for efforts to ensure that the internally displaced people of Colombia receive the assistance and protection they need to rebuild their lives successfully; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H. Res. 427. A resolution urging the Government of Canada to end the commercial seal hunt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H. Res. 428. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 430. A resolution calling on the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to immediately release Dr. Haleh Esfandiari; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

67. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 64 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action to investigate and provide remedies for those injured by the recent contamination of pet food and deaths of family pets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

68. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 77 memorializing the Congress of the United States to fund fully the Select Michigan Agricultural Program through the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

69. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 88 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the Passenger Bill of Rights Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XIII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 65: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 67: Mr. SPACE, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 87: Mr. SHULER and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 98: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 123: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 178: Mr. WATT.

H.R. 241: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 372: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 380: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 451: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 539: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 549: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 554: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 566: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 601: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 612: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT,

Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WALZ

H.R. 694: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 695: Mr. FERGUSON.

- H.R. 734: Mr. BOYD of Florida and Mr. SARBANES.
- H.R. 743: Mr. KELLER and Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 760: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
- H.R. 773: Ms. LEE and Mr. KUCINICH.
- H.R. 821: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. SAXTON.
- H.R. 871: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 943: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 964: Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 969: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 971: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. McCAUL of Texas.
- H.R. 980: Mr. PASCARELLI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BERRY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BARROW, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HODES, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. McNULTY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND.
- H.R. 997: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
- H.R. 1023: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. WALBERG.
- H.R. 1046: Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 1078: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. WALSH of New York.
- H.R. 1091: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 1107: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.R. 1108: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. WU.
- H.R. 1113: Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WU, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
- H.R. 1127: Ms. BEAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. PETRI.
- H.R. 1134: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 1188: Mr. GONZALEZ.
- H.R. 1198: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 1222: Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
- H.R. 1223: Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
- H.R. 1224: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. WALSH of New York.
- H.R. 1228: Mr. PORTER.
- H.R. 1236: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1279: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
- H.R. 1280: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1293: Mr. HONDA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SAXTON.
- H.R. 1304: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. PORTER.
- H.R. 1380: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. WAXMAN.
- H.R. 1385: Mr. SAXTON.
- H.R. 1386: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
- H.R. 1418: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 1426: Mr. BOUCHER.
- H.R. 1440: Mr. SAXTON.
- H.R. 1456: Mr. FOSSELLA and Mr. FORTUÑO.
- H.R. 1461: Ms. CLARKE.
- H.R. 1470: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1474: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. WALBERG, and Ms. FALLIN.
- H.R. 1498: Mr. McNERNEY.
- H.R. 1507: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 1544: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 1560: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. SAXTON.
- H.R. 1564: Ms. LEE.
- H.R. 1567: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 1576: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. RAMSTAD.
- H.R. 1582: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 1623: Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 1638: Mr. ARCURI.
- H.R. 1643: Mr. ROTHMAN.
- H.R. 1655: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
- H.R. 1688: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 1709: Mr. HONDA and Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 1719: Mr. McHUGH.
- H.R. 1735: Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 1748: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 1761: Mr. TIAHRT.
- H.R. 1783: Mr. SIREs, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1797: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. TERRY.
- H.R. 1821: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. BECERRA.
- H.R. 1857: Mr. FEENEY.
- H.R. 1876: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KELLER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAUL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CHABOT.
- H.R. 1881: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 1889: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.R. 1890: Ms. BERKLEY.
- H.R. 1893: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
- H.R. 1907: Mr. LANTOS.
- H.R. 1926: Mr. BOREN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 1971: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. MYRICK.
- H.R. 1975: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1980: Mr. HODES and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 1982: Mr. HODES.
- H.R. 1984: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1992: Mr. McHUGH, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 2032: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2046: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. CROWLEY.
- H.R. 2063: Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 2066: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 2075: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. McCAUL of Texas.
- H.R. 2086: Mrs. MYRICK.
- H.R. 2095: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. ARCURI.
- H.R. 2126: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
- H.R. 2129: Mr. FILNER, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WYNN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 2138: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 2144: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 2147: Mr. CUELLAR.
- H.R. 2158: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. SAXTON.
- H.R. 2164: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
- H.R. 2199: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 2203: Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. EHLERS.
- H.R. 2214: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 2223: Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 2239: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 2266: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mrs. CAPPS.
- H.R. 2292: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 2295: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SPACE, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. WU, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
- H.R. 2298: Mr. SOUDER.
- H.R. 2309: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 2310: Mrs. MYRICK.
- H.R. 2312: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HENSARLING.
- H.R. 2329: Mr. UPTON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 2332: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
- H.R. 2334: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. SALAZAR.
- H.R. 2335: Mr. TERRY and Mr. SHAYS.
- H.R. 2367: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 2380: Mr. GORDON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. FEENEY.
- H.R. 2399: Mr. SHULER, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
- H.R. 2402: Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HILL, and Mr. TANNER.
- H.R. 2417: Mr. TERRY.
- H.J. Res. 14: Mr. ANDREWS.
- H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
- H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. BAIRD.
- H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. CONAWAY.
- H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. GOODE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. McHUGH, and Mr. WOLF.
- H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
- H. Con. Res. 104: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. EHLERS.
- H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. SIREs.
- H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. GINGREY.
- H. Con. Res. 139: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. WATSON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H. Con. Res. 142: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. PLATTS.
- H. Con. Res. 148: Ms. CASTOR.
- H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
- H. Res. 121: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. PORTER.
- H. Res. 233: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H. Res. 257: Mr. FARR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. HINCHEY.
- H. Res. 287: Mr. STEARNS.

H. Res. 295: Mr. WU and Mr. PORTER.
H. Res. 351: Mr. GRAVES and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 378: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H. Res. 379: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 395: Ms. CARSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. WALBERG.

H. Res. 412: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H. Res. 416: Mr. TERRY and Mr. GILLMOR.

H. Res. 417: Mr. WEINER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WATT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. KIND, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGH-

TER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. Clarke, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OBEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SIREN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. DINGELL.

H. Res. 418: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 422: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. POE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SIREN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendments to be offered by Representative BISHOP of Utah or a designee to H.R. 1100 the Carl Sandberg Home National Historic Site Boundary Revision Act of 2007, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

The amendments to be offered by Representative MARTIN MEEHAN or a designee to H.R. 2316 the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative CONYERS or a designee to H.R. 2316, the "Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007", does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative HELLER or a designee to H.R. 1100 the Carl Sandberg Home National Historic Site Boundary Revision Act of 2007, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.