United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2007 No. 89

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 5, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LINCOLN DAVIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Lord, You know us. Lord, You know us through and through. You know each of us personally. You know how we are with one another. You know us, as Your people know us, the 110th Congress of the United States of America.

Lord, help us to know You. Allow us to come to know You even as we are known by You. As Ultimate Truth, enter in and make us suitable of Your dwelling within us, so Your people will place trust in us as leaders, as well as their representatives.

We choose to serve another day, another week, for we were chosen by You and Your people to serve.

Bless us and our service to this great Nation, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KIRK 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 25, 2007, at 9:00 am:

That the Senate concurs in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2206.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1676.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1675.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 158.

That the Senate passed S. 231.

That the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 32.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 5, 2007.

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

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: In the light of recent developments in a legal matter involving me in the Eastern District of Virginia, I hereby request a leave from my duties as a Member of the House Small Business Committee pending my successful conclusion of that matter.

In doing so, I, of course, express no admission of guilt or culpability in that or any other matter that may be pending in any court or before the House of Representatives. I have supported every ethics and lobbying reform measure that you and our Democratic Majority have authored, and I make this request for leave to support the letter and the spirit of your leadership in this area.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TO BE AVAILABLE TO SERVE ON INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of rule X, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker named the following Members of the House to be available to serve on investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the 110th Congress:

Ms. BALDWIN, Wisconsin
Mr. CROWLEY, New York
Mr. ELLISON, Minnesota
Mr. HONDA, California
Mr. INSLEE, Washington
Ms. LEE, California
Mr. MEEKS, New York
Mrs. NAPOLITANO, California
Mr. ROTHMAN, New Jersey
Mr. SNYDER, Arkansas

Printed on recycled paper.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 25, 2007, at 3:45 pm:

That the Senate passed S. 398.

That the Senate passed S. 1537.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bills were signed by the Speaker on Friday, May 25, 2007:

H.R. 414, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 Calle McKinley, West in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the ''Miguel Angel Garcia Mendez Post Office Building''

H.R. 437, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 West Eisenhower Street in Rio Grande City, Texas, as the ''Lino Perez, Jr. Post Office''

H.R. 625, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4230 Maine Avenue in Baldwin Park, California, as the ''Atanacio Haro-Marin Post Office''

H.R. 1402, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South Lecanto Highway in Lecanto, Florida, as the ''Sergeant Dennis J. Flanagan Lecanto Post Office Building''

H.R. 2080, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to conform the District charter to revisions made by the Council of the District of Columbia relating to public education

H.R. 2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes

S. 214, to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys

S. 1104, 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

COMMUNICATION FROM CONSTITUENT SERVICES REPRESENTATIVE OF HON. MICHAEL R. PENCE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from John Shettle, Constituent Services Representative of the Honorable MICHAEL R. PENCE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of Madison County, Indiana.

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

Sincerely,

JOHN SHETTLE,
Constituent Services Representative.

MEMORIAL DAY IN BAGHDAD

(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, Memorial Day last week in Baghdad will always be special to me. On that day, I met with General David Petraeus, Iraq's Defense Minister Jasim, and U.S. and Iraqi troops in a Joint Security Station deep in the City of Baghdad.

Then CODEL Spratt spent 2 days in Kabul briefed by ISAF Commander Dan McNeil, Major General Robert Durbin, Afghan Defense Minister Wardak, President Hamid Karzai, and Brigadier General Robert Livingston. General Livingston commands the 218th Brigade of the South Carolina Army National Guard, which leads Task Force Phoenix to train the Afghan army and police.

I saw firsthand our coalition forces stopping terrorists overseas to protect American families at home. This meets the threat of al Qaeda's Zawahiri that Iraq and Afghanistan are the central front in the global war on terrorism. Our capable military leaders should not have their initiatives handcuffed by Congress.

As we heard a bombing in Baghdad, we read simultaneously of attacks in Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Yemen, Lebanon and Gaza. We must not ignore the worldwide threats.

Congratulations to law enforcement for stopping the bombing of JFK Airport.

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

CONGRESSIONAL PENSIONS

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, last month, several former Members of Congress cashed in their taxpayer-funded retirement checks from jail. After indictment and conviction beyond a shadow of a doubt, they are still paid each month by the taxpayers they betrayed.

After supporting a limited reform bill on this issue, this Congress has stopped all action on the needed reforms. We took no action in February. We took no action in March, no action in April and no action in May.

The House leadership has conveniently stalled all reforms that would kill the pension for a Member of Congress convicted of a felony for over 4 months now. Since senior Members have the largest pensions, you have to wonder if they are delaying this reform hoping that this Congress will fail, like all of its predecessors.

Congressman JEFFERSON was indicted this weekend, and one group estimated that he is entitled to a $47,000 annual taxpayer pension.

Mr. Speaker, if we delay this reform, future Members of Congress who are convicted will cash their taxpayer-funded retirement checks from the jailhouse ATM.

□ 1410

ENERGY POLICY

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a subject that is first on the minds and the wallets of the American public, and that is the cost of rising energy prices.

We are in the middle of the summer, and prices at the pump are above $3 a gallon in much of America. The liberal leadership was going to fix the high gas prices, and they have responded by offering no solutions. They offered so-called ''price gouging'' legislation, but it did nothing to address the root problem of high gas prices.

The American public wants innovation, not procrastination. They want energy exploration, not bureaucratic red tape. They want this Congress to do their jobs and put forth a plan that will power this country, self sufficiently, into this century and beyond. The liberal leadership, meanwhile, is missing in action on the issue.

America needs to change the way we look at how we produce energy, and in the next couple of weeks the Republican Conference will take the lead in unfurling a long-term energy plan for the future. It will not only address our immediate power concerns but those for decades to come.

ONE MORE PEACE OFFICER SHOT BY ONE MORE ILLEGAL

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, while Americans were celebrating the holiday, Deputy Gerald Barnes of the Harris County Sheriff's Department in Houston was celebrating just being alive.

Responding to a call from a nightclub, the 15-year veteran from the Sheriff's Department came upon two men arguing. Oscar Perez had pulled a gun on Miguel Soto and began randomly firing his pistol.

When Deputy Barnes arrived, he told Perez to drop the gun. Perez refused and shot at Deputy Barnes numerous times. One bullet struck him in the chest above his bulletproof vest. Then after kidnapping Soto, whom Perez later shot, Perez sped off into the night. He was later captured. Oscar Perez had been illegally in the United States for years.

According to reports, the last three police officers shot in Harris County, Texas, were all shot by people illegally in the United States.

Deputy Barnes will recover, but Perez shouldn't have been in this country. The Federal Government's refusal to secure the border is allowing criminals like Perez to invade this country and commit crimes. Instead of promoting amnesty, the government should protect the border.

And that's just the way it is.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN LEWIS, ''MR. FAYETTEVILLE''

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of one of the Third District's greatest leaders and greatest servants, John Lewis of Fayetteville.

He was known as ''Mr. Fayetteville'' by those who knew him. The list of what he didn't do would be easier to read. John Lewis was a Marine, a banker and a member of numerous boards, including the Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation. He was a visionary who helped develop Interstate 540 and the Northwest Arkansas Regional Airport, both of which serve literally thousands of people on a daily basis.

Many feel the downtown of Fayetteville, the home of his alma mater, the University of Arkansas, exists in its present form today because of the tireless work of John Lewis.

The condolences of many in northwest Arkansas, including myself and my family, are with the Lewis family.

Thank you, John, for our service to our community, our State, and to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL TRAILS DAY

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 401) supporting the goals and ideals of National Trails Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 401

Whereas June 2, 2007, is observed as National Trails Day;

Whereas there are over 200,000 miles of trails in the United States, providing access to public lands for recreational and educational opportunities;

Whereas trails enrich communities throughout the United States by helping to protect habitats, watersheds, and cultural and historic artifacts;

Whereas 72.1 percent of all Americans age 16 and older participate in at least one of twenty-two designated outdoor activities, including hiking, backpacking, and trail running;

Whereas National Trails Day events take place in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the United States Virgin Islands to celebrate trails, recognize volunteers, and maintain local trails;

Whereas thousands of volunteers and event coordinators throughout the United States make National Trails Day events possible; and

Whereas 2007 is the 15th Anniversary Celebration of National Trails Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Trails Day; and

(2) honors the contributions National Trails Day has made to inspire the public and trail enthusiasts to discover, learn about, maintain, and celebrate trails.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 401 was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON). It expresses the support of the House of Representatives of the goals and ideals of National Trails Day.

I want to commend Representative THOMPSON for his efforts to bring congressional recognition to this important annual event. This resolution is timely, given that the 15th anniversary celebration of National Trails Day was this past Saturday.

National Trails Day is a long-standing event that is dedicated to celebrating, promoting, and protecting America's magnificent trail system. It was started by the American Hiking Society in 1993. Its goals are to raise awareness of trail, to celebrate our incredible national network of trails, and to honor and thank trail volunteers and partners.

National Trails Day events take place in local, State, and Federal public lands from coast to coast. Activities include hiking, biking, horseback riding, trail dedications, workshops, park clean-ups, trail work projects, and much, much more.

Last year, more than 100,000 trail enthusiasts across the country participated in over 1,000 National Trails Day events. At those events, volunteers contributed nearly 150,000 hours of labor to establishing, maintaining, and cleaning up trails across the country. Trail events take place in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam and my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands. Many Federal agencies, nonprofits, local groups, and corporate sponsors are all proud partners in supporting this annual event.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 401 honors the contributions that National Trails Day has made to inspire the public to discover, learn about, maintain and celebrate trails. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in support of House Resolution 401.

House Resolution 401 has been adequately explained by the majority. I thank the gentlelady, and urge adoption of this resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 401.

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.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT NATIONAL MUSEUM OF WILDLIFE ART BE DESIGNATED AS ''NATIONAL MUSEUM OF WILDLIFE ART OF THE UNITED STATES''

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to

the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 116) expressing the sense of Congress that the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located in Jackson, Wyoming, shall be designated as the ''National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States''.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 116

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art in Jackson, Wyoming, is devoted to inspiring global recognition of fine art related to nature and wildlife;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is an excellent example of a thematic museum that strives to unify the humanities and sciences into a coherent body of knowledge through art;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art, which was founded in 1987 with a private gift of a collection of art, has grown in stature and importance and is recognized today as the world's premier museum of wildlife art;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is the only public museum in the United States with the mission of enriching and inspiring public appreciation and knowledge of fine art, while exploring the relationship between humanity and nature by collecting fine art focused on wildlife;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is housed in an architecturally significant and award-winning 51,000-square foot facility that overlooks the 28,000-acre National Elk Refuge and is adjacent to the Grand Teton National Park;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is accredited with the American Association of Museums, continues to grow in national recognition and importance with members from every State, and has a Board of Trustees and a National Advisory Board composed of major benefactors and leaders in the arts and sciences from throughout the United States;

Whereas the permanent collection of the National Museum of Wildlife Art has grown to more than 3,000 works by important historic American artists including Edward Hicks, Anna Hyatt Huntington, Charles M. Russell, William Merritt Chase, and Alexander Calder, and contemporary American artists, including Steve Kestrel, Bart Walter, Nancy Howe, John Nieto, and Jamie Wyeth;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art is a destination attraction in the Western United States with annual attendance of 92,000 visitors from all over the world and an award-winning website that receives more than 10,000 visits per week;

Whereas the National Museum of Wildlife Art seeks to educate a diverse audience through collecting fine art focused on wildlife, presenting exceptional exhibitions, providing community, regional, national, and international outreach, and presenting extensive educational programming for adults and children; and

Whereas a great opportunity exists to use the invaluable resources of the National Museum of Wildlife Art to teach the schoolchildren of the United States, through onsite visits, traveling exhibits, classroom curriculum, online distance learning, and other educational initiatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located at 2820 Rungius Road, Jackson, Wyoming, shall be designated as the ''National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 116, introduced by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), expresses the sense of Congress that the National Museum of Wildlife Art located in Jackson, Wyoming, shall be designated as the National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States.

The National Museum of Wildlife Art is a private museum located on non-Federal land. The museum is housed at a facility that overlooks the 25,000 acre National Elk Refuge and is adjacent to Grand Teton National Park.

The National Museum of Wildlife Art was founded in 1987 with a private gift of a collection of art. Today, the museum features a collection of over 2,000 pieces of art portraying wildlife dating back to 2000 B.C.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 116 will help the National Museum of Wildlife Art receive greater public awareness. I commend Representative CUBIN for her work on this matter. We support the concurrent resolution and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

□ 1420

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 116, and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 116 has been adequately explained by the majority. The only thing I would add is I would like to commend Congresswoman CUBIN for her work on this resolution to designate the National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States in Jackson, Wyoming. This designation places the National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States in a prestigious class of less than 20 museums to earn such a designation.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 116.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF HARMFUL FISHING SUBSIDIES

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 94) encouraging the elimination of harmful fishing subsidies that contribute to overcapacity in commercial fishing fleets worldwide and that lead to the overfishing of global fish stocks, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 94

Whereas nearly 1,000,000,000 people around the world depend on fish as their primary source of dietary protein;

Whereas the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization has found that 75 percent of the world's fish populations are currently fully exploited, over exploited, significantly depleted, or recovering from overexploitation;

Whereas scientists have estimated that a significant percentage of big predator fish such as tuna, marlin, and swordfish are gone from the world's oceans as a result of overfishing by foreign fishing fleets;

Whereas the global fishing fleet capacity is estimated to be up to 250 percent greater than is needed to catch what the ocean can sustainably produce;

Whereas the Congress recognized the threat of overfishing to our oceans and economy and therefore included the requirement to end overfishing in the United States by 2011 in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–479);

Whereas the United States Commission on Ocean Policy and the Pew Oceans Commission identified overcapitalization of the global fishing fleets as a major contributor to the decline of economically important fish populations;

Whereas harmful fishing subsidies encourage overcapitalization and overfishing; support destructive fishing practices such as high seas trawling that would not otherwise be economically viable; and amount to billions of dollars annually;

Whereas such subsidies have also been documented to support illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing, which impacts commercial fisheries in the United States and around the world both economically and ecologically;

Whereas harmful fishing subsidies are concentrated in relatively few countries, putting other fishing countries, including the United States, at an economic disadvantage;

Whereas the United States is a world leader in advancing policies to eliminate harmful fishing subsidies that support overcapacity and promote overfishing; and

Whereas a wide range of countries are currently engaged in historic negotiations to end harmful fishing subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States

should continue to promote the elimination of harmful fishing subsidies that lead to—

(1) overcapitalization;

(2) overfishing; and

(3) illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

I commend the chairwoman of the Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, Congresswoman MADELEINE BORDALLO, for introducing House Concurrent Resolution 94. This resolution will encourage the United States to support the elimination of foreign fishing subsidies that lead to overcapacity and overfishing in global fisheries.

House Concurrent Resolution 94, as amended, resolves that the United States will continue to support efforts to eliminate harmful subsidies issued by foreign governments to their fishing fleets. These subsidies reduce the cost of fishing to foreign fishermen, making fishing a profitable enterprise where it otherwise would not be, and leading to overcapitalization, overfishing and illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing. The end result is that foreign fishing subsidies hurt American fishermen who have to compete against subsidized foreign fishing.

We support this noncontroversial resolution, as amended, and commend Ms. BORDALLO for her leadership on this issue.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 94, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 94 has been adequately explained by the majority, and I urge adoption of the resolution.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 94 expresses our support for ending the fishing subsidies given to foreign fishermen. I appreciate the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, NICK RAHALL, and the Ranking Republican, DON YOUNG, for their assistance in moving this legislation.

Foreign governments' subsidies to fishermen are common in many countries around the world. Too little of these subsidies go toward beneficial purposes, such as improving fisheries management and science. Instead, they typically are used to offset fishing costs, for example, by providing support for fuel consumption and vessel construction.

The subsidies artificially decrease the cost of fishing for foreign fishermen, making fishing a profitable trade when it would not be otherwise. The subsidies increase the rate of overfishing worldwide. Current estimates reveal that the sheer number of vessels actively fishing around the world today is up to 250 percent greater than is sustainable, according to the World Wildlife Fund.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has found that 75 percent of the world's fisheries are fully exploited, over exploited, depleted, or recovering from depletion. There is clearly no need to expand the world's fishing fleets beyond their current capacity. Quite the contrary. By eliminating the subsidies that lead to fleet expansion, we can reduce some of this pressure.

The United States—like other countries—reserves to American fishermen and women the exclusive right to fish within 200 nautical mile of the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). Hundreds of foreign vessels each year, however, are intercepted while fishing illegally in U.S. waters. This rise in illegal fishing, most certainly contributed to by the overcapacity in the world's fleets, is placing additional pressure on our already exploited resources, damaging our marine ecosystems, and taking away potential revenue from our domestic fishing industry. In 2006 alone, the United States Coast Guard intercepted 164 vessels fishing in our EEZ.

In my home district of Guam the problem of illegal fishing is significant. The Western Central Pacific area is considered one of the Coast Guard's three highest threat areas for illegal foreign fishing. In 2006, the Coast Guard recorded 11 incidents of illegal foreign fishing in the Western Central Pacific area. Since 2000, the Coast Guard has intercepted an average of 34 vessels per year. And this only represents the vessels that are being caught.

The countries whose vessels are the most likely to be found illegally fishing in the U.S. EEZ are also countries that provide large capacity-increasing subsidies to their fishing fleets. Because enforcement is so difficult, it is even more important that we attack the issue at its root by encouraging worldwide capacity reduction and by discouraging other countries from making it economically feasible for their vessels to travel into our waters to fish.

While we have no direct control over the actions of foreign governments, the Doha Round of the current World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations have placed the United States in a unique position to influence the future use of harmful fisheries subsidies by other countries. Through these negotiations the United States has an opportunity to exercise its leadership internationally in encouraging the elimination of subsidies that increase fishing capacity and that promote overfishing. By passing this concurrent resolution, Congress can demonstrate to the world its support for our government as they move forward with these negotiations.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take a strong stance against harmful foreign fishing subsidies by supporting this House Concurrent Resolution 94.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 94, encouraging the elimination of harmful fishing subsidies that contribute to overcapacity in commercial fishing fleets worldwide and that lead to the over-fishing of global fish stocks.

I commend my esteemed colleague from Guam, the Chairwoman of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans for submitting this concurrent resolution. She understands the severe impact that over-fishing has on our world's oceans and this resolution is an important step in gaining the cooperation of other nations in managing our shared ocean resources responsibly.

According to a 2006 scientific study, there may be no more commercial fish stocks left in the sea by 2050. As the report states, since 1950 29% of the world's commercial fish species have already collapsed. If we do not change our course and stop over-fishing, our children could be the first generation to face entirely empty oceans.

One major contributor to this precipitous decline in global fish stocks is the huge overcapacity of our global fishing fleets. By some accounts, the current fishing fleet capacity is 250% of what is needed to catch the maximum sustainable yield from the oceans. In many instances, this overcapacity is fueled by harmful subsidies provided by a limited number of foreign governments to their fishing fleets, leading to over-fishing, and ecologically unsound bottom-trawling in international waters.

Through our nation's laws, such as the Magnuson-Stevens Act, we have established a strong federal policy supporting sustainable fishing practices here in the United States. In order to successfully manage the world's limited ocean resources, however, we need to promote the elimination of these fishing subsidies with the cooperation of our neighbors in the world community. This Resolution is an important first step in developing a global plan to manage our oceans responsibly. Again, I thank my friend from Guam and I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 94, encouraging the elimination of these harmful fishing subsidies.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 94. I want to thank Chairwoman BORDALLO and Chairman RAHALL for their efforts on this resolution.

I know the issue of harmful foreign fishing subsidies is one of the key concerns of the West Virginia fishing fleet and I congratulate Mr. RAHALL on his interest in this resolution.

All kidding aside, this issue is a global concern. Harmful foreign fishing subsidies that threaten the sustainability of legitimate fisheries and threaten the economic viability and international competitiveness of the U.S. fishing industry must be identified and eliminated.

Some foreign fishing fleets have been heavily subsidized by their governments and this has led to over exploitation of some important fish species.

Harmful subsidies not only put legitimately prosecuted fisheries in jeopardy of overfishing, but also put U.S. fishermen at an economic disadvantage in the global fish market.

However, we need to be careful when discussing subsidies because some subsidies are actually beneficial. Government programs which help fishermen reduce unnecessary bycatch, which aid efforts to develop ''clean'' fishing gear, which aid governments in monitoring or enforcing the fisheries, or which

make the fishery safer for fishermen are all legitimate and beneficial governmental programs.

Harmful subsidies that increase the size and harvesting capabilities of fishing fleets beyond the capacity needed to sustainably harvest the quotas in a fishery can be harmful environmentally and economically.

While I support the main concept of this resolution—to place the House of Representatives on the record opposing harmful fishing subsidies by foreign governments—one statistic used in this resolution is misleading even though it is often quoted. The resolution uses the statistic that "75 percent of the world's fish populations are currently fully exploited, over exploited, significantly depleted or recovering from overexploitation." Full exploitation of fisheries is not necessarily a bad thing. In fact, the full utilization of our Nation's fisheries is a key purpose of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Admitedly, fully exploited fisheries need to be carefully managed, monitored, and enforced to keep them from becoming over exploited.

If you remove "fully exploited" from this statistic, the figure drops to approximately 25 percent. This figure, while much less dramatic, is still a concern that we need to address. Foreign subsidies that contribute to this figure need to be addressed.

The United States has already taken a leading role in addressing IUU fisheries and in addressing harmful foreign subsidies. I support these efforts and urge support of efforts to continue to reduce harmful foreign fishing subsidies.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 94, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 341) supporting the goals and ideals of ''American Eagle Day'', and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the American bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 341

Whereas the bald eagle was designated as the national emblem of the United States on June 20, 1782, by our country's Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image used in the Great Seal of the United States and the seals of the President and Vice President;

Whereas the image of the bald eagle is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

(1) Congress;

(2) the Supreme Court;

(3) the Department of Defense;

(4) the Department of the Treasury;

(5) the Department of Justice;

(6) the Department of State;

(7) the Department of Commerce;

(8) the Department of Homeland Security;

(9) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(10) the Department of Labor;

(11) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(12) the Department of Energy;

(13) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(14) the Central Intelligence Agency; and

(15) the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the American spirit of freedom and democracy;

Whereas the image, meaning, and symbolism of the bald eagle have played a significant role in American art, music, history, literature, architecture, and culture since the founding of our Nation;

Whereas the bald eagle is featured prominently on United States stamps, currency, and coinage;

Whereas the habitat of bald eagles exists only in North America;

Whereas by 1963, the number of nesting pairs of bald eagles in the lower 48 States had dropped to about 417;

Whereas the bald eagle was first listed as an endangered species in 1967 under the Endangered Species Preservation Act, the Federal law that preceded the Endangered Species Act of 1973;

Whereas caring and concerned citizens of the United States in the private and public sectors banded together to save, and help ensure the protection of, bald eagles;

Whereas in 1995, as a result of the efforts of those caring and concerned citizens, bald eagles were removed from the endangered species list and upgraded to the less imperiled threatened species status under the Endangered Species Act of 1973;

Whereas by 2006, the number of bald eagles in the lower 48 States had increased to approximately 7,000 to 8,000 nesting pairs;

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior is likely to officially delist the bald eagle from both the endangered species and threatened species lists under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, with a final decision expected no later than June 29, 2007;

Whereas if delisted under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, bald eagles should be provided strong protection under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act;

Whereas bald eagles would have been permanently extinct if not for vigilant conservation efforts of concerned citizens and strict protection laws;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the bald eagle population is an endangered species success story and an inspirational example for other wildlife and natural resource conservation efforts around the world;

Whereas the initial recovery of the bald eagle population was accomplished by the concerted efforts of numerous government agencies, corporations, organizations, and individuals; and

Whereas the sustained recovery of the bald eagle populations will require the continuation of recovery, management, education, and public awareness programs, to ensure that the populations and habitat of bald eagles will remain healthy and secure for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of ''American Eagle Day''; and

(2) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate on education information for use in schools; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 341 celebrates the recovery of the American bald eagle, the symbol of our country displayed on American currency and government agency seals, including that of the United States Congress. The bald eagle's recovery is a huge success story for the Endangered Species Act and the conservation laws which preceded it. In 1963, there were 417 pairs of bald eagles in the lower 48 States. Today, there are an estimated 9,789 breeding pairs.

Later this month, the Secretary of the Interior is expected to remove the bald eagle from the list of threatened species. Several Indian tribes, who consider the eagle extremely important to their culture and even sacred, have raised concerns that the eagle will lose all protections upon delisting. However, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act will continue to protect the bald eagle.

I commend Representative DAVID DAVIS for introducing this resolution which encourages organizations and government agencies working on the conservation of endangered species to collaborate on education information for use in our schools. The resolution also asks the American people to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies.

This resolution merits our support.

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

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

I rise in support of House Resolution 341 which endorses the goals and ideals of American Eagle Day.

Two hundred and twenty-five years ago, the Second Continental Congress decided to use the image of the American bald eagle on the Great Seal of the United States. Since that time, the image of this majestic bird has graced American art, our culture, currency and stamps. It has been the subject of more than 2,500 books, making the bald eagle the most extensively studied bird in North America.

While there were nearly 500,000 on this continent prior to European settlement, this species was particularly devastated by various chemical compounds that caused widespread reproductive failure. In response, the Congress enacted the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the bird was listed on our Endangered Species Act.

From its all-time low of 417 nesting pairs in the continental United States in 1963, extraordinary conservation efforts have saved the bald eagle, and we have witnessed a significant population increase. Today, there are 9,789 breeding pairs, not including the more than 30,000 bald eagles living in Alaska.

By any objective standard, recovery of the bald eagle has been remarkable, but sadly, it is one of only a handful of species that have been recovered under the Endangered Species Act. While it is likely that the Secretary of the Interior will soon make a decision to remove the bald eagle from the Federal list of threatened and endangered species, there is no question that the bald eagle will continue to inspire millions of Americans because it symbolizes the fundamental values of this country of courage, freedom and patriotic spirit.

Under the terms of House Resolution 341, the people of the United States are encouraged to observe American Eagle Day on June 20 and to provide educational information on the value of conserving our Nation's wildlife resources.

I urge an ''aye'' vote and want to compliment the author of this resolution, freshman Congressman DAVID DAVIS OF TENNESSEE, for his effective leadership in proposing this celebration of American Eagle Day.

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

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield so such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS), who is the author of the bill.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues on the House Resources Committee for bringing this legislation that I've introduced, along with my fellow Tennessee Members, JIMMY DUNCAN and JOHN TANNER, to the floor of the House today supporting the goals and ideals of American Eagle Day.

Almost 225 years ago, on June 20, 1782, the Second Continental Congress designated the bald eagle as the national symbol of the United States. Since that time, the bald eagle has become a fixture on the seals and marks of the Federal Government and on our stamps, currency and coinage.

And while the bald eagle has always been such a popular fixture in the hearts and minds of so many Americans, it is difficult to believe that we were very close to forever losing the symbol of our great country.

In 1963, the number of nesting pairs of eagles in the 48 contiguous States had dwindled to a figure of just over 400. As the habitat for the bald eagle solely exists in North America, these figures were extremely alarming and led to the bald eagle being listed as an endangered species for the first time in 1967.

Today, I'm pleased to note that, as a result of the Federal protection laws and through the diligent efforts of so many private conservationists, the bald eagle has made an incredible recovery.

□ 1430

In 1995, the bald eagle was removed from the endangered list to the threatened list, and it could very soon be moved permanently off of these lists as soon as Federal guidelines can be finalized that will forever protect the birds and their habitats.

I have been extremely interested in this issue, not only because of the importance of this as a matter of national concern but also because of my first-hand experience in dealing with a group located in the heart of the First Congressional District of Tennessee that has been working for the last 22 years to save the bald eagle.

The American Eagle Foundation is located in Pigeon Ford, Tennessee, at the base of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. This nonprofit group has worked to establish recovery programs to protect the eagle and actively cares for many nonreleasable birds to ensure they live healthy lives.

In addition, they operate the largest bald eagle breeding facility in the world, and they have released hundreds of eaglets into the wild with the support of local, State and Federal officials.

Through the efforts of the American Eagle Foundation and the grassroots efforts of children nationwide, I am pleased to offer this legislation for this consideration. Spaced conveniently between Flag Day on June 14 and Independence Day on July 4, July 20 will give Americans another day in which they can celebrate their patriotism by honoring the unique symbol of our heritage and folklore.

I again thank my colleagues for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House and encourage all of my colleagues on the House to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in recognizing American Eagle Day to honor the birds that have symbolized our country's freedom and democracy for centuries. H. Res. 341 encourages all Americans to acknowledge American Eagle Day on June 20, 2007, which marks the 225th anniversary of the bald eagle's designation as our national symbol.

The bald eagle habitats in Tennessee have been important in the recovery and restoration of this majestic species. I want to particularly thank the American Eagle Foundation and its president Al Cecere for their hard work to protect our American bald eagles. I have had the honor of visiting in my office with Al and Challenger, the world-famous American bald eagle that appears at high-profile events like the Super Bowl to represent the freedoms we enjoy in this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and our colleagues will join me in supporting H. Res. 341 to celebrate June 20 as American Eagle Day.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 341.

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.

EXPRESSING THE SUPPORT OF CONGRESS FOR THE CREATION OF A NATIONAL HURRICANE MUSEUM AND SCIENCE CENTER IN SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) expressing the support of Congress for the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in Southwest Louisiana.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 54

Whereas the Creole Nature Trail All-American Road District Board of Commissioners has begun to create and develop a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in the southwest Louisiana area;

Whereas protecting, preserving, and showcasing the intrinsic qualities that make Louisiana a one-of-a-kind experience is the mission of the Creole Nature Trail All-American Road;

Whereas the horrific experience and the devastation long-term effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita will play a major role in the history of the United States;

Whereas a science center of this caliber will educate and motivate young and old in the fields of meteorology, environmental science, sociology, conservation, economics, history, communications, and engineering;

Whereas it is only appropriate that the effects of hurricanes and the rebuilding efforts be captured in a comprehensive center such as a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center to interpret the effects of hurricanes in and outside of Louisiana; and

Whereas it is critical that the history of past hurricanes be preserved so that all people in the United States can learn from this history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress supports and encourages the creation of a National

Hurricane Museum and Science Center in southwest Louisiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

I want to begin by commending Representative BOUSTANY of Louisiana for introducing H. Con. Res. 54, supporting and encouraging the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in southwest Louisiana.

House Concurrent Resolution 54 expresses Congress' support of the Creole Nature Trail All-American Road District Board of Commissioners in creating and developing a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in the southwest Louisiana area. Such a center will educate visitors about the devastating effects and rebuilding efforts surrounding the region's recent hurricanes and will preserve history so that future generations may learn from it. We support this bill.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 54 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 54 has been adequately explained by the majority. I would like to commend Congressman BOUSTANY for his work on this resolution to create the National Hurricane Museum and Science Center.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my colleague from Utah and the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands for their comments on this, and I appreciate the committee in allowing this to come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. Hurricanes Rita and Katrina forever changed the lives of gulf coast residents. It was not until the 2005 storms that most Americans really began to fully comprehend the potential size, strength and impact of these devastating natural disasters.

We are nowhere near where we need to be as far as educating the public and raising awareness about hurricane preparedness.

Last week marked the beginning of the 2007 hurricane season. Yet despite intense media coverage surrounding Katrina and Rita, a recent poll of coastal residents conducted by the Associated Press revealed that an astounding 88 percent had not taken any steps to protect their homes against future storms. Sixty-one percent had no hurricane survival kits on hand.

We need to do more to remind the public about the devastation caused by major storms on the level of Katrina, Rita, Andrew and Ivan, as well as teach them about the science behind these phenomena and what we can do to better protect lives and property leading up to a potential storm.

This resolution expresses the support of Congress for the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in southwest Louisiana. The goal of this comprehensive center is to interpret the effects of hurricanes on our land, people, culture and government to preserve artifacts and personal histories of those who have suffered and died because of these events, to conduct research and showcase improvements in meteorology, technology, communications and building systems, and also to offer a creative learning experience in the disciplines of math, science, history, geography and social sciences as they relate to catastrophic natural disasters.

The Center will partner with the National Weather Service, the media and other public and private organizations to provide timely and reliable information as it relates to severe weather events and their aftermath.

The Creole Nature Trail All-American Road began working on this project before the 2005 storms. In September, the project was awarded a $1.3 million Department of Transportation Scenic Byways grant, the largest ever awarded under the Louisiana Scenic Byways program.

Just last week, the board conducted two public meetings in southwest Louisiana to seek community input on the top four sites being considered for the museum and science center. A final site selection is expected to be announced later this month, honoring the 50th anniversary of Hurricane Audrey, a storm that was devastating in my congressional district and took many lives years ago.

The National Hurricane Museum and Science Center will not only serve as a historical center to study the effects that hurricanes have on our coast, it will be a living memorial to attract scholars, students and tourists to the region, a region that's still struggling to recover after the 2005 storms.

Southwest Louisiana is constantly learning how to protect itself from future disasters, and this project will help assist our efforts and our neighbors along the gulf coast and throughout the country in that important effort.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. I want to thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Across the Sabine River from southwest Louisiana is southeast Texas, and the citizens of southeast Texas are still reeling from the beating that they got from Hurricane Rita in 2005. The hurricane devastated rice farmers who were struggling even before the wind and rain destroyed most of their crops.

It hit the oil refineries in my congressional district and across the gulf coast, which account for one-third of the Nation's domestic oil production, and it brought our fuel supply to a screeching halt. Gasoline prices soared, and citizens can no longer afford to heat and even cool their homes.

Amidst the chaos of Hurricane Rita and its aftermath, lawlessness preyed upon the real victims. Some of those who weathered the storm took advantage of FEMA's incompetence in its attempt to distribute money to those in need. The cheaters took FEMA debit cards and spent them on gentlemen's clubs and brand-new cars. The real victims languished homeless and helpless, waiting for the Federal Government to do something.

The folks in my congressional district can still feel the impact of the hurricane 2 years later. People are still trying to just survive; and, as Mr. BOUSTANY has said, another hurricane season is now upon us. We cannot forget how a few short hours in southwest Louisiana and southeast Texas caused so much destruction. We cannot forget in historical terms Hurricane Katrina or Rita, and we must remember they are not rare events for the gulf coast.

In 1900, an unnamed hurricane was the deadliest natural disaster in our Nation's history. It killed between 10- and 12,000 people in Galveston, Texas. It destroyed most of the buildings on the island, some 3,600. With remarkable determination, the survivors of the great storm of 1900 raised the whole City of Galveston, Texas, 12 feet to protect it from future disasters.

□ 1440

We cannot forget the victims of the past, and we must remember how the victims of Katrina and Rita are still fighting to recover their homes, their towns and their livelihoods, and we must be better prepared in the future.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to rise in support of this resolution offered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana.

The National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in Southwest Louisiana will honor these victims and those of previous hurricanes, preserve their history. It will tell the stories of all the hurricanes of the past, but also encourage new solutions for natural disasters of the future. So I'd like to commend Dr. BOUSTANY for offering this important resolution. It's a long time in coming.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 54, which supports the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in Southwest Louisiana. The creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in southwest Louisiana will serve as a historical reminder for all Americans as well as the rest of the world of the importance of disaster preparedness.

We must not forget the depths of the devastation and despair of Hurricane Katrina that resulted from the lack of proactive disaster planning and preparedness. Hurricane Katrina was the costliest and one of the deadliest hurricanes in the history of the United States. It was the sixth-strongest Atlantic hurricane ever recorded and the third-strongest hurricane on record that made landfall in the United States. Katrina formed on August 23 during the 2005 Atlantic hurricane season and caused devastation along much of the north-central Gulf Coast of the United States. Most notable in media coverage were the catastrophic effects on the city of New Orleans, Louisiana, and in coastal Mississippi. Due to its sheer size, Katrina devastated the Gulf Coast as far as 100 miles from the storm's epicenter.

Mr. Speaker, the images of the detriment and devastation remain deeply etched in my mind and much of the remnants of the tragedy still remain in those communities today. The storm surge caused severe and catastrophic damage along the Gulf coast, devastating the cities of Bay St. Louis, Waveland, Biloxi/Gulfport in Mississippi, Mobile, Alabama, and Slidell, Louisiana and other towns in Louisiana. Levees separating Lake Pontchartrain and several canals from New Orleans were breached a few days after Hurricane Katrina had subsided, subsequently flooding 80% of the city and many areas of neighboring parishes for weeks. In addition, severe wind damage was reported well inland.

Although we continue to mourn the loss of the thousands of victims who perished in Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath, we must still push forward to gain knowledge and insight about these disastrous hurricanes and their effects on the public. The Hurricane Center has the potential to provide a great source of educational service to the American public as concerns about the rapidly changing climate in hurricane-prone regions rise.

The Hurricane Center will not only educate but also motivate the young and the old in the fields of meteorology, environmental science, sociology, conservation, economics, history, communications, and engineering. In addition, the Hurricane Center can benefit everyone by providing resources that inform the public on preparing, surviving and recovering from natural disasters such as Hurricane Katrina. Hopefully, this will enable us to avoid such needless and devastating results as those from Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath.

Examining technology, engineering, and preservation of natural barriers all can help to reduce the impact of hurricanes. It is only appropriate that the effects of hurricanes and the rebuilding efforts be captured in a comprehensive center such as a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center to interpret the effects of hurricanes in and outside of Louisiana. For these reasons, I strongly support H. Con. Res. 54 and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the creation of a Museum and Science Center that will serve to remind and educate Americans about the importance of hurricane disaster preparedness.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 54.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE OUACHITA NATIONAL FOREST ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 390) recognizing the importance of the Ouachita National Forest on its 100th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 390

Whereas on December 18, 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt created by proclamation the Arkansas National Forest on reserved public domain lands south of the Arkansas River;

Whereas on April 29, 1926, President Calvin Coolidge issued an Executive Order to change the name of the Arkansas National Forest to the Ouachita National Forest to reflect both the name of the mountains embraced by the national forest and the name of the principal river which drains the national forest;

Whereas Ouachita is the French spelling of a Native American word meaning ''good hunting ground'';

Whereas the Ouachita National Forest today encompasses approximately 1.8 million acres in Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma and offers a variety of recreation areas, scenic areas, wilderness areas, historic resources, and timber and other forest products to the Nation; and

Whereas the Ouachita National Forest is the largest and oldest national forest in the southern region of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Ouachita National Forest, the House of Representatives recognizes the important contributions of the Ouachita National Forest to the success of the United States in conserving the environment and ensuring that our natural resources remain sources of pride for our citizens, our communities, and our Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. 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 gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 390 was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative Mike Ross.

The bill would express recognition by the House of Representatives of the importance of the Ouachita National Forest on its centennial.

The Ouachita is the largest and the oldest national forest in the southern region of the United States.

On December 18, 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt proclaimed the establishment of what he called Arkansas National Forest. Nineteen years later, by Executive order, President Calvin Coolidge changed the name of the forest to the Ouachita National Forest, reflecting the name of both the local mountains and the main river running through the forest.

The forest encompasses six wilderness areas, seven scenic areas and 11 shooting ranges, as well as 35 recreational areas, including the 26,445-acre Winding Stair National Recreation Area.

Mr. Speaker, Ouachita is a noteworthy unit of our National Forest System, and it is appropriate that we take this action today to celebrate the forest's centennial.

I want to commend and congratulate my colleague, Representative ROSS, for his commitment and leadership on this matter. We support the passage of House Resolution 390 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 390, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 390 has been adequately explained by the majority, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Arkansas, MIKE ROSS.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 390, a resolution honoring and recognizing the importance of Ouachita National Forest on its 100th anniversary. I am very fortunate to represent a good part of the Ouachita National Forest within the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas.

I'm also pleased that the entire Arkansas Congressional Delegation, Congressmen JOHN BOOZMAN, VIC SNYDER and MARION BERRY have joined me in supporting and cosponsoring this bipartisan bill honoring one of our Nation's true national treasures.

This marks the 100th birthday or anniversary, if you will, of one the largest and oldest national forests in the

southern region of the United States, the Ouachita National Forest.

As Chairwoman CHRISTENSEN indicated, in 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt created the Arkansas National Forest on reserved public lands south of the Arkansas River. And by 1926 President Calvin Coolidge issued an Executive order to change the name of the forest to the Ouachita National Forest, named after the Ouachita Mountains, which stretch from near the center of Arkansas to southeast Oklahoma, and after the principal river which drains the national forest, the Ouachita River.

For the past 100 years, the Ouachita National Forest has remained a vast, magnificent region that offers spectacular recreation, scenic and wilderness areas for numerous visitors from throughout the world. The forest provides an array of activities, ranging from ATV recreational activities and opportunities, to hiking and to mountain biking to horseback riding trails and swimming. The forest also contains five lakes, often referred to as ''Diamond Lakes,'' which are known for their crystal clear quality and beautiful scenery.

In addition to the scenic views and outdoor activities the forest has to offer, the Ouachita National Forest is also one of the only places in the United States that contains an incredible crater area which allows visitors and rock collectors to dig for real diamonds and quartz crystals.

Today the Ouachita National Forest also includes more than 1.8 million acres in Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma, and provides timber and forestry products throughout the United States.

And while the word ''Ouachita'' is the French spelling of the Native American word for ''good hunting ground,'' the forest also contains six locations that have been designated as wilderness areas covering 65,000 acres. These areas provide environmentally safe habitats for wildlife and fish, including many threatened and endangered species, as well as watershed protection and improvement and wilderness area management.

This resolution honors and recognizes all the important services and contributions that the Ouachita National Forest continues to make available to visitors all across our country and throughout the world who come here to visit and to the spirit and practice of ensuring that our natural resources remain sources of pride for our citizens, our communities and, yes, our Nation.

I'm proud to sponsor a resolution commemorating its 100th anniversary, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Resolution 390 today and honor Ouachita National Forest's centennial celebration.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this matter, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 390.

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.

RIVERSIDE-CORONA FEEDER WATER SUPPLY ACT

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1139) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design and construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, and other uses from the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin, Santa Ana River, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1139

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 ''Riverside-Corona Feeder Water Supply Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term ''District'' means the Western Municipal Water District, Riverside County, California.

(2) PROJECT.—The term ''Project'' means the Riverside-Corona Feeder Project and associated facilities.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE RIVERSIDE-CORONA FEEDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Western Municipal Water District, is authorized to participate in the planning, design, and construction of a water supply project, the Riverside-Corona Feeder, which includes 20 groundwater wells, groundwater treatment facilities, water storage and pumping facilities, and 28 miles of pipeline in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California.

(b) AGREEMENTS AND REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may enter into such agreements and promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(c) FEDERAL COST SHARE.—

(1) PLANNING, DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION.—The Federal share of the cost to plan, design, and construct the project described in subsection (a) shall be not more than 25 percent of the total cost of the project, not to exceed $50,000,000.

(2) STUDIES.—The Federal share of the cost to complete the necessary planning studies associated with the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 50 percent of the total study cost and shall be included as part of the limitation on funds provided in paragraph (1).

(d) IN-KIND SERVICES.—In-kind services performed by the Western Municipal Water District shall be part of the local cost share to complete the project described in subsection (a).

(e) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary under this section shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act $50,000,000 or 25 percent of the total cost of the Project, whichever is less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

The purpose of H.R. 1139, as amended, is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design and construct water facilities for municipal, domestic irrigation and other uses in the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin, Santa Ana River in California.

H.R. 1139, as amended, would authorize limited Federal financial assistance for the design and construction of 20 groundwater wells, groundwater treatment facilities, water storage and pumping facilities and 28 miles of pipeline in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties of California.

□ 1450

The West, now more than ever, must explore and identify new ways of providing a reliable water supply to meet the current and future water demands of a rapidly growing population. H.R. 1139, as amended, seeks to accomplish this by building new pipelines and infrastructure that would allow for the storage of conserved water in groundwater basins.

This project would also serve to provide a critical emergency supply, aid in groundwater cleanup, and reduce dependence on the Colorado River and the very sensitive Bay-Delta.

I thank Mr. CALVERT for his efforts on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1139, as amended.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1139. H.R. 1139, sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to assist the Western Municipal Water District in the planning, design, and construction of the Riverside-Corona Feeder. This project includes water storage, pumping facilities, and 28 miles of pipeline in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California.

This legislation, as amended, is another step toward ''drought proofing'' Southern California and also reduces the region's dependence on imported water supplies, while providing limited Federal assistance. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the Riverside-Corona Feeder Water Supply Act represents an important investment in the water infrastructure in western Riverside County, California, one of the fastest-growing regions in this country.

At a time when water demand continues to grow due to the West's increasing population, traditional water sources have been confronted by a prolonged drought and other environmental challenges. In fact, just last week California water officials turned off the huge pumps that send water to Southern California from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to protect a tiny imperiled fish. While the shutdown is only scheduled to last a week or two, it is a stark reminder that Southern California must continue to reduce its dependence on imported water from the Delta and the Colorado River.

The Western Municipal Water District provides water service to western Riverside County and serves a population of more than 600,000 people. The purpose of the Riverside-Corona Feeder water supply project is to capture and store water in wet years in order to increase Western's firm water supplies, provide a cost-effective water supply, and improve water quality.

New wet year water will come from local runoff, including regulated releases from Seven Oaks Dam and the State Water Project and stored in San Bernardino groundwater basins. To deliver the stored water to consumers in Western's service area, the project will provide for new groundwater pumping and pipeline capability. As an additional benefit, the Riverside-Corona Feeder will provide the means to control water tables, thereby reducing liquefaction dangers in the Colton and San Bernardino communities. Additionally, the project improves local water quality as perchlorate and other contaminants would be removed from the basin when water is extracted from the well heads via the Riverside-Corona Feeder.

I applaud Western and our local elected officials in Western Riverside County for taking bold, proactive steps in meeting our region's current and future water demand. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the leadership of Western's General Manager, John Rossi, as well as the Western board members, Charles Field, Tom Evans, Brenda Dennstedt, Don Galleano, and Al Lopez. I also want to thank my good friend GRACE NAPOLITANO, the chairwoman of the Water and Power Subcommittee, for her leadership and support of my legislation.

I think it is crucial that we recognize and assist communities that are working to reduce their reliance on imported water, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the Riverside-Corona Feeder Water Supply Act.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1139, 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.

CONJUNCTIVE USE OF SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER IN JUAB COUNTY, UTAH

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1736) to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for conjunctive use of surface and groundwater in Juab County, Utah.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1736

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

SECTION 1. CONJUNCTIVE USE OF SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER IN JUAB COUNTY, UTAH.

Section 202(a)(2) of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–575) is amended by inserting ''Juab,'' after ''Davis,''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

The purpose of H.R. 1736, as introduced by our distinguished colleague from Utah (Mr. CANNON), is to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater in Juab County, Utah.

H.R. 1736, when enacted, would authorize a water resources feasibility study for the city of Juab, Utah. This study includes groundwater recharge and management, as well as a review of the joint use of surface water and groundwater.

The assessment and evaluation of current water resources is essential to understanding the needs of the community and the environment. H.R. 1736 seeks to provide the technical information needed by the city of Juab.

I thank Mr. CANNON for his hard work on this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1736.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1736. I would like to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands for her kind comments and background on this bill.

H.R. 1736 passed the House of Representatives last Congress, and I reintroduced this legislation earlier this year. This bill will benefit many of my constituents by allowing Juab County to become eligible for funding for conjunctive use under the Central Utah Project. Precious water resources in Utah are highly valued and maximizing existing water resources efficiently is imperative.

The Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project was planned to develop and export water from the high Uinta Mountains in the eastern part of the State and bring it to the populated Wasatch Front.

As originally planned, Juab County would have received a large amount of water. However, due to alterations in the original plan, much of that water is planned for use in the Wasatch, Utah, and Salt Lake Counties. While efforts will continue to identify and secure substantial additional water supplies for Juab, there are near-term steps that can be taken to help the county meet its current needs and growing demands. This legislation will facilitate one of those near-term steps.

H.R. 1736 will allow Juab County to become eligible for funding for studies and construction of conjunctive use projects by amending the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992. Allowing Juab County to be eligible to receive funds under the Central Utah Project Completion Act will allow the county to maximize surface water flows and groundwater sources by storing flows in existing aquifers.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1736.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CEILING INCREASE ON FEDERAL SHARE OF WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1175) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the ceiling on the Federal share of the costs of phase I of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1175

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

SECTION 1. CEILING INCREASE ON FEDERAL SHARE OF WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT.

Section 1631(d) of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h–13(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) The Federal share of the costs of the project authorized by section 1624 shall not exceed the following:

''(A) $22,000,000 for fiscal year 2007.
''(B) $24,200,000 for fiscal year 2008.
''(C) $26,620,000 for fiscal year 2009.
''(D) $29,282,000 for fiscal year 2010.
''(E) $32,210,200 for fiscal year 2011.
''(F) $35,431,220 for fiscal year 2012.
''(G) $38,974,342 for fiscal year 2013.
''(H) $42,871,776 for fiscal year 2014.
''(I) $47,158,953 for fiscal year 2015.
''(J) $51,874,849 for fiscal year 2016.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my friend and our colleague from California, Representative LORETTA SANCHEZ, for her dedicated and hard work on this legislation over several Congresses.

The purpose of H.R. 1175, as introduced by Ms. SANCHEZ, is to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the Federal cost share of phase one of the Orange County, California Regional Water Reclamation Project.

The project authorized by H.R. 1175 will supplement existing water supplies by providing a new, reliable, high quality source of water to recharge the Orange County Groundwater Basin and protect it from further degradation due to seawater intrusion.

I thank Ms. SANCHEZ for her efforts on this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1175.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1175 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Democratic bill manager has adequately explained the bill. This legislation has been cosponsored by five of my Republican colleagues, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1175, a bill that I have introduced for two consecutive Congresses. I am pleased to see that the bill is on the Suspension Calendar today. I would like to thank the House leadership for making that happen.

H.R. 1175 would increase the ceiling on the federal share of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project—from $20 million to $51,874,849. This project will ultimately allow Orange County to complete its innovative groundwater replenishment system, which is designed to reuse advanced treated wastewater to recharge the aquifer in northern Orange County.

This aquifer is the primary source of drinking water for over 144,000 families in Orange County each year, serving about 2.3 million residents from north and central Orange County. This reclamation effort has the potential of creating a new water supply of 72,000 acre-feet per year.

The OC Groundwater Replenishment Project is an innovative program which has drawn national and international attention. Many U.S. states and foreign nations—including Japan, Korea, Taiwan—have come to Orange County to look at our tertiary cleaning system. They have observed that reusing recycled water—especially important in the arid west—will help preserve and recharge overdrawn river and groundwater supplies, and will help protect our environment from unexpected scarcity of water.

What this bill does is to increase the federal share of the project, bringing it closer to the 25 percent level, the level at which almost every other reclamation project is funded in the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act of 1992 and the Reclamation Cycling and Water Conservation Act.

The project is not just important to Orange County, California, but also to the entire western United States. By recycling our own water, we will not rely so heavily on the Colorado River Aqueduct or water from the San Francisco Bay Delta.

Members from both sides of the aisle recognize the need for this project and have been consistently supportive of this effort. I would like to thank, in particular, my colleagues from Orange County who are all original cosponsors of this bill. I appreciate their continued support for this legislation, and this important project.

Let me thank, again, the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, for his support, as well as Ranking Member YOUNG, Subcommittee Chairwoman NAPOLITANO and Ranking Member MCMORRIS for their overwhelming support of H.R. 1175.

Finally, let me thank Denis Bilodeau, Irv Pickler, Virginia Grebbien, Philip Anthony, Craig Miller, and everyone affiliated with the Orange County Water District and Orange County Sanitation District for their hard work and leadership in groundwater treatment and recycling. Their innovation has put Orange County at the forefront of water recycling and groundwater replenishment technology. I thank them for all they continue to do for Orange County.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1175.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 361) to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and activities under that Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 361

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES UNDER THE LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ADDITIONAL PROJECTS.—Section 4(a) of the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–576; 114 Stat. 3067) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) In Cameron County, Texas, Bayview Irrigation District No. 11, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March 3, 2004, engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $1,425,219.

''(21) In the Cameron County, Texas, Brownsville Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the February 11, 2004 engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $722,100.

''(22) In the Cameron County, Texas Harlingen Irrigation District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $4,173,950.

''(23) In the Cameron County, Texas, Cameron County Irrigation District No. 2, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the February 11, 2004 engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $8,269,576.

''(24) In the Cameron County, Texas, Cameron County Irrigation District No. 6, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report by Turner Collie Braden, Inc., at a cost of $5,607,300.

''(25) In the Cameron County, Texas, Adams Gardens Irrigation District No. 19, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004 engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $2,500,000.

''(26) In the Hidalgo and Cameron Counties, Texas, Hidalgo and Cameron Counties Irrigation District No. 9, water conservation and improvement projects as identified by the February 11 engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $8,929,152.

''(27) In the Hidalgo and Willacy Counties, Texas, Delta Lake Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004 engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $8,000,000.

''(28) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 2, a water conservation and improvement project identified in the engineering reports attached to a letter dated February 11, 2004, from the district's general manager, at a cost of $5,312,475.

''(29) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects identified in an engineering report dated March 5, 2004 by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $5,595,018.

''(30) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 6, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $3,450,000.

''(31) In the Hidalgo County, Texas Santa Cruz Irrigation District No. 15, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report dated March 5, 2004 by Melden and Hunt at a cost of $4,609,000.

''(32) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Engelman Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report dated March 5, 2004 by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $2,251,480.

''(33) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Valley Acres Water District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report dated March, 2004 by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $500,000.

''(34) In the Hudspeth County, Texas, Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $1,500,000.

''(35) In the El Paso County, Texas, El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $10,500,000.

''(36) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Donna Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects identified in an engineering report dated March 22, 2004 by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $2,500,000.

''(37) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 16, water conservation and improvement projects identified in an engineering report dated March 22, 2004 by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $2,800,000.

''(38) The United Irrigation District of Hidalgo County water conservation and improvement projects as identified in a March 2004 engineering report by Sigler Winston, Greenwood and Associates at a cost of $6,067,021.''.

(b) INCLUSION OF ACTIVITIES TO CONSERVE WATER OR IMPROVE SUPPLY; TRANSFERS AMONG PROJECTS.—Section 4 of such Act (Public Law 106–576; 114 Stat. 3067) is further amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) INCLUSION OF ACTIVITIES TO CONSERVE WATER OR IMPROVE SUPPLY.—In addition to the activities identified in the engineering reports referred to in subsection (a), each project that the Secretary conducts or participates in under subsection (a) may include any of the following:

''(1) The replacement of irrigation canals and lateral canals with buried pipelines.

''(2) The impervious lining of irrigation canals and lateral canals.

''(3) Installation of water level, flow measurement, pump control, and telemetry systems.

''(4) The renovation and replacement of pumping plants.

''(5) Other activities that will result in the conservation of water or an improved supply of water.

''(d) TRANSFERS AMONG PROJECTS.—Of amounts made available for a project referred to in any of paragraphs (20) through (38) of subsection (a), the Secretary may transfer and use for another such project up to 10 percent.''.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR LOWER RIO GRANDE CONSTRUCTION.

Section 4(e) of the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–576; 114 Stat. 3067), as redesignated by section 2(b) of this Act, is further amended by inserting before the period the following: ''for projects referred to in paragraphs (1) through (19) of subsection (a), and $42,356,145 (2004 dollars) for projects referred to in paragraphs (20) through (38) of subsection (a)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first commend our colleague from Texas, and my classmate, Representative HINOJOSA, for his dedication to and hard work on this legislation.

The purpose of H.R. 361 is to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and related activities.

H.R. 361, when enacted, would authorize limited Federal assistance for 19 projects aimed at conserving water or improving water supply. This would include the replacement of irrigation canals and lateral canals, the lining of channels and the installation of water level, flow measurement, pump control, and remote control systems.

This legislation would help to accomplish a more sustainable water supply by enhancing existing water distribution systems and monitoring water resources.

I thank Mr. HINOJOSA for his efforts on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have his remarks inserted into the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 361.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 361 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands has appropriately explained the bill, which has passed the bill in the last two Congresses in one form or another. I support the bill.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 361, a bill that will authorize a number of projects which will improve irrigation and water conservation throuhgout the Rio Grande Valley. I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and Chairwoman NAPOLITANO as well as my colleagues from the Texas Border Region, Congressmen ORTIZ, REYES, RODRIGUEZ, and CUELLAR for their support in bringing this vitally important legislation onto the House floor.

I represent a region of the country that is experiencing phenomenal population growth yet is subject to severe periodic droughts. The 2000 Census showed that the population of Hidalgo County, in my district, increased by 48 percent. On the Mexican side of the border, millions have come to work in the maquiladoras and to take advantage of the economic boom that has come from NAFTA.

This growth has placed an enormous strain on water delivery systems throughout the Texas-Mexico border region. Water intended for irrigating crops flows through open dirt ditches where much of the precious water supply is lost to seepage and evaporation. Municipalities also rely on the water from these inefficient and outdated irrigation delivery systems to meet the water needs of growing communities.

H.R. 361 will authorize 19 projects that will allow border water districts to continue upgrading and modernizing our antiquated water delivery systems through the installation of water pipes and canal linings. Similar projects were authorized in the 106th and 107th Congresses.

The Rio Grande Valley has already made a great deal of progress because this has been a collaborative effort. The irrigation district have provided matching funds. The Texas Water Development Board and Texas A&M University have paid for many of the engineering studies. Federal appropriators have provided more than $10 million. As a result, we are seeing water savings of almost 80 percent in the projects that have been completed.

Most importantly, Federal authorization has allowed us to tap into the resources of the North American Development Bank. To date, NADBank has approved almost $24 million for these projects and passage of H.R. 361 will make these new projects eligible for NADBank assistance.

These funds are being put to good use. Numerous projects are already underway and some are almost completed.

When the metering system is fully installed, irrigation districts will have a much clearer picture of water usage and water savings. This data will be vital to improving water management throughout the region.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 361.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATOR PAUL SIMON STUDY ABROAD FOUNDATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1469) to establish the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1469

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 ''Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to President George W. Bush, ''America's leadership and national security rest on our commitment to educate and prepare our youth for active engagement in the international community.''.

(2) According to former President William J. Clinton, ''Today, the defense of United States interests, the effective management of global issues, and even an understanding of our Nation's diversity require ever-greater contact with, and understanding of, people and cultures beyond our borders.''.

(3) Congress authorized the establishment of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program pursuant to section 104 of the Miscellaneous Appropriations and Offsets Act, 2004 (division H of Public Law 108–199). Pursuant to its mandate, the Lincoln Commission has submitted to Congress and the President a report of its recommendations for greatly expanding the opportunity for students at institutions of higher education in the United States to study abroad, with special emphasis on studying in developing nations.

(4) According to the Lincoln Commission, ''[s]tudy abroad is one of the major means of producing foreign language speakers and enhancing foreign language learning'' and, for that reason, ''is simply essential to the [N]ation's security''.

(5) Studies consistently show that United States students score below their counterparts in other advanced countries on indicators of international knowledge. This lack of global literacy is a national liability in an age of global trade and business, global interdependence, and global terror.

(6) Americans believe that it is important for their children to learn other languages, study abroad, attend a college where they can interact with international students, learn about other countries and cultures, and generally be prepared for the global age.

(7) In today's world, it is more important than ever for the United States to be a responsible, constructive leader that other countries are willing to follow. Such leadership cannot be sustained without an informed citizenry with significant knowledge and awareness of the world.

(8) Study abroad has proven to be a very effective means of imparting international and foreign-language competency to students.

(9) In any given year, only approximately one percent of all students enrolled in United States institutions of higher education study abroad.

(10) Less than 10 percent of the students who graduate from United States institutions of higher education with bachelors degrees have studied abroad.

(11) Far more study abroad must take place in developing countries. Ninety-five percent of the world's population growth over the next 50 years will occur outside of Europe. Yet in the academic year 2004–2005, 60 percent of United States students studying abroad studied in Europe, and 45 percent studied in four countries—the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, and France—according to the Institute of International Education.

(12) The Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (The 9/11 Commission Report) recommended that the United States increase support for ''scholarship, exchange, and library programs''. The 9/11 Public Discourse Project, successor to the 9/11 Commission, noted in its November 14, 2005, status report that this recommendation was ''unfulfilled,'' and stated that ''The U.S. should increase support for scholarship and exchange programs, our most powerful tool to shape attitudes over the course of a generation.''. In its December 5, 2005, Final Report on the 9/11 Commission Recommendations, the 9/11 Public Discourse Project gave the government a grade of ''D'' for its implementation of this recommendation.

(13) Investing in a national study abroad program would help turn a grade of ''D'' into an ''A'' by equipping United States students to communicate United States values and way of life through the unique dialogue that takes place among citizens from around the world when individuals study abroad.

(14) An enhanced national study abroad program could help further the goals of other United States Government initiatives to promote educational, social, and political reform and the status of women in developing and reforming societies around the world, such as the Middle East Partnership Initiative.

(15) To complement such worthwhile Federal programs and initiatives as the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, the National Security Education Program, and the National Security Language Initiative, a broad-based undergraduate study abroad program is needed that will make many more study abroad opportunities accessible to all undergraduate students, regardless of their field of study, ethnicity, socio-economic status, or gender.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to significantly enhance the global competitiveness and international knowledge base of the United States by ensuring that more United States students have the opportunity to acquire foreign language skills and international knowledge through significantly expanded study abroad;

(2) to enhance the foreign policy capacity of the United States by significantly expanding and diversifying the talent pool of individuals with non-traditional foreign language skills and cultural knowledge in the United States who are available for recruitment by United States foreign affairs agencies, legislative branch agencies, and nongovernmental organizations involved in foreign affairs activities;

(3) to ensure that an increasing portion of study abroad by United States students will take place in nontraditional study abroad destinations such as the People's Republic of China, countries of the Middle East region, and developing countries; and

(4) to create greater cultural understanding of the United States by exposing foreign students and their families to United States students in countries that have not traditionally hosted large numbers of United States students.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) BOARD.—The term ''Board'' means the Board of Directors of the Foundation established pursuant to section 5(d).

(3) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—The term ''Chief Executive Officer'' means the chief executive officer of the Foundation appointed pursuant to section 5(c).

(4) FOUNDATION.—The term ''Foundation'' means the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation established by section 5(a).

(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(6) NONTRADITIONAL STUDY ABROAD DESTINATION.—The term ''nontraditional study abroad destination'' means a location that is determined by the Foundation to be a less common destination for United States students who study abroad.

(7) STUDY ABROAD.—The term ''study abroad'' means an educational program of study, work, research, internship, or combination thereof that is conducted outside the United States and that carries academic credit toward fulfilling the participating student's degree requirements.

(8) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'' means any of the several States, the

District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(9) UNITED STATES STUDENT.—The term ''United States student'' means a national of the United States who is enrolled at an institution of higher education located within the United States.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF THE SENATOR PAUL SIMON STUDY ABROAD FOUNDATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the executive branch a corporation to be known as the ''Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation'' that shall be responsible for carrying out this Act under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.). The Foundation shall be a government corporation, as defined in section 103 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—The Foundation shall be governed by a Board of Directors chaired by the Secretary of State (or the Secretary's designee) in accordance with subsection (d).

(3) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is the intent of Congress in establishing the structure of the Foundation set forth in this subsection to create an entity that will administer a study abroad program that—

(A) serves the long-term foreign policy and national security needs of the United States; but

(B) operates independently of short-term political and foreign policy considerations.

(b) MANDATE OF FOUNDATION.—In administering the program referred to in subsection (a)(3), the Foundation shall—

(1) promote the objectives and purposes of this Act;

(2) through responsive, flexible grant-making, promote access to study abroad opportunities by United States students at diverse institutions of higher education, including two-year institutions, minority-serving institutions, and institutions that serve nontraditional students;

(3) through creative grant-making, promote access to study abroad opportunities by diverse United States students, including minority students, students of limited financial means, and nontraditional students;

(4) raise funds from the private sector to supplement funds made available under this Act; and

(5) be committed to minimizing administrative costs and to maximizing the availability of funds for grants under this Act.

(c) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be in the Foundation a Chief Executive Officer who shall be responsible for the management of the Foundation.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Chief Executive Officer shall be appointed by the Board and shall be a recognized leader in higher education, business, or foreign policy, chosen on the basis of a rigorous search.

(3) RELATIONSHIP TO BOARD.—The Chief Executive Officer shall report to and be under the direct authority of the Board.

(4) COMPENSATION AND RANK.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Executive Officer shall be compensated at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) AMENDMENT.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Chief Executive Officer, Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation.''.

(5) AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES.—The Chief Executive Officer shall be responsible for the management of the Foundation and shall exercise the powers and discharge the duties of the Foundation.

(6) AUTHORITY TO APPOINT OFFICERS.—In consultation and with approval of the Board, the Chief Executive Officer shall appoint all officers of the Foundation.

(d) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be in the Foundation a Board of Directors.

(2) DUTIES.—The Board shall perform the functions specified to be carried out by the Board in this Act and may prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, regulations, and procedures governing the manner in which the business of the Foundation may be conducted and in which the powers granted to it by law may be exercised.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall consist of—

(A) the Secretary of State (or the Secretary's designee), the Secretary of Education (or the Secretary's designee), the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary's designee), and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (or the Administrator's designee); and

(B) five other individuals with relevant experience in matters relating to study abroad (such as individuals who represent institutions of higher education, business organizations, foreign policy organizations, or other relevant organizations) who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of which—

(i) one individual shall be appointed from among a list of individuals submitted by the majority leader of the House of Representatives;

(ii) one individual shall be appointed from among a list of individuals submitted by the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(iii) one individual shall be appointed from among a list of individuals submitted by the majority leader of the Senate; and

(iv) one individual shall be appointed from among a list of individuals submitted by the minority leader of the Senate.

(4) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—The Chief Executive Officer of the Foundation shall serve as a nonvoting, ex officio member of the Board.

(5) TERMS.—

(A) OFFICERS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Each member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(A) shall serve for a term that is concurrent with the term of service of the individual's position as an officer within the other Federal department or agency.

(B) OTHER MEMBERS.—Each member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(B) shall be appointed for a term of 3 years and may be reappointed for a term of an additional 3 years.

(C) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(6) CHAIRPERSON.—There shall be a Chairperson of the Board. The Secretary of State (or the Secretary's designee) shall serve as the Chairperson.

(7) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Board described in paragraph (3) shall constitute a quorum, which, except with respect to a meeting of the Board during the 135-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall include at least one member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(B).

(8) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(9) COMPENSATION.—

(A) OFFICERS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(A) may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of the member's service on the Board.

(ii) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each such member of the Board shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) OTHER MEMBERS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a member of the Board described in paragraph (3)(B) while away from the member's home or regular place of business on necessary travel in the actual performance of duties as a member of the Board, shall be paid per diem, travel, and transportation expenses in the same manner as is provided under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(ii) LIMITATION.—A member of the Board may not be paid compensation under clause (i) for more than 90 days in any calendar year.

SEC. 6. ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PROGRAM.—There is hereby established a program, which shall—

(1) be administered by the Foundation; and

(2) award grants to—

(A) United States students for study abroad;

(B) nongovernmental institutions that provide and promote study abroad opportunities for United States students, in consortium with institutions described in subparagraph (C); and

(C) institutions of higher education, individually or in consortium,

in order to accomplish the objectives set forth in subsection (b).

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the program established under subsection (a) are that, within 10 years of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) not less than one million undergraduate United States students will study abroad annually for credit;

(2) the demographics of study-abroad participation will reflect the demographics of the United States undergraduate population, including students enrolled in community colleges, minority-serving institutions, and institutions serving large numbers of low-income and first-generation students; and

(3) an increasing portion of study abroad will take place in nontraditional study abroad destinations, with a substantial portion of such increases taking place in developing countries.

(c) MANDATE OF THE PROGRAM.—In order to accomplish the objectives set forth in subsection (b), the Foundation shall, in administering the program established under subsection (a), take fully into account the recommendations of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (established pursuant to section 104 of the Miscellaneous Appropriations and Offsets Act, 2004 (division H of Public Law 108–199)).

(d) STRUCTURE OF GRANTS.—In accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, grants awarded under the program established under subsection (a) shall be structured to the maximum extent practicable to promote appropriate reforms in institutions of higher education in order to remove barriers to participation by students in study abroad.

(e) BALANCE OF LONG-TERM AND SHORT-TERM STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS.—In administering the program established under subsection (a), the Foundation shall seek an appropriate balance between—

(1) longer-term study abroad programs, which maximize foreign-language learning and intercultural understanding; and

(2) shorter-term study abroad programs, which maximize the accessibility of study abroad to nontraditional students.

(f) QUALITY AND SAFETY IN STUDY ABROAD.—In administering the program established under subsection (a), the Foundation shall require that institutions receiving grants demonstrate that—

(1) the study abroad programs for which students receive grant funds are for academic credit; and

(2) the programs have established health and safety guidelines and procedures.

SEC. 7. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 31, 2008, and each March 31 thereafter, the Foundation shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this Act during the prior fiscal year.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the total financial resources available to the Foundation during the year, including appropriated funds, the value and source of any gifts or donations accepted pursuant to section 8(a)(6), and any other resources;

(2) a description of the Board's policy priorities for the year and the bases upon which competitive grant proposals were solicited and awarded to institutions of higher education, nongovernmental institutions, and consortiums pursuant to section 6(a)(2)(B) and 6(a)(2)(C);

(3) a list of grants made to institutions of higher education, nongovernmental institutions, and consortiums pursuant to section 6(a)(2)(B) and 6(a)(2)(C) that includes the identity of the institutional recipient, the dollar amount, and the estimated number of study abroad opportunities provided to United States students by each grant;

(4) a description of the bases upon which the Foundation made grants directly to United States students pursuant to section 6(a)(2)(A);

(5) the number and total dollar amount of grants made directly to United States students by the Foundation pursuant to section 6(a)(2)(A); and

(6) the total administrative and operating expenses of the Foundation for the year, as well as specific information on—

(A) the number of Foundation employees and the cost of compensation for Board members, Foundation employees, and personal service contractors;

(B) costs associated with securing the use of real property for carrying out the functions of the Foundation;

(C) total travel expenses incurred by Board members and Foundation employees in connection with Foundation activities; and

(D) total representational expenses.

SEC. 8. POWERS OF THE FOUNDATION; RELATED PROVISIONS.

(a) POWERS.—The Foundation—

(1) shall have perpetual succession unless dissolved by a law enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) may adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) may make and perform such contracts, grants, and other agreements with any person or government however designated and wherever situated, as may be necessary for carrying out the functions of the Foundation;

(4) may determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid, including expenses for representation;

(5) may lease, purchase, or otherwise acquire, improve, and use such real property wherever situated, as may be necessary for carrying out the functions of the Foundation;

(6) may accept cash gifts or donations of services or of property (real, personal, or mixed), tangible or intangible, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act;

(7) may use the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as the executive departments;

(8) may contract with individuals for personal services, who shall not be considered Federal employees for any provision of law administered by the Office of Personnel Management;

(9) may hire or obtain passenger motor vehicles; and

(10) shall have such other powers as may be necessary and incident to carrying out this Act.

(b) PRINCIPAL OFFICE.—The Foundation shall maintain its principal office in the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foundation shall be subject to chapter 91 of subtitle VI of title 31, United States Code, except that the Foundation shall not be authorized to issue obligations or offer obligations to the public.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9101(3) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(R) the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation.''.

(d) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of State shall serve as Inspector General of the Foundation, and, in acting in such capacity, may conduct reviews, investigations, and inspections of all aspects of the operations and activities of the Foundation.

(2) AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD.—In carrying out the responsibilities under this subsection, the Inspector General shall report to and be under the general supervision of the Board.

(3) REIMBURSEMENT AND AUTHORIZATION OF SERVICES.—

(A) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Foundation shall reimburse the Department of State for all expenses incurred by the Inspector General in connection with the Inspector General's responsibilities under this subsection.

(B) AUTHORIZATION FOR SERVICES.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 10(a) for a fiscal year, up to $2,000,000 is authorized to be made available to the Inspector General of the Department of State to conduct reviews, investigations, and inspections of operations and activities of the Foundation.

SEC. 9. GENERAL PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.

(a) DETAIL OF PERSONNEL.—Upon request of the Chief Executive Officer, the head of an agency may detail any employee of such agency to the Foundation on a reimbursable basis. Any employee so detailed remains, for the purpose of preserving such employee's allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits, an employee of the agency from which detailed.

(b) REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employee of an agency who is serving under a career or career conditional appointment (or the equivalent), and who, with the consent of the head of such agency, transfers to the Foundation, is entitled to be reemployed in such employee's former position or a position of like seniority, status, and pay in such agency, if such employee—

(A) is separated from the Foundation for any reason, other than misconduct, neglect of duty, or malfeasance; and

(B) applies for reemployment not later than 90 days after the date of separation from the Foundation.

(2) SPECIFIC RIGHTS.—An employee who satisfies paragraph (1) is entitled to be reemployed (in accordance with such paragraph) within 30 days after applying for reemployment and, on reemployment, is entitled to at least the rate of basic pay to which such employee would have been entitled had such employee never transferred.

(c) HIRING AUTHORITY.—Of persons employed by the Foundation, not to exceed 30 persons may be appointed, compensated, or removed without regard to the civil service laws and regulations.

(d) BASIC PAY.—The Chief Executive Officer may fix the rate of basic pay of employees of the Foundation without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the classification of positions), subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title (relating to General Schedule pay rates), except that no employee of the Foundation may receive a rate of basic pay that exceeds the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''agency'' means an executive agency, as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term ''detail'' means the assignment or loan of an employee, without a change of position, from the agency by which such employee is employed to the Foundation.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $80,000,000 for fiscal year 2008 and each subsequent fiscal year.

(2) AMOUNTS IN ADDITION TO OTHER AVAILABLE AMOUNTS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1) are in addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for educational exchange programs, including the J. William Fulbright Educational Exchange Program and the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, administered by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State.

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foundation may allocate or transfer to any agency of the United States Government any of the funds available for carrying out this Act. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes for which the funds were authorized, in accordance with authority granted in this Act or under authority governing the activities of the United States Government agency to which such funds are allocated or transferred.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The Foundation shall notify the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days prior to an allocation or transfer of funds pursuant to paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a singularly important piece of legislation which I bring to my colleagues with great personal enthusiasm and some fond memories.

Let me first pay tribute to our late colleague, Senator Paul Simon, after whom this legislation is named. Paul was a firm champion not only of education, higher education, but also education abroad, this incredibly important aspect in a growingly interdependent world. It is appropriate that this piece of legislation be named after our great late colleague, Paul Simon.

Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, first I established and then I had the privilege of directing the Study Abroad Program of the California State University and College System. When I established that program, it was a path-breaking enterprise because historically study abroad was the privilege of only the wealthy and those who attended uniquely elite institutions.

Our legislation expands the opportunity for study abroad that hopefully will involve annually about a million of our college and university students.

Not too many years ago, study abroad was the opportunity for some wealthy college students to spend some time in France or Italy or maybe in Germany. But in an increasingly globalized world, our need to have young men and women who are conversant in the languages of many countries and who are familiar with the cultures of many countries is an absolute necessity for our national security and our national well-being.

This historic piece of legislation will democratize the program of Study Abroad, which used to be the privilege of a very thin layer of our society. It opens up for every American college student, irrespective of his or her socioeconomic status, the opportunity of spending a year or more involved in serious language and area study all over the world.

□ 1510

At a time when new languages are required by vast numbers of our young people, Chinese, Indian, Arabic and others, this will provide a dramatic upgrading of our ability to interact with the rest of the globe. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation which will usher in a new era for American higher education for college students all over the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that an exchange of letters between the Committee of Foreign Affairs and the Committee of Oversight and Government Reform be included in the RECORD at this time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2007.

Hon. TOM LANTOS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LANTOS: I am writing about H.R. 1469, a bill to establish the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation. The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported this legislation to the House on May 9, 2007.

I appreciate your effort to consult with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform regarding those provisions of H.R. 1469 that fall within the Oversight Committee's jurisdiction. These provisions address issues related to the Federal civil service, Federal property management, and the duties of inspectors general.

In the interest of expediting consideration of H.R. 1469, the Oversight Committee will not request a sequential referral of this bill. I would, however, request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Oversight Committee should H.R. 1469 or a similar Senate bill be considered in conference with the Senate. Moreover, this letter should not be construed as a waiver of the Oversight Committee's legislative jurisdiction over subjects addressed in H.R. 1469 that fall within the jurisdiction of the Oversight Committee.

Please include our exchange of letters on this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Again, I appreciate your willingness to consult the Committee on these matters.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2007.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Chairman, Committee Oversight and Government Reform,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1469, the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2007.

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. I acknowledge that the Committee will not seek a sequential referral of the bill and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not in any way serve as a jurisdictional precedent as to our two committees.

Further, as to any House-Senate conference on the bill, I understand that your Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees for consideration of portions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction, and I agree to support a request by the Committee with respect to serving as conferees on the bill, consistent with the Speaker's practice in this regard.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters are included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I look forward to working with you on this important legislation. If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me or have your staff contact my staff.

Cordially,

TOM LANTOS,
Chairman.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very proud to join Chairman LANTOS in introducing his bill, H.R. 1469, the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2007. The Act gives effect to key recommendations of the bipartisan, congressionally mandated report of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Commission as well as the 9/11 Commission report.

The United States has an increasing need for foreign language expertise, cultural knowledge and better people-to-people diplomacy. We saw a dramatic example of this need, lamentably, after the events of 9/11 when we faced a sudden shortage of qualified speakers of Arabic, Farsi and other strategic languages. A study released last August by the Government Accountability Office indicated that serious language gaps remain within the State Department that can adversely impact State's ability to communicate with foreign audiences and execute critical duties. Study abroad by more American students in places other than traditional destinations in western Europe is essential to our Nation's security and future leadership in the world.

For these reasons, the gentleman from California's bill, H.R. 1469, aims to increase the number and diversity of American students studying abroad with an eventual goal of 1 million per year. It ensures that most of the increase occurs in nontraditional and strategically important destinations, such as China, the Middle East and the developing world.

This Act will establish the Simon Study Abroad Foundation, an independent U.S. Government corporation that can raise private sector funds to promote its work, freed from the large bureaucracies and short-term agendas of other U.S. agencies. By offering competitive grants to universities and educational consortiums based on its priorities, the Foundation will generate broader interest among American schools in study abroad programs, leveraging an impact far greater than a mere direct grant program for students.

To ensure maximum transparency and efficiency, the Foundation will be subject to oversight by an Inspector General and annual congressional reporting requirements.

I appreciate Chairman LANTOS incorporating my proposals for those oversight mechanisms in the introduced text of the bill.

I also was pleased to consult with him regarding the small changes made to the bill after committee consideration. Three minor changes make explicit what was already implicit in the bill: Two of them confirm that the Foundation is a new and different approach not intended to supplant other exchange and direct-grant programs currently run by the State Department. The third makes clear that the Foundation should take care to fund only safe, high-quality study abroad programs. A fourth, substantive change aims to make the Foundation more

cost-effective by eliminating the compensation for board members that was part of the originally introduced text.

In sum, this Act, Mr. Speaker, represents a creative, forward-thinking initiative to protect American leadership and security in a fast-changing world. H.R. 1469 deserves our enthusiastic support.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 1469, the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Act of 2007. This important piece of legislation seeks to enhance the enrollment, diversity, and range of countries relating to U.S. college study abroad programs.

The United States is failing to take full advantage of a valuable tool that should be used to enhance our standing in the world and to improve our national security. Opportunities for students to study abroad is integral to creating intercultural awareness, a globally competent workforce, ensuring America's economic competitiveness, and protecting national security. Students can be powerfully effective diplomats for American culture, democratic values, and foreign policy.

H.R. 1469 aims to improve the diversity, the range of countries, and number of students that study abroad while in college. Only about 1 percent of all U.S. college students study abroad, and the vast majority study in Europe. Just 9 percent of those students are minority students, even though African American, Native American, and Hispanic students make up 30 percent of the total U.S. college enrollment.

Inspired by the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and the congressionally chartered Lincoln Commission, the Senator Paul Simon Act will create a new government corporation charged with democratizing study abroad for American students the way that the GI Bill democratized higher education.

The Simon Foundation Act is visionary legislation sponsored by Senators RICHARD DURBIN and NORM COLEMAN, and the chairman and ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. LANTOS and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. The legislation authorizes $80 million annually for 10 years in order to assist 1 million American students study abroad each year by 2018. This funding from the Department of State budget will directly support student scholarships and organizations like Bardoli Global around the Nation.

Bardoli Global is an organization that originated in my congressional district. It exists to provide greater access to study abroad opportunities for outstanding African American, Native American, and Hispanic American student leaders and to make those students globally competent change agents for their communities. The organization's Houston pilot program will soon expand to five other cities across the Nation in 2008.

Mr. Speaker, we must act now to enact the vision of the late Senator Paul Simon from Illinois who worked tirelessly to promote a public-private partnership to democratize study abroad. We must act quickly to achieve equity and diversity in study abroad, especially targeting traditionally underrepresented students. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as always, it's a pleasure to work with Chairman LANTOS.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1469, 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.

RELATING TO THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 152) relating to the 40th anniversary of the reunification of the City of Jerusalem, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 152

Whereas June 2007 marks the 40th anniversary of the Six Day War and the reunification of the city of Jerusalem;

Whereas Israel has, since its founding, sought peace with its Arab neighbors;

Whereas in the weeks leading up to the Six Day War, Israel's neighbors, without provocation, called for and implemented a blockade of Israel's critical outlet to the Red Sea, ordered United Nations peace-keeping forces out of the Sinai desert, massed their forces with apparent hostile intent in the Sinai and in the Golan Heights, and publicly threatened to destroy Israel;

Whereas in six days of war, Israel defeated those forces seeking its destruction and reunited the city of Jerusalem which had been artificially divided for 19 years;

Whereas Jerusalem has been the focal point of Jewish religious devotion and the site of a continuous Jewish presence for over three millennia, with a Jewish majority since at least 1896;

Whereas Jerusalem is a holy city for the Christian and Muslim faiths;

Whereas the vibrant Jewish population of the historic Old City of Jerusalem was driven out by force during the 1948 Arab-Israeli War;

Whereas from 1948 to 1967 Jerusalem was a divided city, and Israeli citizens of all faiths as well as Jews of all nationalities were denied access to holy sites in eastern Jerusalem, including the Old City, in which the Western Wall and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre are located;

Whereas this year marks the 40th year that Jerusalem has been administered as a unified city in which the rights of all faiths have been respected;

Whereas the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–45), which became law on November 8, 1995, states as a matter of United States policy that Jerusalem should remain the undivided capital of Israel in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to support a peaceful, two-state solution to end the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) congratulates the citizens of Israel on the 40th anniversary of the Six Day War in which Israel defeated enemies aiming to destroy the Jewish State;

(2) congratulates the residents of Jerusalem and the people of Israel on the 40th anniversary of the reunification of that historic city;

(3) commends those former combatant states of the Six Day War, Egypt and Jordan, who in subsequent years had the wisdom and courage to embrace a vision of peace and coexistence with Israel;

(4) commends Israel for its administration of the undivided city of Jerusalem for the past 40 years, during which Israel has respected the rights of all religious groups;

(5) reiterates its commitment to the provisions of the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 and calls upon the President and all United States officials to abide by its provisions; and

(6) urges the Palestinians and Arab countries to join with Israel in peace negotiations to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict, including realization of the vision of two democratic states, Israeli and Palestinian, living side-by-side in peace and security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my good friend from Florida, the distinguished ranking member of our committee, in recognizing the 40th anniversary of one of the great military triumphs of the 20th century, the so-called Six Day War. Some of us remember and everybody has read about the attempt of the neighboring Arab countries to annihilate the State of Israel 40 years ago. In a brilliant preemptive move, the Israeli military moved ahead and destroyed the air forces and much of the military of the neighboring countries which were ready to destroy it.

The Six Day War transformed the shape of the Middle East and brought about the unification of the city of Jerusalem. Prior to the Six Day War, Jerusalem was closed to Israelis. Following the Six Day War, members of all faiths have had full and free access to the city of Jerusalem, and places of worship, Muslim, Christian, Jewish, are available to all individuals who seek an opportunity for peaceful prayer.

This body and the other body some years back called for the proper placement of the United States embassy in Israel's capital in Jerusalem. My good friend, the late Senator Patrick Moynihan, and I introduced this legislation which was strongly supported with significant majorities in both the House and the Senate. But administrations since that time have seen fit to postpone the move of our embassy to Jerusalem.

I earnestly hope that with this commemorative resolution we again call the attention of this administration to its promise, clear and unequivocal, to move the embassy to Israel's capital, Jerusalem. Our embassy is in the capital of every single country with which we maintain diplomatic relations and the capital is designated by the country concerned. It is long overdue that this administration honor the President's personal commitment to move the United States embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

□ 1520

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 152, which congratulates the citizens of Israel on the 40th anniversary of that nation's victory over those who sought to destroy it in the Six Day War and commemorates the 40th anniversary of Jerusalem's reunification.

Jerusalem has historically been a united city, one holy for Jews, Christians and Muslims alike. Last week I had the privilege to go on a congressional delegation to Israel with my distinguished colleague and friend from Florida, Mr. WEXLER. There we visited the old city of Jerusalem and prayed at the ancient Temple's legendary Western Wall. At that site, and throughout the City of Jerusalem, people have freely beseeched God for centuries. But had Jerusalem still been divided, as it was from 1948 to 1967, the old city's holy places would have been off limits to us and to millions of others.

Therefore, I stand here today with particular appreciation for the religious freedom that Jerusalem's unity entails. It is unfortunate, however, that much of the world continues to refuse to recognize Jerusalem's unity and specifically its status as Israel's capital, a status which is both appropriate and a fact of reality.

The Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 states that it is a matter of U.S. policy that Jerusalem should remain the undivided capital of Israel and that the United States should move its embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The resolution before us, H. Con. Res. 152, reaffirms U.S. policy in this regard, and I hope that the administration and our allies worldwide will move swiftly to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital and to move their embassies to that city.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, to clearly articulate that Jerusalem must remain the undivided capital of Israel.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 152, and I take pride in joining my colleagues to congratulate the citizens of Israel on this important anniversary, as well as commending Jordan and Egypt for making peace with their neighbor.

The anniversary marks the 40th year that the ancient and historic city has been administered as a unified city in which the rights of all faiths have been respected. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that having worked in Jerusalem in 1965, I experienced that time when in fact people could not travel to all of Jerusalem, and in fact we know that that is very different today.

It is also important that we use this anniversary to highlight the work that still needs to be done. The historic victory by the Israeli military greatly expanded Israel's territory, but with territorial gains came new problems. These unresolved issues have led to ever-increasing tensions that today manifest themselves in the form of Qassam rocket attacks and military insurgents. As we debate this resolution today, the region, as we know, finds itself in dire conflict.

Earlier this year, I introduced a resolution calling on President Bush to dispatch a new special envoy to the Middle East to capitalize on every opportunity for progress.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must be the leader in promoting peace. The current situation is simply unsustainable. So as we look back 40 years today, let us also look 40 years ahead. Let us look 40 years ahead and work toward a future, not fraught with conflict and strife, but coexistence, moderation and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and continue to push for peace.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and colleagues for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, my father is from Israel, and every summer I spent a good portion of my childhood in Israel, 2 days after the 1967 war, every summer for 5 years, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1973, every summer going to Israel. I remember that moment, since the bulk of my childhood was spent there.

The Six Day War was obviously not only an amazing military accomplishment, a lot of people think today in retrospect that it is a pyrrhic victory, that things would have been so much easier for Israel had that victory not occurred; that David became Goliath.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of myths that I would like to address to the chairman, and also to the leader on the Republican side.

One is it was not such a peaceful time pre the 1967 war. There were a lot of attacks on Israel because of indefensible boundaries. In fact, the peace with Jordan and Egypt could not have happened if it weren't for the 1967 war. There was no possibility, given the pan-Arabism that existed under Nasser, for any peace to have happened.

In fact, one has to look at the 1967 war, that it created possibilities, as did the 1973 war, for peace to occur, and every nation that has decided to make peace with Israel, Egypt and Jordan, has had peace.

The war in 1967, because of the changes to the boundaries to the south, to the immediate east and to the north, redefined Israel's security. Once those nations came to terms with Israel's status, which is what the 1967 war accomplished, they accomplished and received peace, and land-for-peace has been at the premise of America's foreign policy, Israel's foreign policy, and was possible because of the outcome and the results strategically on the ground and in the environment because of 1967.

People remember the military accomplishment which was unique and stands out in the 20th century, but it also created an environment that allowed peace to happen, at least with the two countries that have chosen the road of peace with Israel.

I would like to pick up on my colleague from California and her comments about the next 40 years. The next 40 years needs to be a period of time where America, and this may be a little bit of a criticism here, we were always and always will be the indispensable leader in that region. The moment we walk away from that role the parties lose interest in discussing among themselves.

I would hope that immediately the President would again, and I echo what my colleague from California said, nominate somebody to be a Middle East envoy, to again create a dialogue between the Israelis and Palestinians, to find what the Jordanians and Egyptians have found with the Israelis, peace, based on the premise of land for peace.

But everybody should not only look at the military peace of the 1967 war, but it created an opportunity that today two countries that prior to that had fought in the 1967 war against Israel now recognize Israel and have economic, cultural and other types of trade, and that is only due to what happened in 1967.

To those who think 1967 was a pyrrhic victory, wasted, we wouldn't have in fact the Israeli-Jordanian agreement

or the Israeli-Egyptian agreement if it weren't for the victories that happened there. There were also other things that happened to Israel.

One does hope though that as we look forward to trying to find resolution and look at the region as a whole, everybody has always described that Israel and the Arab conflict was at the heart of the Mideast. That is not at the heart. It is a problem. It needs to be resolved.

But the larger problem of the greater Gulf area is not one of the Israeli-Palestinian problem, although it is a significant problem; it is the radical philosophy that is dominating the young in the Arab world that we need to help resolve, because it is leading and feeding part of the terrorism, and that is the larger conflict. The Palestinian-Israeli problem is a problem, but it is not at the heart of the conflict in that region.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment our two leaders today, the chairman and the leader on the Republican side, for this resolution, for recognizing an historic moment that in fact without which we would not see the peace between Israel and Jordan and Israel and Egypt.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before yielding back my time, I would like to make a couple of observations. As my colleagues pointed out, two of Israel's neighbors, Jordan and Egypt, have signed historic peace agreements with the State of Israel. And while this peace is not a full-fledged, blossoming, all-encompassing peace agreement, it certainly has meant the end of hostilities and the beginning of commercial, cultural, educational, touristic and diplomatic relations.

□ 1530

The time is long overdue for Israel to be able to reach an agreement with both Lebanon and Syria, as well as the Palestinian people, so this long-suffering area, where all of the people have suffered for far too long and far too severely, at long last can be a region of peace and reconciliation.

For this to come about, terrorism must end. You cannot make peace with people who are plotting daily to destroy your very existence. When Israel evacuated Gaza, it expected peace from that area. But, under Hamas, daily rocket attacks are unleashed on peaceful civilian Israeli border communities. Two women were killed just in recent weeks as a result of these monstrousattacks. Hezbollah in the north similarly is sworn to terrorism.

This must be put to an end if this important region is to join much of the rest of the world in moving ahead with economic progress, social progress, and the reconciliation of people.

I honestly hope that our resolution paying tribute to the victory 40 years ago and reminding ourselves of our formal commitment to move the U.S. Embassy to its proper location in Jerusalem will serve as a reminder that the time is long overdue for normalizing the situation in this region.

The end of terrorism, the move of our Embassy, will bring about a long prayed for and hoped for period of peace.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 152, which recognizes the 40th anniversary of the reunification of the City of Jerusalem.

This week Israel is recognizing the 40th anniversary of the Six-Day War. On June 7, 1967, Israel reunified the city of Jerusalem, opening it to worshippers of all nationalities and religions.

On that day Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan declared: "This morning, the Israel Defense Forces liberated Jerusalem. We have united Jerusalem, the divided capital of Israel. We have returned to the holiest of our holy places, never to part from it again. To our Arab neighbors we extend, also at this hour—and with added emphasis at this hour—our hand in peace. And to our Christian and Muslim fellow citizens, we solemnly promise full religious freedom and rights. We did not come to Jerusalem for the sake of other peoples' holy places, and not to interfere with the adherents of other faiths, but in order to safeguard its entirety, and to live there together with others, in unity."

Mr. Speaker, even 40 years after Israel's overwhelming victory in the June 1967 War—a war fought to preserve Israel's very existence in the face of enemies determined to destroy it—Israel's stability is still threatened. At this critical time in Israel's history we must focus on what is of the utmost importance—furthering the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

Congress must fully analyze and consider the Arab League Peace Initiative which offers Israel full normalization of relations with the Arab world and is widely viewed in Israel and around the world as an important opportunity and a real basis for negotiations that could end the Israeli-Arab conflict. While not perfect, this plan sets the table for fruitful negotiations and a final resolution of the conflict.

We must also consider negotiations with Syria. If successful, such negotiations could have significant positive impact with respect to limiting Iran's sphere of influence, calming the situation in Lebanon, weakening the support network for Hamas and Hezbollah, and delivering real security to Israel on its northern border.

We must call on President Bush to invest in serious, sustained, and effective efforts to improve the security situation on the ground today and re-establish a viable peace process that can deliver peace and security to Israel, and international acceptance of Jerusalem as Israel's capital.

Mr. Speaker, today I call on all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 152, and I pledge to continue to work to maintain Jerusalem as Israel's indivisible capitol and to promote the policy of the United States to support a peaceful, two-state solution to end the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, forty years ago this week, America's Israeli allies triumphed over the greatest threat to their nation's survival since it was founded in 1948. By emerging from the Six-Day War victorious, Israel demonstrated that a country devoted to liberty, equality and democracy could not only exist, but flourish, in one of the most volatile regions in the world.

In the weeks leading up to June of 1967, Israel's Arab neighbors amassed an immense force along their shared borders with the Jewish state. Their goal—as Egyptian President Gamel Abdel Nasser then put it—was "the destruction of Israel," and they assembled 465,000 troops, 2,800 tanks, and 800 aircraft on Israel's doorstep to achieve this malicious goal.

In the armed conflict that followed, Israel defended itself honorably, courageously, and effectively—winning the war in just six days and taking control of lands previously held by the invading nations. And in an unprecedented act of compromise, Israel offered to give back the captured lands in return for nothing more than a promise that Israel's neighbors would join them in pursuit of peaceful co-existence.

Furthermore, Israel stated that the City of Jerusalem, which was placed under Israel's control as a result of the war, would once again be open to peoples of all faiths and nationalities—a provision that allowed Jews, Christians and Muslims alike to freely worship in the holy city.

These actions in defense of peace and equality—undertaken by Israel just weeks after being attacked—help to demonstrate why the U.S.-Israeli relationship remains so strong to this day. The Israeli people have always worked hard to find common ground with their neighbors, even while facing profound threats to their safety and sovereignty. And just as Israel has never turned its back on the principles and values that all free nations share, America will never turn its back on her.

It gives me great pride to support H. Con. Res. 152, commemorating the 40th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem and recognizing the preceding struggle—and I look forward to many more years of fruitful partnership between the United States and Israel.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 152.

When the 1947 U.N. Partition Plan created two separate states in Palestine—one Jewish, and one Arab—it was a milestone in world history. Jerusalem was from this point on to be an international city—neither Jewish nor Arab, but shared by the two cultures.

However, the excitement over this groundbreaking compromise was short-lived. Although Israel accepted the plan, the Arab world refused to sign on, and soon after attacked Israel, plunging the region into Arab-Israeli War of 1948. The result of this war was a division of Jerusalem in two, with one half being controlled by Israel and one half controlled by Jordan.

In 1967, during the Six Day War, Israel retook control of the Jordanian half of Jerusalem. On June 7, 1967, a cease fire occurred, and Israel took full control over the entire city of Jerusalem. One year later, Israel declared a new holiday—Jerusalem Day—to commemorate the reunification of the city.

This year, to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the reunification, Israel held its Jerusalem Day with the slogan ''Something Special for Everyone.'' I commend Israel and all of the inhabitants of Jerusalem for embodying the inclusiveness of the phrase ''Something Special for Everyone.''

I encourage my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, if there's been any good news on the Middle East peace process over the last 7 years, it's that barriers to ending the conflict are less about final-status issues and more about the challenge of reaching the outcome that majorities on both sides know will be necessary: an independent Palestinian state, based on the 1967 borders, living side by side with Israel in peace, with a shared Jerusalem and a negotiated solution to the Palestinian refugee problem. Against that backdrop, it is unclear to me what good comes from passing a resolution which would place Congress out of step with large parts of the Israeli political spectrum.

This resolution is disconnected from the reality on the ground. At a time of rocket attacks in Sderot, retaliations in Gaza, and renewed fears of war between Israel and Syria, it is, at a minimum, inappropriate for either the United States Congress or the Bush administration to stand in the way of whatever moves for peace Israel may choose to make, yet that is exactly what this resolution does. We should be more engaged at promoting a return to a peace process, not less, and we should be encouraging compromise, not intransigence on the difficult issues.

Jerusalem is Israel's capital and a city of unmatched significance for the Jewish people. I will never forget my first morning in Israel and what it was like to go on a run around the Old City. However, I must oppose a resolution that reaffirms the need to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem prior to a peace agreement because, as both Presidents Clinton and Bush have recognized, this harms our efforts at diplomacy and, therefore, the security of Israel and the United States. Instead, we should keep faith with the Biblical injunction to ''pray for the peace of Jerusalem,'' reject this senseless resolution, and recommit our support for serious efforts at peace in the Middle East and security for Israel.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 152, celebrating the 40th anniversary of the reunification of the city of Jerusalem.

The city of Jerusalem is a unique place in the world, steeped in history and faith, the eternal heart of three major world religions. Jerusalem has suffered war and conquest repeatedly throughout the ages, but I have faith that Jerusalem will never be fractured again.

Jews, Muslims, and Christians all find a spiritual home in Jerusalem, and it is essential that Jerusalem remain open to worshippers of all faiths. Unfortunately, for too many years of its history, access to the holy sites in Jerusalem was denied to some. But for the last 40 years, Israel has guaranteed access to all faiths, and the world community has been able to visit Jerusalem freely. I applaud Israel for this principled and fair policy, which has surely not always been easy to maintain. It is an important affirmation of Israel's humane and democratic values that a country which finds itself under frequent attack would maintain a commitment to the openness of a site of such international importance as Jerusalem.

Unfortunately, the great emotion people feel about the holy city of Jerusalem has frequently found a false outlet in violence against others. It is a great sadness to me, and a great injustice against the history and sanctity of Jerusalem, that the city has been a flashpoint for so much violence in my lifetime.

I am deeply disappointed and frustrated that in the past several years the Middle East peace process has been derailed from the promising moments during the Clinton presidency. President Clinton was as deeply involved, at a personal as well as a political level, with the quest to find a permanent solution to the problems of the region as any world leader has ever been. While he was not quite able to attain the overarching peace agreement that he had worked so hard to achieve, President Clinton recognized that finding a lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian issue needed to be a foreign policy priority of the United States.

Since President Clinton left office, the involvement of the United States in the Middle East peace process has been scattered, sporadic, and ineffectual. Instead of redoubling our efforts to find peace, the United States launched a disastrous war in Iraq. We have sparked a bloody civil war in that country, inflamed Islamic fundamentalism throughout the Middle East, empowered the dangerous regime in Iran, ignored the frustrations and economic despair of the Palestinians, and damaged the immediate security of our great ally in the region—Israel.

On the 40th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem, I view that city as a symbol of hope in the bleak landscape of the Middle East. Through Israel's commitment to the openness of Jerusalem, worshippers of all faiths can visit the holy Old City and see the beauty of its timeless stone buildings and ancient walls.

The United States has always stood steadfast with its close ally Israel, and we must never cease doing so. We must recommit ourselves to the peace process in the Middle East, and lead the international community in forging a path to reconciliation and coexistence. We must dedicate ourselves to bringing about a new peaceful history in this divisive region, so that future generations may continue to find spiritual renewal in Jerusalem.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a strong supporter of Israel, of the Palestinian people, and of achieving a two-state solution where Israel and Palestine exist peacefully side by side. I have had the pleasure of visiting Jerusalem on more than one occasion, and am keenly aware of its importance to people of different faiths.

I rise today, however, to voice my disappointment that H. Con. Res. 152 conveys rather empty rhetoric instead of constructive observations and commitments. The United States has always served as the historical broker of peace agreements between Israel and its Arab neighbors and this is a role that we should continue to fulfill and I believe we should return to taking a much more active role in negotiations than we have under the Bush Administration's tenure. However, passage of a resolution by the United States Congress which fails to recognize the progress of past peace negotiations runs contrary to achieving our ultimate goal of a lasting peace in the region.

Jerusalem is the rightful capital of Israel and will forever remain the capital of Israel. However, it has long been understood that a permanent agreement about the Palestinian areas of Jerusalem will be left to final-status negotiations. The sooner the United States returns to a more active participant in the peace negotiations, the sooner we can arrive to a solution for Jerusalem. But in the meantime, I think we tread on dangerous territory when Congress adopts positions that run counter to issues that have yet to be negotiated.

Israel's victory in 1967 was necessary to shatter the idea that the State of Israel could ever be destroyed. Make no mistake that I am firmly committed to the viability and security of a Jewish state in Israel. However, it would be naive to ignore the unresolved consequences of the war and foolish to believe that continued occupation does not pose a real threat to Israel's well-being. I hope that we can use the anniversary of the Six-Day War to look forward and reaffirm a real commitment by the United States to achieve at last a workable two-state solution and a lasting peace.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, while I applaud the fact that H. Con. Res. 152 recognizes and reinforces a two-state solution to end the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians, I urge Congress and the Administration to move away from rhetoric and actively engage in steps that will foster lasting peace in the Middle East. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict not only grossly disrupts the lives of Israelis and Palestinians, it destabilizes the entire Middle East and enflames extremism, threatening U.S. national security.

U.S. involvement in Iraq has consumed the Administration's attention, but resolving the Israel-Palestinian conflict is an integral component for long-term peace in the region. Efforts to bring resolution to this conflict should not be put on the back burner because of the Administration's political fumbling in Iraq. I urge the Administration to reinvigorate its role as a fair and balanced broker and call on the U.S. Congress to recognize that securing peace in the volatile Middle East will require a sustained financial commitment. And, I urge our friends and allies in the region to recognize that peace in the Middle East is in their own countries' best national security interests and to become more actively engaged in the peace process.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address H. Con. Res. 152, recognizing the 40th anniversary of Israel's victory in the Six-Day War. This resolution will pass by a large majority, but I fear that it will become the latest in a series of missed opportunities for this body to support a viable peace process in the Middle East.

This resolution has several positive features. It is appropriate to commemorate Israel's victory in the Six-Day War. Its overwhelming military victory helped to secure Israel's continuing existence as a sovereign nation, something that was very much in doubt on the eve of the conflict.

I particularly support the third clause of the resolution, which commends Egypt and Jordan for their bold and brave decisions to reach peace with Israel. Their leadership has been a critical, if often underappreciated, guarantor of Israel's security and survival, and I continue to hope that other nations in the region will follow their lead.

It is also important to affirm that Jerusalem is the rightful capital of Israel, while acknowledging that the Palestinian people also have a

claim to Jerusalem as a capital and as a sacred city.

Nevertheless, I am concerned that this resolution, while calling for peace negotiations, actually undermines U.S. efforts to secure the trust of all sides in the search for peace. The resolution pursues an obsolete notion, put forth as if the last decade of peace negotiations simply had not occurred.

The idea of an undivided Jerusalem under sole Israeli sovereignty has not been part of any serious peace proposal—proffered by Israelis, Palestinians, or the international community—in the last several years. Israel's 2000 Camp David proposal and the Clinton compromise proposal, the 2002 Road Map for Middle East Peace, the 2003 Geneva Initiative, the 2003 ''People's Voice'' Initiative offered by Ami Ayalon and Sari Nuseibeh: none of these plans envision an undivided Jerusalem under sole Israeli sovereignty.

And this idea is not just outdated in theory; it fails to reflect the present reality in Jerusalem. Israel's security barrier is rapidly creating a physical barrier between already segregated neighborhoods of East and West Jerusalem.

Recognizing Jerusalem as the undivided capital of Israel under sole Israeli sovereignty does not help to bring peace to Jerusalem or Israel, nor does it help achieve the vision the resolution espouses. In fact, the only thing likely to fully guarantee Jerusalem as the permanent capital of Israel is the official, international recognition of Israel's neighbors and the entire international community—and this recognition is unlikely so long as Palestinian claims to their own capital and sacred city are denied.

As Christians, Jews, and Muslims, we can best honor our holy city by helping it become a model of peace, unity, and reconciliation. Doing so requires sustained, courageous, and open-minded efforts to promote negotiations, stand against violence, and find solutions. Congress and our Administration must play a much more effective role, returning our nation to active and sustained engagement in seeking peace.

I just returned from a brief visit to Jerusalem, now divided, threatened, strained by the anxiety of constant conflict. It is my great hope to one day visit a revitalized Jerusalem, undivided and shared as the capital of Israel and an independent Palestinian state, where Jews, Muslims, and Christians live together in peace and mutually honor the sites sacred to all of us. I can only wish that the resolution before us more adequately expressed this aspiration.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the House recognizes the 40th anniversary of the Six Day War and congratulates Israel on administering a unified Jerusalem as a city open to people of all faiths.

I want to join in congratulating the people of Jerusalem on the 40th anniversary of the unification of this ancient city. Further, I wish to commend the State of Israel for opening this holy city to followers of all faiths. Jerusalem is the holiest city of the Jewish faith, the third holiest Islamic city, and is the site of many significant Christian sites. Because of its important status to all these religions, Jerusalem must remain an undivided city that protects the rights of all ethnic and religious groups. Israel has recognized this important reality and allows members of all faiths to visit and worship at their holy sites.

It is my hope that all parties in the Middle East will use Jerusalem's example of religious coexistence to work towards a final negotiated peace in the region. A lasting peace between Israel and its neighbors is in the interests of all countries in the region and overall international stability.

Finally, it is my belief that the United States should help to reaffirm its commitment to a strong relationship with Israel by placing its embassy and staff in its capital city of Jerusalem. Accordingly, I hope that the President will consider the relevant language in the legislation before the House today and abide by the provisions of the Jerusalem Embassy Act passed by Congress in 1995. This would be an important step in cementing the bond between the United States and Israel at this critical time in history.

Mr. LANTOS. 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. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 152, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE IN ESTONIA AND ATTACKS ON ESTONIA'S EMBASSIES IN 2007

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 397) condemning violence in Estonia and attacks on Estonia's embassies in 2007, and expressing solidarity with the Government and the people of Estonia, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 397

Whereas on April 27, 2007, a crowd of more than 1,000 pro-Russian demonstrators gathered in Tallinn and riots broke out across the city;

Whereas more than 153 people were injured as a result of the pro-Russian riots, and one died as a result of stabbing by another rioter;

Whereas several stores in Tallinn and surrounding villages were looted as a result of the riots, and a statue of an Estonian general was set on fire;

Whereas since April 27, 2007, the Government of Estonia has reported several cyber-attacks on its official lines of communication, including those of the Office of the President;

Whereas on April 28, 2007, and in days following, the Embassy of Estonia in Moscow was surrounded by angry protesters who demanded the resignation of the Government of Estonia, tore down the flag of Estonia from the Embassy building, and subjected Embassy officials inside the building to violence and vandalism;

Whereas on April 30, 2007, a delegation of the State Duma of the Russian Federation visited Estonia and issued an official statement at the Embassy of the Russian Federation in Estonia that ''the government of Estonia must step down'';

Whereas on May 2, 2007, the Ambassador of Estonia to the Russian Federation was physically attacked by protesters and members of youth groups during an official press conference;

Whereas on May 2, 2007, the Swedish Ambassador to the Russian Federation was attacked as he left the Embassy of Estonia in Moscow, and his car was damaged by a crowd, resulting in a formal protest to the Russian Federation by the Swedish Foreign Ministry;

Whereas the Government of Estonia has reported other coordinated attacks against Estonian embassies in Helsinki, Oslo, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Riga, Prague, Kiev, and Minsk, and the Estonian Consulate in St. Petersburg;

Whereas on May 2, 2007, Prime Minister of Estonia Andrus Ansip stated that a ''sovereign state is under a heavy attack'' and that the events constitute ''a well-coordinated and flagrant intervention with the internal affairs of Estonia'';

Whereas on May 2, 2007, the public prosecutor's office of Estonia initiated an investigation into the cyber-attacks against Internet servers in Estonia and requested cooperation from the Russian Federation to identify the source of the attacks;

Whereas on May 2, 2007, the European Commission expressed its solidarity with Estonia and urged Russia to respect its obligations to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961, and end the blockade of the Embassy of Estonia in Moscow; and

Whereas the Embassy of Estonia in Russia has been closed since April 27, 2007, and Estonia has suspended consular services to Moscow because conditions remain unsafe for Embassy officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its strong support for Estonia as a sovereign state and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) as it deals with matters internal to its country;

(2) condemns recent acts of violence, vandalism, and looting that have taken place in Estonia;

(3) condemns the attacks and threats against Estonia's embassies and officials in Russia and other countries;

(4) urges all activists involved to express their views peacefully and reject violence;

(5) honors the sacrifice of all those, including soldiers of the Red Army, that gave their lives in the fight to defeat Nazism;

(6) condemns any and all efforts to callously exploit the memory of the victims of the Second World War for political gain;

(7) supports the efforts of the Government of Estonia to initiate a dialogue with appropriate levels of the Government of the Russian Federation to resolve the crisis peacefully and to sustain cooperation between their two sovereign, independent states; and

(8) urges the governments of all countries—

(A) to condemn the violence that has occurred in Estonia, Moscow, and elsewhere in 2007 and to urge all parties to express their views peacefully;

(B) to assist the Government of Estonia in its investigation into the source of cyber-attacks; and

(C) to fulfill their obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the only Member in the history of Congress who survived the Holocaust and was liberated by the Russian Army. I was therefore opposed to the decision and continue to remain opposed to the decision by the government of Estonia to move a memorial honoring Russian soldiers for their historic sacrifice during World War II in liberating Estonia and many other parts of Europe from Hitler's domination. What came afterward, however, is an entirely different issue.

On April 27, over 1,000 pro-Russian demonstrators gathered in Tallinn, the beautiful small capital of Estonia. That group soon got out of control. Riots broke out across the city. Finally, over 150 people were injured. One person died.

The next day, the Embassy of Estonia in Moscow was surrounded by angry, pro-Russian demonstrators who demanded the resignation of the government of Estonia. The Estonian ambassador was physically attacked by demonstrators during an official press conference. Even the Swedish ambassador to Russia was assaulted when he left the Estonian Embassy in Moscow.

Since the initial riots in Tallinn, the Estonian government has reported other coordinated attacks against its Embassies in Helsinki, Finland; Oslo, Norway; Copenhagen, Denmark; Stockholm, Sweden; Riga; Prague and Kiev.

The Estonian government, with the assistance of NATO, has also been investigating cyber attacks against the government's Web site, as well as against the computer systems of political parties, banks, and media organizations in Estonia. Cyber attacks in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, can be devastating. The Estonian government estimates that these attacks cost the targets tens of millions of Euros, a significant sum for a small country like Estonia.

These incidents of violence have been condemned by a host of European institutions. The European Commission has expressed its solidarity with Estonia and urged Russia to respect its obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. NATO has issued a similar statement condemning the violence.

So, today, we in Congress join our friends in Europe in expressing our strong disapproval of the unjustified and unacceptable Russian attacks against Estonia, and we express our strong solidarity with the people and government of the great democratic nation of Estonia.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this all-important measure.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of this resolution authored by our good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), which condemns the violence within Estonia, condemns the attacks on Estonia's Embassy in Russia that have taken place recently, and which expresses our solidarity with the government and the people of Estonia in the face of such violence and intimidation.

As the chairman has pointed out, the April 27 relocation by the Estonian government of a Soviet-era statue and memorial, located in the capital, led some ethnic Russians within Estonia and some Russians in Russia itself to undertake violent demonstrations and threatening intimidation. These events presented the rest of the world with the worrisome prospect that Estonia and other countries once held captive by the former Soviet regime would continue to be subjected to organized, threatening behavior by their neighbor, Russia.

Additionally troublesome is the possibility that such behavior might be supported by officials at high levels within the Russian government.

It is the view of the most impartial observers that in the days that followed the memorial's relocation, the Russian government quite obviously failed to adequately protect the Estonian Embassy in Moscow, which was threatened for some time by a mob.

In Estonia itself, government, commercial and media Web sites observed a series of suspicious and devastating cyber attacks, reportedly originating from within Russia in what appeared to be a very organized manner.

□ 1540

All of that followed very violent demonstrations mounted by some ethnic Russians within Estonia, demonstrations that required significant engagement by the police to halt.

Mr. Speaker, since regaining their independence with the fall of the Soviet regime, Estonia, as well as the other Baltic States, have worked hard to overcome the serious impact of that decades-long occupation, a period in which the native population in Estonia came close to becoming a minority, a minority in their own land, due to the actions of the Soviet government.

Many Baltic citizens were deemed to be threats to that occupation and they were shipped off to Siberia, some never to be seen again, while ethnic Russians were assigned by the regime to settle in the Baltic States.

But with renewed independence, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania have had the opportunity to again take control of their future.

To their credit, they have worked with the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the European Union to find ways to address the presence of those who had been settled on their territories during the Soviet era, finding procedures to grant proper citizenship that, while tough in some cases, nevertheless provided a means for the large ethnic Russian minorities to participate in the civic life of those states whose independence was no longer questioned.

The European Union and the NATO alliance recognized the efforts by these Baltic States to constructively address the challenges and to implement general democratic and free market reforms.

That is why Estonia and other Baltic States are today members of both the European Union and NATO, and why those organizations have stood by Estonia in the face of the disproportionate reaction to the recent relocation of the memorial, that reaction appearing to have had its roots in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltic States have more than earned their independence through decades of repression and suffering under a Communist regime.

It is important that through the adoption of this resolution before us today, authored by Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois, we make it clear that we stand in support of Estonia and its independence in the face of threats and intimidation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join us in support of Mr. SHIMKUS' resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the author of the resolution.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman LANTOS and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for your time and the speedy movement of this resolution, and it's timely with the President's trip to Europe.

A few things of note. I continue to follow, as the chairman knows, the occurrences in the former captive nations, the European Union countries, and mostly the Baltic countries, and it seems like we can never get to forgiveness. It seems like countries always go back to another point in time to address their grievances.

I've been on the floor numerous times to talk about Molotov-Ribbentrop, and we've debated that and we've voted on that resolution. We forget about Roosevelt's land lease deal that was very helpful to the Soviet Union at that time, and as the chairman's correct, we also forget about the sacrifices made by the Soviet Union in winning World War II, especially on the Eastern

front. So his concerns are well-founded and very much appreciated by this Member.

There was great hope after the fall of the Wall, as I served on the German border during the Cold War era, that this would bring a new time for Europe, a time of prosperity and peace, the rule of law, democratic institutions. And that's why we continue to be frustrated by the current involvement, because when there is peace and stability and the rule of law, the people prosper, people on both sides of the boundary lines. In this case the Estonians and across the border, the Russians, they would both benefit from peaceful relations and coexistence.

But we just can't get there yet, and so that's why I'm very appreciative of bringing this resolution because the decision by the Estonian government to move the memorial, as the chairman said, probably not proper in his estimation, I know that it can be said that it was done with dignity, with consultation and moved to a place in a military cemetery and given all the respects offered.

But having said that, what a free and independent country, a decision it can make, doesn't justify the result. Again, that's why going back to the comments of, can't we just forgive and can't we just move forward, the great nations do not have to bully small neighbors. Great nations can stand side by side with their smaller allies and their neighbors to help them develop and grow.

And what we see from the Russian Federation is just the opposite. We see them continually harass and bully their neighbors. Their neighbors have made choices that we expect free and democratic countries to be able to make, and just because the Russian Federation are unhappy with that it does not give them the right to bypass the rule of international law.

So this issue, as has been discussed earlier, the result of the movement of the statue led to riots within Estonia by ethnic Russians and also problems in the capital of Moscow, and as Ranking Member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN said, any impartial observer would say that there was a move by the government to specifically not stop them, and there is great evidence that they helped encourage this ability to be thugs and bullies to ambassadors and government representatives of free and democratic countries.

That's why I'm very thankful that the committee seemed right to bring this resolution speedily to the floor. As cochair of the House Baltic Caucus, I've been heavily involved for 10 years with NATO expansion, the EU expansion and the energy disputes.

Estonia is one of our closest allies and friends in Europe. They have been an integral part in our war on terror in having troops in Afghanistan.

That is why House Resolution 397 is so important. The U.S. House of Representatives must stand with our Estonian friends and refuse to let them be bullied by the Russian government. The intimidation that President Putin is using against our allies in Eastern Europe is simply unacceptable.

Again, I'd like to thank the chairman for bringing this to the floor.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. LANTOS. Before yielding back our time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all of my colleagues to an upcoming open joint hearing of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Russian Duma on June 21. This will be the first time in history that the Foreign Affairs Committees of these two parliaments will have met in joint session.

□ 1550

I very much hope, and I know my distinguished ranking member, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, joins me in hoping, that we will have a meaningful and helpful dialogue with our Russian colleagues so that the current state of tension between Russia and the United States could somehow be diminished.

We had high hopes when the Soviet Union collapsed over 15 years ago, but many recent statements by Mr. Putin and many actions by Russia, including the action that we have just heard described against the free and democratic Republic of Estonia, fill us with a great deal of concern and anxiety.

I urge all of my colleagues to attend this joint session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Duma's Foreign Affairs Committee in a few weeks in our hope that before the President and Mr. Putin meet in Kennebunkport we might have a legislative opportunity of exploring candidly all of the issues that, at the moment, seem to divide us.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 397, which condemns violence in Estonia and attacks on that country's embassies in 2007. It also expresses solidarity with the government and the people of Estonia.

This past April 27, a crowd of more than 1,000 pro-Russian demonstrators gathered in Tallin, the capital city of Estonia. The gathering became unruly and riots broke out across the city. In the end, over 150 people were injured and one person died from stab wounds.

On May 2, the Estonian Ambassador was physically attacked by protesters during an official press conference. That same day, the Swedish Ambassador to Russia was assaulted when he left the Estonian Embassy in Moscow.

Since the initial riots in Tallin, this wave of violence continued, and the Estonian Government has reported other coordinated attacks against its embassies in Helsinki, Oslo, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Riga, Prague, and Kiev, among other cities. The Estonian Government, with the assistance of NATO, has been investigating cyber attacks against the government's website, as well as against the computer systems of political parties, banks, and media organizations. The Estonian Government estimates that these attacks have cost the targets tens of millions of euros.

Estonia is a well respected member of NATO and the European Union. These incidents of violence have been condemned by a host of European institutions. The European Commission and NATO have expressed their solidarity with Estonia and urged Russia to respect its obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that this House also express its disapproval of the unjustified attacks against Estonia. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution, which denounces violence in Estonia and attacks against its embassies, while also expressing solidarity with the government and people of the great nation of Estonia.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 397, 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. LANTOS. 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.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II AND HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS, PRINCE PHILIP, DUKE OF EDINBURGH, FOR THEIR STATE VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 412) expressing gratitude to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, for their State Visit to the United States and reaffirming the friendship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 412

Whereas Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, traveled to the United States for a State Visit from May 3 to May 8, 2007, celebrating the special relationship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom;

Whereas the United States and the United Kingdom enjoy a trans-Atlantic friendship sustained by a commitment to democratic traditions, liberty, and the spread of freedom, as well as common economic and cultural foundations;

Whereas in a rapidly changing world, Queen Elizabeth II has been a force of stability and constancy and has provided inspiration to the world in times both peaceful and tumultuous; and

Whereas Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip serve as ambassadors for the British people and the goodwill engendered by their visit serves as a reminder, for the people of the United States and the United Kingdom alike, of our joint values and priorities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives is deeply appreciative of the State Visit recently conducted by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and celebrates the State Visit as having been an occasion to reaffirm the value and depth of the friendship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Two hundred and thirty years ago, Americans threw off the yoke of the British monarch with much fanfare, as everyone knows. But, since then, the American people have celebrated the royals, and they have watched and observed the demeanor of the royal family of Great Britain throughout the years. As a matter of fact, we gave a coveted film award to a woman portraying the Queen just not long ago.

But, anyway, a few short weeks ago, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, were greeted by enormous crowds visiting the United States. This was the Queen's fourth State visit following previous visits in 1991, 1976 and first in 1957.

Her most recent trip was highlighted by her commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, the first permanent English settlement in the New World. When 108 London entrepreneurs set sail on orders from King James I to settle Virginia, that would set the stage for one of the most, if not the most, successful and lasting alliance in modern history.

The Queen praised such historic links and bonds of friendship between our two countries when she was here and referred to the fact that our relationship has been built on a shared commitment to democratic traditions and liberty.

During her visit, she also noted, as well, our shared future. Just as the settlers of 1607 set out to discover a new world, researchers on both sides of the Atlantic are now seeking to explore new frontiers in medicine and space. This collaboration between British and American scientists is invaluable.

The Queen has served tirelessly as an ambassador for the British people, and she has led her country through times of prosperity as well as times of turmoil. It is for these reasons and others that I am delighted to support this resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) for authoring the resolution before us; and I rise in support of his resolution, 412, which expresses gratitude to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, for their recent state visit to the United States and reaffirms the friendship that exists between the United States and the United Kingdom. Queen Elizabeth's visit reminded us of the shared values that underpin the unique friendship and partnership of the United States and the United Kingdom.

The extent to which the United States and the United Kingdom today share common goals in their foreign and defense policies as well is also quite remarkable. There is no other bilateral relationship that the United States has with another country that is routinely referred to as ''the special relationship.''

In the time that Queen Elizabeth has reigned, more than half a century, America and Britain have continually strengthened their partnership and collaborated on threats to world peace and security, both large and small. That important collaboration continues today, as President Bush noted in his remarks in the dinner he held at the White House in the Queen's honor, when he stated the following: ''together we are supporting young democracies in Iraq and Afghanistan . . . confronting global challenges such as poverty and disease and terrorism, and together we're working to build a world in which more people can enjoy prosperity and security and peace.''

Mr. Speaker, I should note as well the significance of how closely the economies of the United States and the United Kingdom are linked. The United Kingdom is the fourth largest market for exports, such exports totaling more than $36 billion in the year 2004 alone. Just as significant, the United States and the United Kingdom are each other's biggest foreign investors.

This resolution gives us an opportunity to reflect upon the strength and the value of a trans-Atlantic relationship that has proven critical to safeguarding the community of democracies in Europe and, indeed, throughout the world.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution, expressing appreciation to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip for their recent visit and the bonds that tie our two nations together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of the resolution, Mr. BOOZMAN of Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this bill that expresses our appreciation to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, for visiting the United States over the last month.

Over the course of her lifetime and during her 55 years on the throne, Queen Elizabeth has played a vital role in the United Kingdom's successes through her strong leadership in diplomacy. She has been a great source of stability for her nation.

During times of peace and times of unrest, Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip have displayed amazing courage and have inspired the world community. The relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom is a special one. The Americans and British have been working together for generations, furthering the deep-rooted commitment each country has for peace and security.

I would like to thank Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip for reaffirming the trans-Atlantic friendship between our two countries with their visit last month to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1600

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 412, 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.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO STOP GENOCIDE AND VIOLENCE IN DARFUR, SUDAN

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 422) calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 422

Whereas since the conflict in Darfur, Sudan began in 2003, hundreds of thousands

of people have been killed and more than 2,500,000 displaced as a result of the ongoing and escalating violence;

Whereas on July 23, 2004, Congress declared, ''the atrocities unfolding in Darfur, Sudan, are genocide'' and on September 23, 2004, then Secretary of State Colin Powell stated before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that, ''genocide has occurred and may still be occurring in Darfur,'' and ''the Government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility'';

Whereas on October 13, 2006, the President signed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act (Public Law 109–344), which identifies the Government of Sudan as complicit with the forces committing genocide in the Darfur region and urges the President to, ''take all necessary and appropriate steps to deny the Government of Sudan access to oil revenues'';

Whereas President George W. Bush declared in a speech delivered on April 18, 2007, at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum that no one ''can doubt that genocide is the only word for what is happening in Darfur—and that we have a moral obligation to stop it'';

Whereas the presence of approximately 7,000 African Union peacekeepers has not deterred the violence and the increasing attacks by the Government of Sudan and Government-sponsored Janjaweed militia and rebel groups;

Whereas worsening violence has forced humanitarian organizations to suspend operations, leaving a substantial portion of the population of Darfur inaccessible to aid workers;

Whereas violence has spread to the neighboring states of Chad and the Central African Republic, threatening regional peace and security;

Whereas the Government of Sudan continues to refuse to allow implementation of the full-scale peacekeeping mission authorized under United Nations Security Council Resolution 1706;

Whereas former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan subsequently negotiated a compromise agreement with the Government of Sudan for a hybrid United Nations-African Union peacekeeping mission to be implemented in three phases;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has long-standing economic and military ties with Sudan and continues to strengthen these ties in spite of the on-going genocide in Darfur, as evidenced by the following actions:

(1) China reportedly purchases as much as 70 percent of Sudan's oil;

(2) China currently has at least $3,000,000,000 invested in the Sudanese energy sector, for a total of $10,000,000,000 since the 1990s;

(3) Sudan's Joint Chief of Staff, Haj Ahmed El Gaili, recently visited Beijing for discussions with Chinese Defense Minister Cao Gang Chuan and other military officials as part of an eight-day tour of China; Cao pledged closer military relations with Sudan, saying that China was ''willing to further develop cooperation between the two militaries in every sphere'';

(4) China has reportedly cancelled approximately $100 million in debt owed by the Sudanese Government;

(5) China is building infrastructure in Sudan and provided funds for a presidential palace in Sudan at a reported cost of approximately $20,000,000; and

(6) Data provided by the Government of Sudan to the United Nations for 2005 states that Sudan imported at least $24,000,000 in arms and ammunition from the People's Republic of China, as well as nearly $57,000,000 in parts and aircraft equipment, and $2,000,000 in helicopter and airplane parts from China, making China the largest provider of military arms and equipment to Sudan, even as Sudan has defended its right to transfer and use such military arms and equipment in Darfur for military operations;

Whereas given its economic interests throughout the region, China has a unique ability to positively influence the Government of Sudan to abandon its genocidal policies and to accept United Nations peacekeepers to join a hybrid United Nations-African Union peacekeeping mission;

Whereas the President's Special Envoy to Sudan, Andrew S. Natsios, further said in testimony on April 11, 2007, that ''China's substantial economic investment in Sudan gives it considerable potential leverage, and we have made clear to Beijing that the international community will expect China to be part of the solution'';

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China's recent appointment of a senior diplomat as China's special representative on African affairs who shall focus specific attention on the Darfur issue and its pledge to provide military engineers to support African Union peacekeeping forces in Darfur are welcome developments, but do not demonstrate that Beijing is truly committed to using all the considerable diplomatic and political means at its disposal to stop the genocide in Darfur;

Whereas due to its large population, its rapidly growing global economy, its large research and development investments and military spending, its seat as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and on the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, China is an emerging power that is increasingly perceived as a leader with significant international reach and responsibility;

Whereas in November 2006, China hosted its third Forum on China-Africa Cooperation with more than 40 heads of state in attendance and which focused heavily on trade relations and investment on the African continent as it is expected to double by 2010;

Whereas China is preparing to host the Olympic Summer Games of 2008, the most honorable, venerated, and prestigious international sporting event and has selected ''One World, One Dream'' as a slogan for those games;

Whereas China should act consistently with the Olympic standard of preserving human dignity in Darfur, Sudan and around the world; and

Whereas China has been reluctant to use its full influence to improve the human rights situation in Darfur: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to—

(A) acknowledge publicly and condemn the atrocities taking place in Darfur;

(B) cease all military arms, ammunition, and related military equipment sales to the Government of Sudan; and

(C) take steps to immediately suspend economic cooperation with the Government of Sudan and investment in Sudan until and unless the Government of Sudan—

(i) stops its attacks on civilians;

(ii) complies with all United Nations Security Council resolutions related to Darfur; and

(iii) engages in good faith negotiations with Darfur rebel groups to achieve a sustainable negotiated peace agreement;

(2) recognizes the close relationship between China and Sudan and strongly urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its full influence to—

(A) urge the regime in Khartoum to comply with the deployment of the peacekeeping force authorized by United Nations Security Council Resolution 1706;

(B) call for Sudanese compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1556 and 1564, and the Darfur Peace Agreement, all of which demand that the Government of Sudan disarm militias operating in Darfur;

(C) call on all parties to the conflict to adhere to the 2004 N'Djamena ceasefire agreement and the recently-agreed United Nations communiqué which commits the Sudanese Government to improve conditions for humanitarian organizations and ensure they have unfettered access to the populations they serve;

(D) emphasize that there can be no military solution to the conflict in Darfur and that the formation and implementation of a legitimate peace agreement between all parties will contribute toward the welfare and stability of the entire nation and broader region;

(E) urge all rebel groups to unify and assist all parties to come to the negotiating table in good faith;

(F) urge the Government of southern Sudan to play a more active role in pressing for legitimate peace talks and take immediate steps to support and assist in the revitalization of such talks along one single coordinated track;

(G) engage collaboratively in high-level diplomacy and multilateral efforts toward a renewed peace process; and

(H) join the international community in imposing economic and other consequences on the Government of Sudan if that Government continues to carry out or support attacks on civilians and frustrate diplomatic efforts; and

(3) recognizes that the spirit of the Olympics, which is to bring together nations and people from all over the world in peace, is incompatible with any actions directly or indirectly supporting acts of genocide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Six days ago, the President imposed a new series of sanctions on the Sudanese government and its murderous leaders. The administration may have sent a stronger message a month ago, but did not. But new American sanctions, however belatedly imposed, are in place. Now the rest of the civilized world must respond. Strong sanctions represent a crucial bridge in efforts to force the regime in Khartoum to give

up its reprehensible program of genocide in Darfur. But it is now readily apparent that we can only cross that bridge with the help of China.

Time and again, we have witnessed national interests taking precedence over the destruction of people's lives, their society and their culture. China, purely for economic interests, in our opinion, has stood firmly in the way of a robust international response to the Darfur genocide.

It has been 3 years since this Congress declared that the unfolding atrocities in Darfur constitute genocide. Yet, since it began, China has acted as a shield for Sudan against international criticism and tough sanctions at the United Nations.

In spite of unimpeachable evidence of genocide and other atrocities, China has continued as Sudan's largest trading partner and the main foreign investor in its oil sector.

China's sales of arms and military equipment to Khartoum is even more disturbing. But China has taken it one step further by actually blocking efforts to send international forces into Darfur.

Several countries have been resistant. But among the states unwilling to support a robust civilian protection operation to stop the genocide, China assumes a unique culpability because of its influence, its permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council, and its role in Sudan.

In 2004, China forced the Security Council to water down an oil sanctions resolution and threatened it would veto any future resolutions sanctioning Sudan.

China shielded Khartoum against international sanctions while the Sudanese military drove tens of thousands out of their communities and oil regions just to speed exploration.

In 2006, China explicitly argued to the Security Council against a peacekeeping deployment to Darfur, arguing that it could not support the resolution because Sudan's government was not yet ready to accept U.N. peacekeepers on its soil.

Not only did China oppose the deployment on behalf of Sudan, its Ambassador lobbied hard for the Russians to take the same position. Only under relentless international pressure, with the actress Mia Farrow and others raising the specter that the upcoming Beijing Olympics will become the ''Genocide Olympics,'' has China finally begun to take a few small, constructive steps in the right direction on Sudan.

If we are going to save lives in Darfur, it is imperative that we keep the pressure on China to force Sudan to end the atrocities, resume peace talks and bring resolution to the horror known as Darfur.

This very important resolution calls on China to condemn explicitly the atrocities in Darfur, to cease military arms sales, to suspend economic cooperation with Sudan and use its influence to urge President Bashir to comply with full and immediate deployment of the African Union peacekeeping force.

It also calls on all parties to the conflict to adhere to the ceasefire agreement and allow unfettered access by humanitarian workers to those in need. It's a clear signal to China and Sudan that their relationship cannot and will not withstand the glare of international scrutiny.

Unless it wants to permanently scar its reputation, China must act as a responsible world power and use its influence to stop this now.

I therefore urge passage and commend the author, my friend and colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for her tireless leadership on the Darfur issue.

Let me also thank our majority leader, STENY HOYER, for his consistent and effective efforts to do the same.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 422, which calls on the government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur.

I wish to thank my colleague from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE, for introducing this important measure, and for all of the cosponsors who she has gathered and their strong and steadfast support of efforts to halt the humanitarian disaster which continues to unfold daily in Sudan.

I had the honor of traveling to the camps of the internally displaced persons in Darfur with Ms. LEE, and I thank her for her courageous leadership in this effort.

In July 2004, as my good friend from Tennessee stated, the House boldly declared that genocide was occurring in the Darfur region of western Sudan. Nearly 3 years later, the bombing, rape and murder continue.

Hundreds of thousands of people have been killed, and more than two million people have been forced from their homes by marauding militias and a callous government bent on total destruction.

And while I'm encouraged by the leadership of our United States Government and attempts to end this carnage, I cannot help but feel a profound sense of frustration. Where is the rest of the international community?

The U.S. Government has provided vital support for the African Union, the United Nations peacekeeping forces. We've led diplomatic efforts to find a political solution to the crisis. We've donated over $2.6 billion in humanitarian assistance for Darfur and Chad since 2005.

And just last week the President announced that he would impose tough additional sanctions against key individuals and businesses linked to human rights abuses in the region. Included among those businesses were five major petrochemical companies owned or controlled by the Sudanese regime, and an air transport company transferring arms to fighters in Darfur.

President Bush also announced that he had directed the U.S. Permanent Representative to the U.N. to seek passage of a Security Council resolution which would sanction the regime in Khartoum, expand and extend the arms embargo and impose a no-fly zone over Darfur.

These measures have been characterized as unhelpful by some, including the Sudanese regime's representatives here in Washington, as well as by Chinese officials.

And it's no wonder, Mr. Speaker. As the resolution before us indicates, China purchases up to 70 percent of Sudan's oil. It has $3 billion invested in the energy sector in Sudan, and it has exported at least $24 million in arms and ammunition and another $59 million in aircraft equipment to Sudan.

This continues, despite the Sudanese regime's insistence that it can use these funds and equipment for military operations in Darfur; that is, to continue the carnage against Sudanese civilians there.

Regrettably, the Chinese leadership appears unwilling to sacrifice its economic interests in Sudan for the sake of humanity. This is unacceptable, and it is also no surprise.

Beijing must take immediate steps to prevent further death, misery and destruction by compelling the regime in Khartoum to end these atrocities.

□ 1610

This means suspending economic cooperation with and stopping all military equipment sales to Sudan until the Sudanese regime stops its assaults on civilians in Darfur, allows the deployment of U.N. peacekeepers, disarms militias, and brings all rebel groups and high-level diplomats together to negotiate a political solution.

Through this resolution we are challenging China as well as other countries who have influence in Sudan to stand with the United States at the United Nations and press for immediate deployment of a robust peacekeeping mission in Darfur as authorized by Security Council Resolution No. 1706. We call on them to support and enforce a rigorous, multilateral sanctions regime against those individuals and businesses which are complicit in genocide. If China and other nations with influence in Sudan choose to look the other way, then we should reevaluate our relationship with those governments. It should be made clear that governments allied with Khartoum are complicit in a war on civilians and the immeasurable human suffering occurring in Darfur.

I strongly support Ms. LEE's timely resolution, and I take heart in the moral strength that has been demonstrated by this administration, this body, and the American people.

The people of Darfur have known too much suffering with the leaders of the world showing too much procrastination and China showing far too much negligence. The time for action is now. It is long overdue, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentlewoman from California for introducing this resolution.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of the resolution, Ms. BARBARA LEE of California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding, for his leadership and support to end the genocide in Darfur, and also let me just thank our chairman, Congressman LANTOS; our ranking member, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN of the Foreign Affairs Committee; and Chairman PAYNE and the ranking member of the Africa subcommittee, Mr. SMITH, for their leadership on the issue of Darfur and for working together to make sure that all of our efforts here continue to be bipartisan. We have over 128 cosponsors of this resolution today.

Again, thank you to Congressman JERRY MORAN of Kansas and also Congressman JIM MCGOVERN of Massachusetts and to all of our staff.

This is a mission that we are all on. Many of us have visited on several occasions, and each time we visit Darfur we come back recommitted and rededicated to do what we can each and every day to end this horrific genocide.

Thirteen years ago, the world stood by as nearly 1 million people, 1 million people, were slaughtered in the genocide in Rwanda. The best our country could do then, unfortunately, was to apologize for our failure to act, and that was after the fact. Many of us swore that another Rwanda would never happen again on our watch. But today, Mr. Speaker, it is happening again.

Nearly 3 years ago, under the bold leadership of our good friend, Chairman DONALD PAYNE, on July 22, 2004, Congress formally declared that genocide was taking place in Darfur. Estimates indicate that nearly 450,000 people have been killed, and 2.5 million innocent civilians have been displaced to date.

I witnessed this ongoing tragedy for the first time in 2005 when I visited the refugee camps in Chad and Darfur with two great humanitarian leaders, Don Cheadle and Paul Rusesabagina, this delegation led, again bipartisan, by Chairman ED ROYCE. In February, 2006, under the leadership of our great Speaker, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI, I had the opportunity once again to visit the refugee camps in another region of Darfur. This again was a bipartisan delegation. And just this past April, along with my colleague Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, we visited another region in Darfur as part of this visit organized by our majority leader, STENY HOYER.

As Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN has said, what we saw in Darfur, of course, is continuing to deteriorate. More and more people are dying, and even humanitarian aid workers are at risk. The day before our delegation arrived, five soldiers from Senegal were killed in Darfur, African Union soldiers there to protect innocent civilians.

Unfortunately, for many Darfurians the situation remains grim. Last week, many of us expressed our support for the President's announcement of additional sanctions on businesses controlled by the government of Sudan and on individuals in the Sudanese government. Today, we take another step forward by calling on the Chinese to use their unique influence with Sudan to end the genocide.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way to sugarcoat this. China is the principal trading partner of a genocidal regime that has thumbed its nose at the international community. China reportedly purchases as much as 70 percent of Sudan's oil and has cancelled over $100 million in debt and has provided $20 million in funding to build a palace for General Bashir. China unquestionably has the unique ability to influence Khartoum in a positive manner, but they cannot do so by simply following a policy of appeasement. They must put real pressure on General Bashir to comply with all U.N. resolutions and fully, unconditionally accept the U.N.-AU peacekeeping mission. And they must urge Sudan to pursue a renewed peace process with all parties, and they must insist that humanitarian organizations have unfettered access to the 2.5 million people who have been displaced.

Most importantly, they should deny Bashir the tools to continue perpetrating the genocide by cutting off, and I mean cutting off, all military arms sales and suspending economic opportunities and cooperation with the government of Sudan.

The economic costs to China for taking these steps today is minimal compared to the benefit they would achieve if they would provide to the people of Darfur an end to the genocide and the international acclaim that China could win by helping to end the genocide.

I urge our Chinese friends not to view this resolution as a condemnation but to view it as an opportunity to take action to end an urgent moral and humanitarian crisis. So we are urging the Chinese government to act, and our own steps must increase to stop this horrific and unbelievable tragedy occurring on our watch.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the Members here who are speaking in support of this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Judge POE of Texas, a distinguished member of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for yielding time.

Sudan is responsible for the genocide in Darfur. ''Genocide'' is a fancy term, Mr. Speaker, that means organized murder by a government. The violence has displaced over 2 million people, and it has claimed at least 500,000 lives. President Bush has announced tougher sanctions on businesses and individuals dealing with the government of Sudan, but the perpetrators of evil are also propped up by China.

Seventy percent of Sudan's oil goes to China, and loads of Chinese arms regularly find their way to these demons of the desert. No wonder China is road-blocking change in Sudan. It is all about money and who gets it.

Though the Chinese have appointed envoys, they haven't done anything to pressure the Sudanese to stop murdering their own people. I think it is safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that as long as China continues to prop up the evil in Sudan, the Chinese government is complicit in this atrocity; and I don't think it is too much to ask Congress, in the name of basic human rights, to demand that China use its influence in Sudan to help stop the genocide. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this resolution offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Mr. Speaker, the Chinese have an opportunity to show the world that they care about innocent people and take this blemish off of their historical record. It is in their best interest, not to mention the best interest of the victims of Darfur, that they pressure Sudan to stop the killing of their own people.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 2 minutes to Ms. SHELLEY BERKLEY of Nevada.

□ 1620

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of this important legislation.

Everyone in this body knows about the atrocities being committed in Darfur. Congress has already labeled them a genocide, and the administration followed suit shortly thereafter.

Last year, we passed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, which seeks to give teeth to our declarations and clamp down on the Sudanese government. And yet, despite all of this activity, the horrors continue. The Sudanese regime still has not gotten the message that the United States is serious about stopping the bloodshed.

Many countries continue to view the situation as ''business as usual.'' China is the largest foreign investor in Sudan and continues to provide the Sudanese blood-soaked government with interest free loans. They are even engaging in arms sales, despite the clear evidence of massacre, rape, destruction, displacement and genocide.

Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about stopping the bloodshed in Sudan, we cannot allow business to continue as usual. The Chinese government and governments throughout the world need to start getting the message: If you continue to invest in murderous, blood-thirsty regimes, if you continue to invest in Sudan, there will be consequences, there will be very serious consequences.

I urge support for this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to a leader in worldwide human rights efforts, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend and colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ms. LEE for introducing H. Res. 422, which calls on the government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop the atrocities being committed in Darfur.

This measure builds on numerous steps that this Congress and the United States Government, through the White House and the executive branch, have taken over the past several years to call a halt to the relentless killings, rapes and displacement of the innocent men, women and children in that region.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that Sudan's soil has been soaked in the blood of innocent people. Sudan has not suffered just one, but two genocides. Everybody will recall that in southern Sudan, some two million people were slaughtered by the Bashir government; another 4 million people were displaced.

When President Bush came into office, he announced that Senator Danforth would become our special envoy, and very vigorous and robust efforts were made to try to stop the killing in southern Sudan. We succeeded. But after a short period of time new hostilities broke out in the Darfur region in 2003, in February, and the blood-letting was beginning again. Darfur is now the second genocide that has occurred in Sudan.

I think we should note for the record that no other nation on Earth has done as much as the United States to stop the genocide. Most of the food and the medicines at the refugee camps that my colleagues and I have all visited, looked in the eyes of so many people who have suffered so much, has come from the U.S. taxpayer. I think that should give us some sense of meaning that we have played a significant role in alleviating at least some of this suffering.

Just last week, President Bush announced the expansion and tightening of economic sanctions against the Sudanese government. These sanctions include the barring of 30 more companies owned and controlled by the government of Sudan from the U.S. financial system, and it is a crime for Americans to knowingly engage in businesses with these companies.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that more can and must be done by other members of the international community to address these crimes against humanity. A primary culprit is the complicity in this genocide by the People's Republic of China. Instead of joining the international community in calling an end to the genocide, China has served as enabler-in-chief to the atrocities that continue to take place in Darfur. Not only has the Chinese government provided Bashir with funds and weapons, about over $90 million worth in 2005 alone, but it has lavished him with gifts and a false sense of legitimacy. The money and the weapons that Sudan has received from China has made the Chinese government absolutely complicit in these crimes against humanity.

And now we see China's thwarting or attempting to thwart a U.S.-led effort at the U.N. Security Council for a resolution that would impose extended international arms embargo and new sanctions against the Sudanese government. According to Reuters last week, the Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman said, ''New sanctions against Sudan would only complicate the issue. China appeals to all parties to maintain restraint and patience.''

I would urge this spokeswoman and all Chinese officials to go to Darfur and again look into the eyes of those who have suffered, look in the eyes of at least some of the 2 million people who have been displaced from their homes, look into the eyes of some of the families, the survivors of the 450,000 that have been killed and say, ''let's look for patience and restraint.''

China has covered itself in shame. It has enabled two genocides, southern Sudan and now in Darfur. Still, because so many victims are going to be suffering today and tomorrow and the next day, we appeal to the Chinese government, Mr. Speaker, to join us as peacemakers in that troubled region.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Mr. STEVE ISRAEL from New York for 2 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, and I rise in support of this very important resolution.

I want to thank the sponsor of this resolution, the gentlewoman from California, not only for authoring it, but for working with me several weeks ago on an amendment that passed by a bipartisan margin in the House of Representatives to send a message to the leaders of Sudan that we will not tolerate genocide and in fact we will explore the upgrade of the Abeche airbase, which is located 100 miles from the border in Chad.

This is a very important resolution. I rise in support of this resolution today because too few people rose in support of those from my faith who were victimized by a holocaust in the 1930s and 1940s.

When I came to this body, Mr. Speaker, I made a vow that I would stand up and oppose and fight against and speak out against any genocide, and speak out against any power that was wittingly or unwittingly empowering or assisting in a genocide, which is what brings me to the floor today.

I was recently in China just 2 months ago engaging the Chinese government on a broad range of energy security issues. China has one of the world's fastest growing economies, arguably the world's fastest growing economy. By the year 2030, it will have more cars on its roads than we have on our roads. It is expanding its defense budget. China can be an important partner with the United States in leading the world, but with that role in leading the world comes a responsibility not to empower, not to assist any kind of genocide. It is time for the leadership of China to stand up with our democracy and say no to the genocide that is occurring in Darfur, and China has a critical opportunity to do that. They purchase 70 percent of Sudan's oil. They invested over $10 million in the Sudanese energy sector over the last two decades. They are the main supplier of arms to Sudan with $83 million exported there in 2005.

Mr. Speaker, we want to work with China. We want to engage China. We want to work with China to lead the world in a constructive way on stability and peace and economic development and environmental stewardship, but China needs to show the world that it is willing to engage those who are perpetrating a genocide, to draw the line and say it will not be tolerated. That is precisely what this resolution does. I am very pleased and proud to support it.

I thank the gentlewoman from California again for her leadership, and I will continue, with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis, to stand up and speak out when genocide is committed, or against those who assist in the commission of a genocide.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia, with whom I had the honor of traveling to Darfur on Ms. LEE and Mr. HOYER's trip to that area recently.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentlewoman, and I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I had the opportunity to travel with Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, Majority Leader HOYER and other members of a bipartisan congressional delegation to the war-torn nation of Sudan and see firsthand one of the worst humanitarian crises in recent times.

As a Nation dedicated to freedom and the rights of the individual, the United States has a responsibility to speak out when those rights are violated. While in Darfur, we saw directly the atrocities in this besieged nation. We toured the Alsalam Internally Displaced Persons Camp, where 47,000 people seeking food, water and safety live in crowded, deplorable and often still unsafe conditions.

□ 1630

This is one of nearly 100 such camps which collectively have more than 2 million people. They live in small, makeshift twig huts, many only the size of a pup tent. On numerous occasions, the IDP camps themselves have been attacked. And this is just one of

many examples of the deplorable situation in Darfur.

There is no doubt that the ongoing crisis in Darfur has led to a major humanitarian disaster. We along with the rest of the world must band together to bring change to this horrible situation. Next year the world will join together to celebrate the Olympic Games. The Olympic spirit brings together nations and people from all over the world in a spirit of peace. The People's Republic of China as the Olympic host country has a profound responsibility to ensure that spirit of peace will be celebrated throughout the games. However, I am deeply worried that this spirit will be deeply compromised due to China's implicit acquiescence to the atrocities being committed in Darfur.

The People's Republic of China has a deep relationship with Sudan and has substantial economic investment there. China's connection to Sudan, a country that supports the genocide of its own people, is troubling and seriously undermines the spirit of the Olympic Games.

There is no question that China is in a position to help improve the situation in Darfur. As an economic partner to Sudan, China must use all means possible to help bring an end to this genocide. As they seek to host the world, they must show the true extent of their leadership and call for an end to this genocide.

House Resolution 422 rightfully calls on the People's Republic of China to end military and economic assistance to Sudan until Sudan ceases attacking civilians and promotes the humanitarian and peacekeeping efforts going on in Darfur in its own country. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and call on China to fully support the Olympic spirit by calling on Sudan to end the genocide in Darfur.

While I have never seen anything like what I saw in Darfur, the situation is not completely hopeless. The humanitarian assistance the United States is providing is helping millions of people in desperate circumstances. But we must continue to do more and we must urge the international community to join with us to bring an end to the genocide. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in a bipartisan spirit to bring an end to this international crisis.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I now am proud to yield the floor to Mr. GEORGE MILLER from California for 2 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank all of my colleagues who have spoken on this resolution and certainly to BARBARA LEE, my colleague from California, who has been such a not only supporter and the author of this resolution but all of our efforts to change the situation in Darfur.

I had the honor to accompany Congresswoman LEE and our Speaker to Darfur a year ago February and saw the incredible devastation and the brutality and the genocide that is taking place there and vowed to do whatever I can to see if we can change it. I have been wearing this green band to save Darfur for over a year and a half. But this band will not save the people of Darfur, all of my constituents, thousands of my constituents who have marched throughout the Bay area, who have come across the country to march to save Darfur will not save Darfur. What will save Darfur is the nations of the world owing up to their responsibility to reject this genocide, to stop this genocide, to stop this holocaust against these people and get the government of Sudan to do so.

Of course today we are here to call upon the nation of China to owe up to its responsibilities, given its huge influence, its economic influence, its military influence, its resource influence in Sudan, to use that influence to get the government of Sudan to start to sit down and to negotiate with all of the parties to end the arms trade that is taking place, to stop the economic engagement until such time as these people in Darfur are once again made safe, until these people in Darfur are once again allowed to return to their villages, to their families and start to put their lives back together and to end the genocide. That's what is necessary to be done.

My colleague Mr. GOODLATTE referred to the Olympics. It's hard to believe that the world is going to look upon the host of the Olympics and see there at the same time a nation that is underwriting a genocide. That is absolutely on a daily basis by its inaction and then by its positive actions underwriting and allowing the genocide to go forward. It's not that China can stop this alone, but in concert with the rest of the nations of the world that have called out for an end to this genocide, to take actions against the economic activity and the military activity in Sudan.

Congresswoman LEE has pushed the effort of divestiture that has been followed up in many States and cities and universities and other entities. This has got to continue to stop the genocide that now so many of my colleagues have witnessed firsthand on those terrible, terrible visits to Darfur where we see the worst of humanity and the violence against these individuals and their families and their children. It has got to stop. I want to thank my colleagues for bringing this bipartisan resolution to the floor to help us try and end the genocide in Darfur.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 5 minutes.

Mr. TANNER. I am pleased to yield to the author of the resolution our remaining time.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentleman once again for yielding and would like to thank so many of our young people from around the country who have been nonstop in their work to end the genocide. Also, I would like to thank and recognize and salute the faith community, because this has been a movement to save Darfur by young people in the faith community. I would just like to mention a few of the organizations that have been unbelievable and unrelenting in their commitment. The Save Darfur Coalition, and my colleague from California referred to our arm bands, Not on Our Watch, Save Darfur. The Sudan Divestment Task Force. The American Jewish World Service. STAND, which is the Student Anti-Genocide Coalition. Dream for Darfur. Genocide Intervention Network. ENOUGH: The Project to End Genocide and Mass Atrocities. These are examples of the type of organizations at the grassroots level that have been working day and night to help us here in the House of Representatives understand our focus and what we need to do as a country to join hands to end this horrible massacre that is taking place.

I just want to once again thank Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Chairman LANTOS, Mr. TANNER from Tennessee and especially once again Congressman DON PAYNE for beating the drum, oftentime being a lone voice in the wilderness, but making sure that the rest of the world knew that it is incumbent upon the United States Government to lead to end this genocide and to say again to our country, to the world, not on our watch will this take place. And today we are taking one more step closer to bringing the world together to ask China to join with us, as Congressman GEORGE MILLER said, to stop underwriting this genocide that is taking place and to come together now with people and countries of good conscience who stand together to say to General Bashir and the Sudanese government to stop this carnage, to allow the people of Darfur to return home to their villages. They want to go home. They want to go live their lives and raise their children. We want the international forces, the U.N. forces, to go in and to help protect the refugees and to help the AU forces to make sure that people are protected until they can go home. And, of course, finally to find a long-term political solution.

A month ago we called upon the League of Arab Nations to do the same thing. And so it's time that the world stand together and say, no more. It's time that we stand together and say to the people of Darfur that hope is coming and that 450,000 people should not have been tolerated, but we don't want to see another single death occur as a result. China has got to help us do this. And so today we are asking the Chinese government in the spirit of cooperation to help stop this genocide that is taking place.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, Chairman LANTOS and I protested in front of the Sudanese Embassy about the

continuing genocide in Darfur. I'm privileged to say that I've shared jail time with the distinguished gentleman from California.

I also want to thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership on this issue, and I'm honored to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, others have already described the terrible humanitarian crisis affecting the civilian population of Darfur. Crimes against humanity are committed on a daily basis. President Bush and the Congress have determined the systematic killings and deprivations in Darfur constitute acts of genocide.

These serious matters demand a sustained, multilateral response by the United States and the international community. Together, we must pressure the Government of Sudan to stop the killing, stop the arming and support of proxy militias, and negotiate and implement a just and lasting peace.

Key to the success of such a strategy is the active support of Sudan's major economic and political partners: China, Russia, Malaysia, Egypt and India.

China is Sudan's largest economic partner and its largest provider of military arms and equipment.

China can play a significant, perhaps even decisive, role in ending the genocide in Darfur and convincing Khartoum to negotiate a lasting peace accord.

But will it?

China has taken some steps in the right direction. It supported the deployment of a joint United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force, and recently appointed a special envoy to Darfur.

But rather than condemn the violence against defenseless civilians, China's envoy cited poverty as the reason for Darfur's suffering.

Did poverty displace over two-and-a-half million people into camps, Mr. Speaker?

Did poverty force another half a million to flee the country and live in refugee camps?

I visited some of these camps in eastern Chad, Mr. Speaker. I saw first-hand how the conflict in Darfur is destabilizing Sudan's neighbors.

Did poverty burn Darfur's villages to the ground, poison water wells, rape women, murder men, and leave children to die of hunger and thirst?

No, Mr. Speaker. The regime sitting in Khartoum has orchestrated and condoned these actions.

This resolution asks China to acknowledge this violence and use its influence to stop the death and destruction taking place in Darfur.

To stop selling military arms and equipment to Sudan.

To exercise its considerable economic leverage by suspending its economic ties until Khartoum stops the killing, complies fully with U.N. Security Council resolutions, and enters good faith negotiations to end the fighting in Darfur.

Next year, China will host the 2008 Summer Olympics. It has chosen as its theme for the Games a motto filled with hope: ''One World, One Dream.''

But life in Darfur is no dream, Mr. Speaker. It's an unspeakable nightmare.

China has the ability to change that reality.

It is, as always, Mr. Speaker, a matter of political will.

Is China's so-called dream for the world nothing more than a paper banner carried around by a cute and cuddly mascot?

Or does China genuinely want to play a responsible role in world and human events and help stop the genocide in Darfur?

We are watching, Mr. Speaker.

The world is watching, Mr. Speaker.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 422.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 422, which calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan. I traveled to Darfur in February 2006. I will never forget what I saw, nor will I relent in my work to end the ongoing genocide.

China, if it chose to, could play a critical role in ending the genocide in Darfur. The President's Special Envoy to Sudan, Andrew S. Natsios, has said that ''China's substantial economic investment in Sudan gives it considerable potential leverage, and we have made clear to Beijing that the international community will expect China to be part of the solution.'' China has a close relationship with the Government of Sudan, economically and militarily. It purchases 70 percent of Sudan's oil. China has agreed to cancel nearly $100 million if Sudan's debt to the country, and it has invested over $10 million in the Sudanese energy sector over the last two decades. China, already the main supplier of arms to Sudan with $83 million exported there in 2005, recently agreed to cooperate more closely militarily ''in every sphere.''

With this resolution we are asking China to acknowledge and condemn the violence taking place in Darfur, Sudan. Additionally, we are calling on China to cease all military arms and equipments sales to Sudan. Finally, we are strongly encouraging China to suspend economic ties to Sudan until the Government of Sudan stops attacking civilians, complies with U.N. Security Council resolutions, and enters into peace negotiations with rebel groups. China has the ability to end the genocide and horror. I hope it chooses to act immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 422, calling on the People's Republic of China to use their influence and economic leverage with the Government of Sudan to stop the genocide and violence in Darfur. I am proud to join a large number of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, in cosponsoring this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we stand in serious risk of allowing the ongoing slaughter in Darfur to become one of the blackest marks on humankind's history. This is absolutely unacceptable. It has been nearly 3 years since we in Congress declared that ''the atrocities unfolding in Darfur, Sudan, are genocide,'' a sentiment that has been repeated only recently by President Bush, who went on to say ''we have a moral obligation to stop it.'' Congress has been outspoken in expressing a bipartisan consensus of disgust at the atrocious human rights abuses committed in the western region of Sudan.

Genocide in Darfur continues to play out on our watch. Current estimates put the death toll at 450,000 people, with an additional two million driven from their homes and livelihoods into wandering uncertainty or refugee camps. More than 3.5 million people within Darfur are currently entirely reliant on the international community for the crucial aid that might enable them to survive.

Some valuable foundations have been laid. The 22,500-strong U.N. peacekeeping mission authorized by United Nations Security Council Resolution 1706 is absolutely necessary to boost the brave but struggling African Union forces already in the region. These U.N. soldiers must be deployed immediately in Sudan, and given unimpeded access to the Darfur region. We must continue to press this issue until U.N. boots are actually on the ground in Darfur.

To do this, we must step up pressure on China. As the principle export destination of Sudanese oil, China is complicit in the genocide perpetrated by the Sudanese government. However, the immense economic and diplomatic weight wielded by the Chinese government could be used to great effect in ending the killing in Darfur, if applied to that end. It remains my hope that China may be persuaded to provide the type of constructive leadership in Sudan befitting a great power.

To this end, this resolution strongly urges China to acknowledge and condemn the atrocities in Darfur, to cease all military arms and related sales, to suspend economic cooperation with the Government of Sudan, and to work to positively influence the Government of Sudan to achieve a number of specific objectives, including the full compliance with Security Council Resolutions.

As China prepares to host the 2008 Summer Olympics, I believe we should expect China to work to live up to its own Olympic slogan: ''One World. One Dream.'' The time for admirable speeches and impassioned rhetoric, valuable though these are, has passed. The people of Darfur need definitive action and decisive leadership, and they need it now. Now is the moment to seize upon bipartisan common ground, and to work together to respond actively, to fulfill our humanitarian promises, and to finally help bring an end to this shameful chapter in human history. This bill is an important, definitive, and imaginative step toward this goal, and I commend my colleague for introducing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, Darfur continues to burn on our watch. Since the genocide began, we have commemorated both the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, and the 10th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide with candles and powerful speeches of regret. We have expressed a bipartisan consensus against the genocide, and yet it continues.

Though we in Congress are currently faced with a number of important and pressing issues vying for our attention, Darfur must be made a priority, and it must remain so until the genocide has ended. I strongly support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 422.

This resolution aims at encouraging the People's Republic of China to use its influence as one of Sudan's chief purchasers of oil to place pressure on the Sudanese government to improve the conditions for the people in the Darfur region and allow humanitarian organizations to enter the region and assist the people of Darfur.

The underlying basis for the conflict in the Darfur region is difficult to define. Some scholars describe it as a conflict between Arab and African cultures, although this is a simplistic

view. Whatever the foundation of the conflict, the Nile Valley region (the area around the Darfur region in Sudan), has had cultural conflicts dating as far back as the fourteenth century.

The current conflict in the Darfur region of Sudan places the Sudanese military and the Janjaweed militia against rebel groups, including the Sudan Liberation Movement and the Justice and Equality Movement. The Sudanese government, while denying its support for the Janjaweed militia, has nonetheless provided funding and weapons to the Janjaweed.

Because of this military conflict, humanitarian aid groups have been unable to reach most parts of the Darfur region. Further, journalists have been prevented from entering the region by the Sudanese government, thus ensuring that many of the atrocities occurring in Darfur go unreported.

U.N. officials have estimated that over 400,000 Darfur residents have died since the conflict began, many due to starvation. Further estimates put the number of residents displaced from their homes at over 2 million.

It is important that the United States look to any means available to quell the atrocious acts occurring in Darfur. As a leading arms dealer to the country of Sudan, The People's Republic of China is uniquely situated to encourage the Sudanese government to accept the decisions of the United Nations with regard to helping the inhabitants of the Darfur region.

As China readies itself for the spotlight on the world stage at the 2008 Beijing Olympics, it is important that China, along with the rest of the world, step up its influence on the Sudanese government and ensure that the atrocities and human rights violations taking place in the Darfur region are put to an end.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in support of ending the genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan.

For far too long, the international community has paid inadequate attention and devoted insufficient resources to stopping the crisis in Darfur. Although the problems of Sudan lay a long way from our homes, we have learned from the Holocaust in Europe, as well as ethnic cleansing in Yugoslavia and genocide in Rwanda, that an assault on humanity anywhere is an assault on humanity everywhere. We cannot continue to ignore this genocide without diminishing our own humanity.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am committed to bringing security and relief to the people of Darfur. I have led efforts to encourage state, local, and university divestment of funds from companies that conduct business operations in Sudan. And now I join my colleagues in urging China to do the same.

Given its economic interests throughout the region, China has a unique ability to positively influence the Government of Sudan to abandon its genocidal policies and to accept the United Nations' peacekeeping mission. To be accepted as a responsible player at the world's diplomatic table, China must end all military and economic assistance to the government of Sudan until Sudan stops overt and covert support for attacks on civilians and engages in meaningful peace negotiations.

All members of the international community share a moral obligation to end to the human suffering in Darfur. The situation is dire, but I am confident that we can all do our part to help stop this genocide and bring peace and stability to millions of innocent men, woman, and children.

Calling on the People's Republic of China to use its influence to help stop the genocide in Sudan is the right thing to do. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H. Res. 422.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 422, which calls on China to use its leverage with the government of Sudan to end the genocide in Darfur.

The ongoing genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan already is believed to have caused the deaths of almost half a million people. More than 200,000 people have been killed by Sudanese Government forces and armed militias since 2003, and another 200,000 people have died as a result of the deliberate destruction of homes, crops and water supplies and the resulting conditions of famine and disease. Over one-third of the population of Darfur has been displaced, and the United Nations estimated that almost 250,000 people have been displaced in the past 6 months alone, due primarily to government-sponsored militia attacks.

China, unlike most nations in the international community, has cultivated a close relationship with the Government of Sudan. China maintains close military ties with Sudan and purchased almost $2 billion worth of Sudanese oil last year. China also has cancelled $100 million in Sudanese debt and provided an additional $20 million to finance the construction of a presidential palace in the capital city. As a result, China is in a unique position to put pressure on the Government of Sudan to stop the violence in Darfur. So far, it has failed or refused to do so.

This resolution urges China to acknowledge and condemn the atrocities in Darfur, cease all weapons sales to Sudan, and suspend economic cooperation with Sudan. The resolution also urges China to use its leverage to influence the Government of Sudan to: comply with United Nations Security Council Resolutions providing for disarmament of militias in Darfur and deployment of a full-scale peacekeeping force; participate in peace negotiations to secure a legitimate peace agreement between all parties; and improve working conditions for humanitarian organizations operating in Sudan and ensure they have access to the 2.5 million people displaced by this genocide.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I urge China to join with the international community and take a stand against genocide in Darfur.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 422, which calls upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop the genocide in Darfur.

The violence in Darfur grows more gruesome by the day. I led the first congressional delegation to Darfur in 2004 with Senator SAM BROWNBACK, and I have personally witnessed the nightmare there with my own eyes. Every day that passes, more men are killed, more women are raped, and more children die of malnutrition. This is simply unacceptable.

The people in Darfur have lost their homes, their livelihoods, their loved ones. They have seen unspeakable horrors, carried out by the genocidal National Islamic Front in Khartoum and their cruel compatriots, the Janjaweed militia.

The U.S. and the international community have made strong efforts to halt the violence in Darfur, and have provided significant levels of humanitarian support to the victims of this genocide. However, these efforts have largely failed to stop the NIF's desire to complete their campaign in Darfur.

The Chinese Government's destructive role in the region is partly to blame for the continuing violence in Darfur. A recent Amnesty International report showed that China is making the conflict worse by providing weapons to the Sudanese Government to carry out the genocide in Darfur.

When President Hu visited Khartoum in February, instead of using his influence to persuade Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir to stop the violence in Darfur, he promised to build Bashir a brand new palace.

When President Hu appointed a new special envoy to Darfur, the envoy came back from the region claiming that the ''final solution'' for Darfur lies with removing ''mistrust'' between the Sudanese Government and the United States. He said the violence in Darfur is limited to sporadic conflicts along the border with Chad.

China has used its veto power on the U.N. Security Council to repeatedly obstruct efforts by the U.S. and the U.K. to introduce peacekeepers to curtail the slaughter. Beijing is uniquely positioned to put a stop to the slaughter, yet they have so far been unabashed in their refusal to do so.

China, which is a major business partner of Sudan, should be using its influence with the Sudanese Government to bring an end to the violence in Darfur. China's role in extracting oil from Sudan and maintaining close business relations with this genocidal regime are clearly more important to the Chinese Government than saving human lives.

This resolution calls on the Chinese Government to use its influence to stop the violence in Darfur. It urges China to push the Sudanese Government to accept a hybrid peacekeeping force, to disarm the Janjaweed militia, and to join the international community in imposing economic sanctions on Sudan if the government continues to support attacks on civilians.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution. A critical part of our efforts on Darfur is pressing the Chinese Government to stop supporting the genocide there. China must begin playing a constructive role in the region.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 422 to call on the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to halt the ongoing genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan.

As hundreds of thousands have died at the hands of government-backed militias in Darfur, China, and Sudan have cultivated a mutually beneficial relationship that provides crucial energy resources to China in return for thwarting international efforts to sanction the Khartoum government and deploy a United Nations peacekeeping force in Darfur.

China and Sudan have extensive economic, political, and military ties. China is Sudan's largest foreign investor and purchases two-thirds of Sudanese oil exports. China has sold arms to the Sudanese military and in February cancelled $80 million in Sudanese debt.

While it can do much more, China has taken some steps to alleviate the suffering in Darfur. Last November, China helped negotiate the agreement at Addis Abba which called for the deployment of a joint United Nations/African Union peacekeeping force. In May, China appointed a Special Envoy to Sudan and pledged $5.1 million in humanitarian aid to Darfur. Yet these positive steps are far outweighed by China's continuing support for the genocidal regime in Khartoum.

Unless China acts to pressure the Khartoum government into accepting a U.N. peacekeeping force, China risks having the 2008 Beijing Olympics forever known as the genocide Olympics. China must condemn the violence taking place in Darfur, halt all military arms sales to Sudan, and suspend economic ties to Sudan until the Government of Sudan stops attacking civilians, complies with U.N. Security Council resolutions, and enters into peace negotiations with rebel groups.

As China rises as a power in the 21st century, it must realize that with its increased power comes a greater responsibility to take action to stop genocide.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H. Res. 422, which calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop the genocide and violence in Darfur.

The world must be united in its call for an end to genocide. As China seeks to enter onto the world stage as a global economic and diplomatic power, the government must assume the responsibility, as well as the benefits that accompany this distinction.

China must use its close economic and military ties and advise the Sudanese government that genocide is very bad for business. Congress and the world are watching. It is imperative that China uses its power in a responsible manner and help bring a change to this troubled region.

Mr. TANNER. 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 Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 422.

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. TANNER. 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.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN TO RELEASE DR. HALEH ESFANDIARI

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 430) calling on the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to immediately release Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 430

Whereas Haleh Esfandiari, Ph.D., holds dual citizenship in the United States and Iran;

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari taught Persian language and literature for many years at Princeton University, where she inspired untold numbers of students to study the rich Persian language and culture;

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari is a resident of the State of Maryland and the Director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, D.C. (referred to in this preamble as the ''Wilson Center'');

Whereas, for the past decade, Dr. Esfandiari has traveled to Iran twice a year to visit her ailing now-93-year-old mother;

Whereas, in December 2006, on her return to the airport during her last visit to Iran, Dr. Esfandiari was robbed by three masked, knife-wielding men, who stole her travel documents, luggage, and other effects;

Whereas, when Dr. Esfandiari attempted to obtain replacement travel documents in Iran, she was summoned to an interview by Iran's Ministry of Intelligence;

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari was interrogated by the Ministry of Intelligence for seven to eight hours per day;

Whereas the questioning by the Ministry of Intelligence focused on the Middle East Program at the Wilson Center;

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari answered all questions to the best of her ability, and the Wilson Center also provided extensive information to the Ministry in a good faith effort to aid Dr. Esfandiari;

Whereas Lee Hamilton, former United States Representative and president of the Wilson Center, has written to Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to call his attention to Dr. Esfandiari's dire situation;

Whereas Mr. Hamilton repeated that the Wilson Center's mission is to provide forums to exchange views and opinions and not to take positions on issues, nor try to influence specific outcomes;

Whereas the lengthy interrogations of Dr. Esfandiari by the Ministry of Intelligence of Iran stopped on February 14, 2007, but she heard nothing for ten weeks and was denied her passport;

Whereas, on May 7, 2007, Dr. Esfandiari was summoned to the Ministry of Intelligence and taken immediately to Evin prison, where she was arrested and is currently being held;

Whereas Iran's Intelligence Ministry has implicated Dr. Esfandiari and the Wilson Center in advancing what it alleges is the United States Government's aim of a ''soft revolution'' in Iran;

Whereas Parnaz Azima holds dual citizenship in the United States and Iran;

Whereas Ms. Azima is a journalist for Radio Farda;

Whereas the Iranian Government confiscated the passport of Ms. Azima when she arrived in Iran to visit her ill mother in January of 2007;

Whereas the Iranian authorities have interrogated Ms. Azima on multiple occasions;

Whereas Ms. Azima's attorney was told in April 2007 that she would be detained in Iran for at least two years or more;

Whereas social scientist Kian Tajbakhsh was arrested in mid-May by Iranian security officials while consulting for the Open Society Institute, which runs humanitarian programs in Iran;

Whereas Mr. Tajbakhsh holds dual citizenship in the United States and Iran;

Whereas Mr. Tajbakhsh was retained by the Open Society Institute as a consultant to facilitate public health, humanitarian assistance, and urban planning projects that were undertaken openly and with the knowledge of the Iranian Government;

Whereas on May 31, 2007, a State Department spokesman announced that California businessman Ali Shakeri, who holds dual citizenship in the United States and Iran, had been arrested approximately ten days earlier;

Whereas Mr. Shakeri serves on the board of University of California at Irvine's Center for Citizen Peacebuilding, a research institution that seeks to promote reconciliation and sustainable peace in areas of international conflict;

Whereas Mr. Shakeri's arrest occurred as he sought to leave the country after having visited his ill mother, who passed away during his stay;

Whereas reports indicate that a fifth dual American-Iranian citizen, who has thus far remained anonymous, has also been imprisoned unjustly by Iranian authorities;

Whereas the Iranian Government has yet to produce evidence of wrongdoing by any of these individuals to justify its actions toward them; and

Whereas Dr. Esfandiari, Ms. Azima, and Mr. Tajbakhsh have been charged with espionage and, if convicted, face execution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Iran should immediately and unconditionally release dual Iranian-American citizens Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, Ms. Parnaz Azima, Mr. Kian Tajbakhsh, Mr. Ali Shakeri, and a fifth unnamed individual also being detained against his will, replace their lost travel documents, cease its tactics of harassment, and permit them to leave Iran.

Amend the title so as to read: A resolution ''calling for Iran to immediately release five dual Iranian-American citizens currently being held unjustly.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a few short months ago, a remarkably accomplished Iranian American woman, Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, made a decision that any of us would make under a similar circumstance. Her 93-year-old mother was failing and she needed to visit her in Tehran without delay. She boarded a flight to Iran, completely unsuspecting of what would unfold.

After a visit with her ailing mother, Dr. Esfandiari reached the Tehran airport. As one of the leading Middle East scholars in the United States at the highly respected Woodrow Wilson Institute, she had no reason to believe she was about to encounter trouble. But on

her way to the airport, she was attacked by plain-clothed, knife-wielding thugs and her passport was stolen.

This was only the beginning of her nightmare. Iranian authorities refused to grant her a new passport. She was interrogated and put under house arrest. She was told she would not return to the United States. And the ordeal grew worse. Dr. Esfandiari, a slender woman of 67 years, has been detained without just cause ever since, under the outlandish pretense of being an enemy of Iran. And, ominously, late last month she was formally charged with espionage.

She now sits in Iran's notorious Evin Prison. She has been allowed to make but a few painfully brief phone calls to her family. She has been interrogated at excruciating length. At the height of absurdity, she has been pressured to acknowledge participation in some kind of alleged coup against the Iranian government. This type of effort at forced confession is beyond absurd. It goes to the heart of the injustice of the Iranian regime.

Despite quiet initiatives of diplomacy undertaken by many countries, organizations, and individuals on Dr. Esfandiari's behalf and frustrated by her audacious commitment to the truth, the Iranian security services have done what they know best, and that is arrest without cause.

In discussing Dr. Esfandiari's case, news articles have also cited at least four other cases of dual Iranian American citizens deplorably being detained in Iran for no justifiable reason. It is particularly worrisome that two of these detainees, like Dr. Esfandiari, have now been charged with espionage.

□ 1645

Oddly enough, what all of these five seem to have in common is a commitment to U.S.-Iranian engagement. The government of Iran has unjustly detained five American citizens without due legal process. And Mr. VAN HOLLEN's resolution today aptly expresses the serious concern we have on their behalf and our justifiable demand that they be released without delay. These outrageous arrests are indicative of the blatant excesses and obvious shortcomings of the Iranian political system, too much tyranny and too little rule of law. This is a matter of basic human rights, and we cannot allow the Iranian government to continue trampling on the fundamental liberties of our citizens in this manner.

Ten Iranian parliamentarians have recently formed a Parliamentarian American friendship group. I call on these parliamentarians and all Iranians of good will, all people of good will, to use whatever influence they have to help bring about the immediate release of all American citizens in Iran who are held so unjustly and against their will.

I commend my friend and colleague from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for introducing this important measure.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 430, which decries the unlawful imprisonment of dual U.S.-Iranian citizens by the regime in Tehran. As this resolution illustrates, Iranian intelligence officials have unlawfully detained, interrogated and imprisoned numerous dual U.S.-Iranian citizens, in particular Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, who works for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

The Iranian government incarcerated Dr. Esfandiari in Evin Prison in Tehran on May 9 of this year. However, as I noted, this is not an isolated incident by any means. The Iranian government also confiscated the passport of Radio Farda journalist Parnaz Azima, an American citizen, when she arrived in Iran to visit her ill mother in January earlier this year.

Iranian government officials have interrogated Ms. Azima and pressured her to collaborate with Iranian intelligence. Iran has also imprisoned a consultant for the Open Society Institute and a fourth American citizen who has chosen to remain anonymous and who has been unlawfully detained in Iran for 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot stand. The Iranian government's recent actions are particularly egregious in light of that regime's past involvement in the killing of Americans and its past incitement and support of the taking of 66 American citizens hostages at the U.S. embassy in Tehran on February 4, 1979, with 52 of those Americans held in captivity for 444 days.

In response, we must remain resolute in our condemnation of the Iranian regime for detaining innocent American citizens for political purposes and demand that the Iranian regime immediately and unconditionally permit all American citizens detained in Iran against their will to leave.

These threatening actions by the Iranian regime come amidst Tehran's ongoing support for Islamic militants in Iraq that are killing Iraqis and Americans alike, its arming and support for Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza and its continued pursuit of nuclear capability in contempt of international demands that it suspend its enrichment activities. I therefore believe that the United States should suspend all contact with any agent, instrumentality or representative of the Iranian regime until Americans held hostage by Iran are released and other issues critical to the United States are addressed.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the author of the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) for his leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee and for our national security interests around the world, and I thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. LANTOS, and the ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for their bipartisan support in sending a strong message to the government of Iran that their actions are absolutely unacceptable and to pass this legislation to immediately and unconditionally release the Americans of Iranian descent that are being held by the government of Iran.

It was on May 30 of 2007, just a few weeks ago, the day after Washington and Tehran held their high profile talks with respect to Iraq that Iran turned around and charged three Iranian Americans, one academic, Haleh Esfandiari, a social scientist, Kian Tajbakhsh, and a journalist, Parnaz Azima, with spying, a charge which under Iran's Islamic law is punishable by death.

These trumped up charges are absolutely ridiculous. Haleh Esfandiari is a constituent of mine. She lives in Bethesda, Maryland. She is a 67-year-old Director of the Middle East program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Kian Tajbakhsh is a respected social scientist who is consulted by George Soros' Open Society Institute at the World Bank, and Parnaz Azima is a Radio Farda journalist.

The government of Iran accused these Iranian Americans of endangering state security and fomenting a, quote, soft revolution. These are ridiculous charges under any circumstances and clearly an excuse by Iran to once again take action in violation of international law.

Just to emphasize the point, Ms. Esfandiari is someone who has invited scholars and statesmen from Iran to the United States to conferences and events and has even been criticized by some members of the Iranian American community for being too soft on the current regime in Tehran. Mr. Tajbakhsh has consulted directly for the Iranian government and, working with the Open Society Institute, helped run its humanitarian health outreach program in Iran with full cooperation of the Iranian government.

The lists of foreign detainees doesn't stop there. Iranian American businessman Ali Shakeri, who is on the board of the University of California at Irvine's Center for Citizen Peacebuilding, was arrested on May 8 as he returned to the United States from visiting his ill mother, who died during his stay.

These detainees have dedicated their lives to building bridges between the Americans and the people of Iran. Their presence in Iran to visit their parents or to conduct humanitarian work poses absolutely no threat to the people or the government of Iran.

Their detention is a gross perversion of the rule of law. And the claim that

the Iranian government has made that they seek dialogue and improved relations with the West is belied by the actions they have taken with respect to these individuals.

So we call today upon the Iranian government to do as they say they want to do, which is to have a better relationship with the United States and the people of the United States and to immediately, unconditionally release these Americans.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 430.

This resolution calls on the government of Iran to release Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, who is being held captive in Evin prison, despite the Ministry of Intelligence offering no evidence of wrongdoing.

Dr. Esfandiari is a respected member of academia, holding the position of director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars, having previously taught Persian language and literature at Princeton University.

While visiting her ailing 93-year-old mother in Iran, Dr. Esfandiari was held up at knifepoint; her travel documents and luggage were taken in the process. It was while attempting to procure subsequent documents that Dr. Esfandiari was taken into custody by the Ministry of Intelligence in Iran.

Dr. Esfandiari is not the only American taken prisoner in Iran under the guise of being a ''spy.'' With U.S. and Iranian diplomatic relations resuming again after 25 years, it is important that the United States remain vigilant in opposing these unconscionable tactics employed by the Iranian Government toward United States citizens abroad.

This resolution is a strong first step in standing up for the safety of all American citizens traveling abroad. No American should ever be deprived of their liberty simply because they crossed the safe haven of U.S. borders.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the H.R. 430, introduced by my esteemed colleague Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, calling for the immediate and unconditional release of dual Iranian-American citizens Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, Ms. Parnaz Azima, and a third unnamed individual also being detained against her will. Mr. Speaker, these three Americans have been unjustly incarcerated without due legal process. They have had their travel documents stolen, and they have been subjected to tactics of harassment. I strongly support this legislation, which expresses the serious concerns we have for these three individuals, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, one of the detained individuals, is head of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars and widely recognized as one of Washington's top experts on Iran. Dr. Esfandiari was robbed of her passport upon her arrival at Tehran airport in December of last year when she went to visit her ailing, 93-year old mother. After being refused new documents, she was interrogated at excruciating length by Iranian intelligence, and pressured to make forced confessions that would falsely implicate herself and the Wilson Center in trying to launch a full-fledged coup in Iran. She consistently refused to tarnish her good name or the reputations of her colleagues.

Dr. Esfandiari was arrested on May 7th, and has been incarcerated, despite numerous efforts by countries, organizations, and individuals on her behalf. She faces ludicrous charges of seeking to launch a one-woman coup against the Iranian government. The United States government has called for her immediate release.

Unfortunately, Dr. Esfandiari is only one of a number of American citizens who have recently been detained in Iran without adequate legal grounds. Another case involved a journalist for Radio Farda, who was courageously involved in the effort to bring free and open media to the Iranian people. These outrageous arrests are indicative of the Iranian political system, including the concentration of power and the lack of rule of law.

Another American missing in Iran, former FBI agent Robert Levinson, disappeared after flying to Iran's Kish Island in March. I call on the Iranian government to use all the powers at its disposal to locate Mr. Levinson, if it has not already done so, and to repatriate him.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an issue of basic human rights. We as a Congress, and we as a nation, cannot allow the Iranian government to continue trampling on the fundamental liberties of our citizens in this manner. Therefore, I rise in strong support of this resolution, calling for the unconditional release of these three American citizens unjustly being held in Iranian prisons, and I call upon all of my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 430, which calls on the Islamic Republic of Iran to immediately release Dr. Haleh Esfandiari.

Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, a highly respected member of the Washington, DC and Maryland communities, is currently serving as the Director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. In December, she traveled to Iran to visit her ailing mother, something that she has done countless times before. On her return to the airport, her travel documents and personal effects were taken from her. When she attempted to obtain replacement travel documents in Iran, she was instead subjected to days upon days of interrogation and essentially placed under house arrest for several months.

Last month, Dr. Esfandiari was summoned by the government and was taken to the infamous Evin prison, where she is currently being held. She has been accused by the Iranian Intelligence Ministry of trying to set up networks of Iranians to start a revolution to bring down the government. In fact, she has long advocated for building bridges between the United States and the Middle East

Iran's imprisonment of Dr. Esfandiari is entirely baseless and shows a disregard for the rule of law as well as the Iranian government's continued claim that they would like to gain the world's respect. We must demand Dr. Esfandiari and all other Americans that are being held without just cause be released by the Iranian government.

I urge all my colleagues to join us in support of this important resolution.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on December 30, 2006, Dr. Haleh Esfandiari, a prominent Iranian-American scholar, was in Iran to visit her sick 93-year-old mother when she was stopped by the Iranian authorities.

What followed was nearly 5 months of a series of intense interrogations and pressure tactics where she was harassed, threatened, and forced to make false statements against her employer, the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars. On May 8, she was again detained and imprisoned.

Her arrest and detention has angered analysts, human rights groups and lawmakers throughout the world. Yet still, the Iranian regime refuses to release her, claiming she is a spy who was plotting to overthrow the Iranian government.

I would like to submit a statement issued from the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars on May 21, 2007 for the record.

Mr. Speaker, these charges are a farce. Professor Esfandiari is an accomplished scholar of Persian literature, language and history who taught at Princeton University before becoming the Director of the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars Middle East Program. Her husband, Mr. Shaul Bakhash, is a professor at George Mason University of Fairfax, VA. The Woodrow Wilson Center is a non-profit, non-partisan organization whose work is to research and foster dialogue within the scholarly world on current and future public policy issues.

Dr. Esfandiari's tireless dedication to teaching and advocating on behalf of Iran is clear. She has focused on building bridges and opening doors for peace in the Middle East. She has sought to facilitate and strengthen Iranian-American relations through numerous seminars, lectures and workshops with educators, policymakers and groups from both countries and has pressed wider freedoms to communicate about our common bonds and negotiate over our disagreements.

Like thousands of other Iranians living abroad, Professor Esfandiari is an academic who took a personal trip to see her family. If she as one individual scholar threatens this regime so much that they have to interrogate her for almost five months and detain her in a notorious prison cell known for human rights abuses, then one has to assume this regime is desperate to retain whatever control it can.

Today, the Iranian leadership's lack of courage and conscience is as clear as it is disappointing.

It is evident that this regime is criminalizing scholarly work of any kind, despite the fact that Iran's very own history is filled with centuries of scholarly research and discovery. This regime's egregious decision to imprison Dr. Esfandiari reflects a deepening departure from the values and ideals the Iranian people have historically prided themselves on.

Iran's renowned nationalist Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh once said ''There is no better way to govern Iran than democracy and social justice!''

Professor Esfandiari should be released immediately. Every day she is so unjustly detained, Iran proves the case of its detractors and makes it all the more difficult for institutions like Dr. Esfandiari's Wilson Center to treat the Iranian people with the respect that should be afforded to ah historic civilization and citizenship of 70 million people.

STATEMENT ON THE ARREST IN TEHRAN OF ESFANDIARI, DIRECTOR OF THE WOODROW WILSON CENTER'S MIDDLE EAST PROGRAM

Haleh Esfandiari, director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and a dual Iranian-American national, was arrested in

Tehran on May 8 and incarcerated in the Evin Prison.

The background to this entirely unjustified arrest is as follows. Timeline of events:

December 21, 2006, Haleh Esfandiari, director of the Middle East Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and a dual Iranian-American national, traveled from Washington D.C. to Tehran, Iran to visit her 93-year-old mother for one week.

On December 30, 2006, on her way to the airport to catch a flight back to Washington, the taxi in which Dr. Esfandiari was riding was stopped by three masked, knife-wielding men. They threatened to kill her, and they took away all of her belongings, including her Iranian and American passports.

On January 3, when applying for replacement Iranian travel documents at the passport office, Dr. Esfandiari was invited to an ''interview'' by a man from Iran's Ministry of Intelligence.

Beginning on January 4, she was subjected to a series of interrogations that stretched out over the next six weeks, sometimes continuing for as many as four days a week, and sometimes stretching across seven and eight hours in a single day. Dr. Esfandiari went home every evening, but the interrogations were unpleasant and not free from intimidation and threat.

The questioning focused almost entirely on the activities and programs of the Middle East Program at the Wilson Center. Dr. Esfandiari answered all questions fully; when she could not remember details of programs stretching back five and even eight years, the staff at the Wilson Center provided her all the information requested. As a public organization, all Wilson Center activities are on the public record. Repeatedly during the interrogation, she was pressured to make a false confession or to falsely implicate the Wilson Center in activities in which it had no part, but she refused.

On Friday, January 15, in the third week of interrogations, Dr. Esfandiari was told (misleadingly as it turned out) the questioning was over. On January 18, the interrogator and three other men showed up at Dr. Esfandiari's mother's apartment. Dr. Esfandiari was taking a nap and was startled to wake up and see the door to her bedroom open, her privacy violated, and three strange men, one of them wielding a video-camera, staring into her bedroom.

On February 14, the lengthy interrogations stopped.

On February 17, Haleh received one threatening phone call, and then she did not hear anything from her interrogators for ten weeks.

On February 20, Lee Hamilton, president and director of the Wilson Center, wrote to Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad asking that Dr. Esfandiari be allowed to travel. However, President Ahmadinejad did not reply to the letter.

At the end of April or early May, she was telephoned once again and invited to ''cooperate.'' In effect, she was being asked to make a confession. She refused to make the false statements.

On Monday, May 7 she was summoned to the Ministry of Intelligence once again. When she arrived for her appointment on Tuesday morning, May 8th, she was put into a car and taken to Evin prison. She was incarcerated and was allowed only one phone call to her mother.

On May 9 she called her mother asking her to bring her clean clothes and her medicine. Her mother delivered the small package at Evin Prison on May 10, but was not allowed to see her.

On May 12, the hard-line daily ''Kayhan'' in an article accused Dr. Esfandiari of working with the U.S. and Israeli governments and with involvement in efforts to topple Iran's Islamic regime.

On May 15, Iranian judiciary spokesman Ali Reza Jamshidi said that Dr. Esfandiari was being investigated for crimes against national security and that her case was being handled by the Intelligence Ministry.

On May 15, Haleh made a brief telephone call to her mother.

On May 16, Haleh's family retained the legal services of Nobel Peace Laureate Shirin Ebadi to represent her.

On May 17, in an interview with Washington Post Staff Writer Robin Wright, Shirin Ebadi indicated that the Iranian government has rejected her request to represent Dr. Esfandiari. She also noted the court refused information on the legal charges against Dr. Esfandiari, and denied her legal team the ability to see Haleh.

On May 21 state-run television broadcasts in Iran indicated that Haleh is being charged with seeking to topple the government of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Our efforts to obtain Haleh's release will continue and will be redoubled. She will be in our thoughts and prayers every day.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no more 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 Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 430, 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. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1802

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSS) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 451.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 452) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 452

Whereas, clause one of House rule XXIII (Code of Official Conduct) states, ''A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall conduct himself at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House.'';

Whereas, on June 4, 2007, the United States Department of Justice filed an indictment by a grand jury against the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable William J. Jefferson, in the United States Court for the Eastern District of Virginia;

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment of Representative Jefferson, the grand jury specifies sixteen counts, including but not limited to Solicitation of Bribes by a Public Official, Violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, Money Laundering, Obstruction of Justice and Racketeering;

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury alleges that Representative Jefferson did knowingly engage in an unlawful conspiracy ''to provide for the unjust enrichment of Defendant Jefferson and his family members by corruptly seeking, soliciting, and directing that things of value be paid to him and his family members in return for Defendant Jefferson's performance of official acts'';

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury further alleges that ''Defendant sought to and did conceal his and his family members' expected or actual receipt of things of value by directing congressional staff members, family members, and others to form nominee companies that entered into business agreements to receive things of value sought by Defendant Jefferson while not referencing him or disclosing his involvement in obtaining the agreements'';

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury further alleges that ''Defendant Jefferson failed to disclose his and his family's financial interests in these business ventures by omitting this material information from travel and financial disclosure forms required to be filed by the Rules of the House of Representatives and, in some cases, by failing to make any of the required filings'';

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury further alleges that ''On or about July 30, 2005, in Arlington, Virginia, Defendant Jefferson received $100,000 in cash from [cooperating witness]'' for use in an illegal bribery scheme;

Whereas, in the aforementioned indictment, the grand jury further alleges that ''On or before August 3, 2005, at his residence in Washington, DC, Defendant Jefferson secreted in his freezer $90,000 of the $100,000 in cash provided by [cooperating witness] as part of the front-end bribe to Nigerian Official A, which was separated into $10,000 increments, wrapped in aluminum foil, and concealed inside various frozen food containers'';

Whereas, on February 27, 2007 the House Democratic Caucus unanimously approved the recommendation of House Democratic leaders that Representative Jefferson be elected to the Committee on Homeland Security, a position in which he would have had access to highly sensitive Top Secret information concerning national security matters;

Whereas, on June 5, 2007 Representative Jefferson resigned from the Committee on Small Business to which he was elected by vote of the House on January 23, 2007;

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States authorizes the House of Representatives to ''determine the rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member'';

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is charged with enforcing the Code of Official Conduct and related rules of the House governing the Conduct of Members and staff;

Whereas, during the 109th Congress, on May 17, 2006 the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct issued a public statement which noted, ''[t]he Committee has voted to establish an investigative subcommittee to conduct an inquiry regarding Representative William J. Jefferson'';

Whereas, absent any subsequent public statements by the committee concerning Representative Jefferson and in light of press accounts describing the Jefferson inquiry as ''halted'' and ''stalled'' it is essential that the House act to ensure that appropriate and timely action is taken to complete the Jefferson inquiry and protect the integrity of the House;

Whereas, clause 5(a)(4)(A) of House rule X states, ''At the beginning of a Congress, the Speaker or his designee and the Minority Leader or his designee each shall name 10 Members, Delegates or the Resident Commissioner from his respective party who are not members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to be available to serve on investigative subcommittees of that committee during that Congress. The names of Members, Delegates or the Resident Commissioner so named shall be announced to the House.''

Whereas, Republican Leader Boehner, having chosen ten Republican Members for the ethics pool for the 110th Congress earlier this year and Speaker Pelosi only having named the Democrat Members of the pool earlier today: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is directed to investigate without further delay alleged illegal conduct and violations of House rules by Representative William J. Jefferson and report its findings and recommendations to the House, including a recommendation regarding whether Representative Jefferson should be expelled from the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of privilege.

Under rule IX, the minority leader and the majority leader or his designee each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, will instruct the Ethics Committee to review the serious allegations and evidence against the gentleman from Louisiana and report back to the House whether the gentleman should be expelled for conduct that brings dishonor on this institution.

This resolution is not intended to cast innocence or guilt on the gentleman from Louisiana. It is intended to ensure that the Ethics Committee process, a process that all the Members of this House want to see work fairly and honestly, begin its deliberations of this issue.

This Ethics Committee last year, over a period of approximately 6 months, was looking into this matter, but as of today there has not been a subcommittee established to look at the facts of this case. The Republican pool was announced several months ago, and we have been waiting for the majority party to put their pool members onto the Ethics Committee so, in fact, this investigation could continue. And it is somewhat of a sad state that these members weren't announced until today and it took the indictment of Mr. JEFFERSON for the majority to outline to the House who the members will be that will make up their pool.

But the point I make is that all of us have been through a very difficult period in this House, and I think that I have made clear to my colleagues on the minority side of the House that I intend to hold our colleagues to a higher standard. And when we talk about the standard here, we all know that bringing honor on this House is a standard that all of us attempt to meet and make sure that there is no dishonor brought. And we are not talking here about a standard that is very different from that of a criminal plea or a criminal indictment. We are talking about behavior that brings dishonor on this institution.

So I believe that the Ethics Committee can, in fact, do its work. I think they can do it efficiently. And the purpose of this resolution is to ensure that the House speaks to our Ethics Committee to make sure that it is doing its job in resolving this case as soon as possible.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this resolution, and I agree with the minority leader. The allegations that have been made are extraordinarily serious. They, if proven true, should lead to the expulsion of the Member in question. They, of course, have not been proved true. They are allegations.

Having said that, I also intend to and have called for a resolution to be considered tonight under suspension. That resolution speaks not only to the Jefferson case, to which the gentleman from Ohio limits his privileged resolution, but also speaks to any allegations of serious criminal conduct that may be made either through indictment or other charging documents; and it calls for action by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in any and all of those cases.

We appreciate the sensitivity of the minority leader to this issue at this time. It is, frankly, the first time I recall such a resolution being offered by the minority. For over a year, the Ethics Committee essentially didn't act, didn't operate. In fact, when it did and it held the former majority leader as having adversely affected the ethics of the House, the chairman was summarily removed from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; and, in fact, two of the members that had the temerity to vote to have a consequence for actions that reflected on the House were removed from that committee.

But I welcome the minority leader and the minority party's interest in pursuing this matter. I presume that the gentleman's resolution will pass unanimously. I also hope that the suspension resolution will also pass unanimously because there are, of course, unfortunately, a number of allegations being made publicly about Members of this House; and irrespective of what party they may fall into or be members of, it is critically important for us to hold accountable those Members and to assure the American public that the Ethics Committee is looking at those allegations, investigating those allegations, and making reports not only to the House of Representatives but to the people.

□ 1815

We swear an oath to not only defend the Constitution, but to uphold the laws of our land. As Members of this House, we have an absolute obligation to conduct ourselves in a way that does not violate the standards of official conduct or bring into disrepute the House of Representatives. Hopefully, we will agree on that proposition.

So I say to my Republican friends, we welcome them to this focus on holding accountable Members who violate the trust of the American public. We certainly intend to support it. I hope they will support the subsequently offered resolution, which says that in every case we will pursue this focus.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's support of our efforts, and in support of the Ethics Committee taking up this case and moving as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that the gentleman refers to has been shown to us just moments ago. The gentleman, the majority leader, is well aware that legislation does not come to the floor without the cooperation of both sides. And to have seen this bill just moments ago strikes me as something that we never, ever, ever would have considered doing on the floor of the House without clear consultation and advisement of the minority. And so, I will look at the bill. I'm not quite sure what it says because, again, we have just received it moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would yield to the gentleman from Missouri, the minority whip, for as much time as he may consume.

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

I am pleased that the body will move forward this evening to approve this resolution that the Republican leaders offered.

The majority leader indicated in the last Congress that the Ethics Committee didn't meet for a year. I think

that is because the Members of the minority at that time, now the majority, wouldn't meet for a year. And now we are in the sixth month of this Congress, and only today is there a group of Members made available by the majority to choose a panel from to investigate this case. Now, maybe that was just an accident. Maybe that's just starting a new majority. Maybe that's not remembering that this investigation was stopped at the end of the last Congress and couldn't start in this Congress unless there was a new panel put in place. Those of us in the minority, I suppose, have less to worry about, so we put our panel of Members out immediately at the beginning of Congress, as we have in the past. We put our panel out there immediately. And now, in June, the sixth month of the Congress, the majority makes Members available suddenly to investigate this case as if it just occurred today, or as if we were just aware of it today. That is almost too big a coincidence to overlook.

We are going to start looking at this case. I am pleased that our friends on the other side are going to join us in that effort. This case has been known to Members of Congress for some time now. It rises to a level of accusations and an indictment that has seldom been met in the history of the Congress. A 94-page indictment that alleges conspiracies on this and at least one other continent that could result in 230 something years of prison time if the Member is found guilty.

Mr. Speaker, even if all of those things did not turn out to produce guilt at the end of this pathway, the standards that have been referred to here on the floor are clearly standards that the Ethics Committee should have been looking at. Those standards that violate the official conduct of the House, you don't have to necessarily have violated a law to violate those standards. You certainly don't have to have violated a law to have brought disrepute on the House, or whatever language is used in the code of conduct we attempt to hold each other to.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I think it's high time that we did start this investigation. I think it is unfortunate that we had the time this entire Congress where nothing has been done to look at this case. And because of that, I hope that we not only ask the Ethics Committee to look at the case, but do everything we can to encourage them to not decide necessarily the legal matters, they will be decided somewhere else, but to decide whether or not this Member has violated the ethical code of the House; and if that is the case, what should the action of the House be in the future.

So not only do I stand as the majority leader just did to join the Republican leader in supporting this resolution, but also in encouraging all of our Members to.

Mr. Speaker, if my friend has a quick response, I would be glad to just yield 1 minute to him for that purpose.

Mr. HOYER. I can do it shorter than that. I just wanted to make one point, because I checked.

The important issue is going forward. We agree with that. We can argue about what happened in the past, we certainly have our perspective. Your panel was named last month, not at the beginning of the session, not in January or February or March or April, but last month. So we need to move forward on this, and we are going to. We are going to support this resolution.

I welcome your support of the suspension resolution, which will ensure that in these kinds of cases, that we go forward in every instance as we are going forward today.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time back to the gentleman from Ohio. I think that our panel was available before that, but he is the one that would know more about the specifics of that than I do.

I do know that going forward is important. And in fact, if we could set a standard of moving forward we would probably all be better off, but it is awfully hard in any political environment to not keep looking backwards.

We do need to move forward. We need a resolution of this. And it doesn't have to go hand in hand with the resolution of legal matters, it needs to go hand in hand with the code of conduct of the House and what happens there.

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

The gentleman referred to when our panel members were named, which was on May 1. The gentleman should be aware that our panel was picked and members had agreed to serve on the panel by the end of January of this year. We held the list, trying to work with our colleagues in the majority so that the panels on both sides could be named as soon as possible. And finally, right before Easter, we filed our 10 panel names and they were certified. That occurred on May 1. I am sorry that it is a fact that your panel members were not named until today, and not until after the indictment of a sitting Member.

So the fact that almost 6 months have gone by in this Congress without any work on the part of the Ethics Committee with regard to Mr. JEFFERSON's case I think is a sad record.

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

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

Mr. BOEHNER. I am pleased to yield for as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say, this is a very sad debate. I was one of the members of the Ethics Committee that was not reappointed that was referenced to in the distinguished majority leader's presentation. I will tell you this; before coming to Congress I was a prosecuting attorney in my hometown.

I served on the Ethics Committee for 4½ years. I found the Ethics Committee to be a place where five Members of each party came together and treated the rules fairly, treated the Members fairly, and treated the rules of this House more than fairly.

I sat through and listened to only the second time since the American Civil War that a Member of this House was expelled, my friend, James Traficant of Ohio, but the evidence warranted it.

These competing resolutions, in my opinion, continuing the dumbing down of the House. Now, I don't know whether Representative JEFFERSON is guilty or not guilty of the things that he has been indicted for by the Justice Department. But even Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, are entitled to a presumption. And there was a reason that in the Traficant case the Ethics Committee waited until the judicial process worked its will, and that is two things; one, you've got to find out whether the person is guilty or not guilty of what they are accused of. Two, when you have competing investigations, you can actually impede the prosecution of someone who has committed a crime with the Department of Justice.

Your side started this ''culture of corruption'' last year; we're going to start the ''House of hypocrisy'' this year. Stop dumbing down the institution.

Members of Congress are human beings. When they are charged with a crime, they should get the full weight of the law. If they are guilty, they should suffer the penalty not only of going to prison or jail, but they should be expelled from the House. But to rush to judgment and to permit the United States Department of Justice or some rogue district attorney, like I happen to believe in Tom DeLay's case, I know you guys aren't big fans of Tom DeLay, but you are sending a message that a common prosecutor in my district, your district, your district, your district can indict you tomorrow, and on the basis of that you are removed from your leadership position, you are removed from your committees, and you may not have done a darn thing.

I think this is a sad day for this House. And I know that I am going to be in the minority tonight, I'm actually in the minority, so it will be a double minority, but I intend to vote against both of these resolutions. I am sorry we've come to this.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time for us to have sort of a status report of how we got here.

Two years ago, it was publicly revealed that one of our Members of this

House, a gentleman from New Orleans, had an FBI raid on his home and had discovered 90,000 in cash wrapped up in aluminum foil and in Tupperware containers in that freezer. It was also publicly revealed that that same gentleman used National Guard assets that were then being used as part of the rescue and recovery efforts after Hurricane Katrina to go to his home and recover something resembling the boxes that were later found in his freezer to be containing $90,000 in cash.

Since that time, he continued to serve on the Ways and Means Committee for some period of time, which was the committee that he is alleged to have used to conspire on a continent-wide basis in bribery and racketeering of several African nations to profit himself, his family and bring shame and discredit upon this institution. He later left that committee and was unanimously approved by the Democratic Caucus to go to the Homeland Security Committee, that committee being the committee that has jurisdiction over a number of the assets that he misappropriated in the wake of Hurricane Katrina to retrieve the boxes that resembled the ones that had the cash of $90,000 in the freezer.

When it was brought to light that the Republicans would demand a public vote on that Democratic Caucus action, that vote was never called for. He remained on the Small Business Committee until today, several days after the actual indictment.

That same individual, for the first time in the history of the Republic, had his congressional office raided by the FBI. Now, in the course of all those events did the House Ethics Committee, now led by Democrats, ever open an investigation into his behavior in this Congress? The answer is no. Now why is that? Because if an FBI investigation, $90,000 in cash, an FBI raid on a congressional office, and misappropriation of National Guard assets isn't enough to merit an ethics investigation in this body then perhaps the majority leader could share with us what is. And he could also explain to us why, if there had been an ethics investigation, it could not have proceeded because the Speaker had not appointed Members to the investigative pool until today.

□ 1830

So even if they had been proactive, there would have been no one to look into the allegations that have brought shame and discredit upon the People's House.

So it takes a peculiar rhetorical bravado to come to this House floor and say with a straight face that they have been moving forward with these investigations, when for over half of the 109th Congress the Ethics Committee could not function because the Democratic members refused to show up; and in the 110th Congress the ethics investigative pool could not function because no Members had been nominated by the Speaker until today. That undermines this institution; and it is the reason why it requires a very rare motion, the privileged motion that the minority leader is offering today.

Now, Mr. HOYER has offered a suspension bill. Suspension bills are typically used to name post offices. They are typically used to designate National Fishing and Boating Month, National Jewish History Month, National Smoke-Free Awareness Week. That is typically the route that suspension bills are pursued. And suspension means that they enjoy broad, non-controversial support in this House. So while it is, I hope, broadly supported that we would refer the Jefferson case to Ethics, it seems as though that in this new open and accountable House Chamber that the language of such a suspension that would suspend the rules would have been shared by all the Members. The rare motion that is afforded the Republican leader was available in the public domain for days, which presumably has led to the timing of the suspension vote also being offered today.

As we move forward with this I think it's important that we recognize that the real losers here are the constituents in a Louisiana congressional district who have been denied representation by someone who has brought shame and discredit upon this House, potentially, depending on the outcome of a 16-count indictment that could result in 235 years in prison. And I hope that the majority leader in his haste to craft the suspension bill that we will consider today has included in it improvements to the existing law as it relates to Member pensions. Because nothing drives the American taxpayer more crazy than to know that potentially, if the gentleman from Louisiana is convicted and if the gentleman from Louisiana is sentenced to prison, he would still have his family entitled to a pension. That is a watered-down version of what the House Republicans passed last year that would deny a pension to Members who use their office to engage in criminal activity. And in this particular case, the people who would be eligible to continue collecting the pension are in the public domain as having been coconspirators, beneficiaries of the illegal activity.

So I hope that in his haste to craft a suspension bill, he would bring the pension issue back up for this body to put the teeth back into it that Republicans put in a year ago and add to that additional language that perhaps the majority leader, Mr. REID, would find acceptable in the Senate so that we can actually get it to the President's desk so that the American taxpayer doesn't have to foot the bill for convicts, thieves, racketeers and people who engage in bribery by abusing their office.

This is a very serious issue for this institution, and it should be treated as such, and we should have the highest possible standard for all Members who enjoy the trust in public service, and that includes the issues that follow all of us, including access to the pension, including enforcing the House rules on earmarks that have been routinely abused, and maintaining all of the other rules that we have passed and taken a victory lap for allegedly making this the most open and honest and accountable place. And yet when the rubber meets the road, the path chosen is to airdrop in earmarks, cover up misbehavior on the House floor in terms of threats and intimidation, and unanimously affirm someone who is now under a multi-page indictment, unanimously affirm that person to have a position on the Homeland Security Committee.

I urge this body to endorse, support and vote for the Republican leader's motion that will begin the process of restoring the dignity and honor and respect that this institution deserves.

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

Chutzpah is a wonderful word. Chutzpah is the position of a person who has been involving themselves in activities for a long period of time and then accusing somebody else of doing the same and being sanctimonious in the process.

That aside, Mr. Speaker, this House was told in November of last year by the people of this country, clean up your House, get rid of the culture of corruption. That's what they said in 2006, on November 7; and that's what we're doing. We adopted one of the strongest rules packages dealing with ethics in the history of this House, eliminating all meals and gifts from lobbyists. Arm's-length transactions. No travel. We just passed a lobbying disclosure bill 2 weeks ago, which most of us voted for because we want to be in on the effort of cleaning up this House.

My young friend from Florida apparently forgets that in January we passed a pension bill which says that if you're convicted and expelled, you won't get your pension. That was the Boyda bill, NANCY BOYDA from Kansas, who came to Congress on a pledge to clean up the Congress. And she was elected to do just that.

Earmarks. Earmarks were quadrupled over the last 14 years. We have now adopted a rule that says they're going to be transparent. You're going to know who made the request for earmarks, that there is going to be some check on those earmarks.

Now, my young friend from Florida says that our resolution, which will be on suspension, was just seen. I will tell him, and there is no way he would know this, I saw the leader's resolution just minutes ago.

But that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. The issue is the American public did indeed send us here to act ethically, honestly and openly and do the people's business, not the special interests'. And that's why they made a change in this House in November of 2006, that's why we unanimously on our

side are going to support this resolution, and that's why we're going to support the suspension bill.

Because not only do we believe it ought to be done in this instance, but there are a lot of Members publicly under investigation in this House whose homes have been raided by Federal officials, but they're not in this resolution. They have not been indicted.

Mr. Speaker, we need to act. The public needs to know we're acting, and we need to hold accountable those who fail to meet their public duty and trust to the American people. This leadership is committed to making sure that we do just that.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) so much time as he may consume.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Republican leader for yielding.

I would like to begin by engaging my very good friend and classmate, the distinguished majority leader, in a colloquy, if I might; and I would be happy to yield to him to respond.

Our Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER, has just referred to the fact that, on May 1, we saw the appointment of the pool of those on the Ethics Committee who would in fact be responsible, or they will be impaneled to deal with this question, and he referred to the fact that we have gone for, really, almost the first half of this year without any action taking place. And as he correctly said, a decision was made to empanel that group on the majority side today.

We got the news yesterday of this very unfortunate indictment. I would just like to inquire of my friend exactly why it is that it took us this long to see action taken, when, in fact, so much other action was taken in the 109th Congress.

I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I don't have a specific answer for that. But let me say this. You gave your list last month. We have given our list this month. The minority leader is correct on that time frame. We heard about this indictment. We determined to take specific action. The minority leader also determined to take specific action. We believe they complement one another, but the real issue is that we need to take decisive action and we intend to do so.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, and I thank the distinguished majority leader, Mr. Speaker, for his comments and for being forthright in saying that they really don't have an answer in response to the fact that this has been open for literally months, this entire year. A very serious question was carried over from the 109th Congress to the 110th Congress, and I listened to my friend just a few minutes ago provide a great campaign speech about the message that was sent last November and the fact that we've got this great degree of openness and transparency and all, the likes of which didn't exist in past Congresses.

But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I am really very troubled when I look at this resolution that as our Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER, said was just provided to us.

Now, let me state very clearly for the record, this falls within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Rules. This has not been referred to the Rules Committee, and with our first look at it, again it was just handed to us, it would be an understatement to say that we're very troubled with the potential ramifications of what this resolution would do, Mr. Speaker.

One of the staff members just said to me, it would be possible that one of our Members could be protesting at the Sudanese Embassy. We know that there is a great deal of controversy and question around policy that takes place in Sudan as it relates to Darfur and other things, and conceivably if a Member of this institution were protesting and were arrested, it would have to be referred to the House Committee on Ethics, and they would be required to empanel an investigative committee to look at this or report back as to why it didn't take place.

In this resolution, it says any Federal or State court. I don't know if someone possibly might be exceeding the speed limit and pulled over and ticketed. I don't know whether or not that Member would have to be referred to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and see an investigative committee empaneled to investigate that speeding ticket.

The point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is we continue to hear about this great new openness and transparency and the deliberative nature of this institution, when we have a resolution that the majority leader correctly has introduced, and he is certainly entitled to do that, to say it is to be referred to the Committee on Rules. Yet from what the majority leader has said, Mr. Speaker, we're scheduled to vote on this in just a matter of a few minutes, and we've just looked at this three-page measure, and those are the questions that we have initially that I would have certainly raised if we had had a hearing up in the Rules Committee on this measure.

Everyone wants to make sure that this institution is held to the highest possible ethical standard. I believe that we all sincerely want to do that.

□ 1845

The issue of ethics and lobbying reform and all has been greatly politicized by our friends in the majority; greatly politicized by our friends in the majority. We had a debate on this just before we adjourned before Memorial Day, and to me it was just outrageous to hear the kind of rhetoric that was used, pointing the finger of blame on this issue.

I think it is very sad. We are here responding to an indictment, the likes of which has not been seen for a Member in a long, long period of time, and I hope very much that as we do seek greater deliberation that we will take resolutions like this and run them through the regular order process.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know when Mr. Cunningham was indicted and convicted, but ''a long, long time'' seems not to be my recollection of how long ago it was.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are entitled to see this institution held to the highest ethical standards. They clearly expect more of us than maybe they have in the past. And the reason to bring this resolution here tonight is to not profess innocence or guilt. It is to make sure that the process that we have in this House for protecting the House and protecting the institution and protecting our Members, we want to make sure that that process works the way it was intended.

So I appreciate the support of my colleagues for this resolution.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, my love of the Constitution of the United States of America, and my hatred of unfair precedents, equals my vote against the Minority Leader's resolution.

Mr. Speaker, today, I was one of the 26 Members of Congress who voted against the privileged resolution offered by Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER. My opposition to this resolution has little to do with the serious allegations against Congressman WILLIAM JEFFERSON, and everything to do with the oath that each and every Member of Congress took in this very chamber—to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. In America, we have a Constitutional principle of innocence before being proven guilty and that no citizen shall be ''deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.'' The resolution by the Minority Leader will not allow our system of justice to work. If the system of justice is not allowed to work for a Member of Congress, for whom should the system work?

I also oppose this measure because of the horrible precedent it establishes. Instead of illustrating and penalizing those instances of law breaking and working toward establishing higher standards for all Members of Congress, the Minority Leader's resolution puts the behavior of one individual under a microscope. Instead of seeking an opportunity to improve the behavior of all Members of Congress, this resolution makes the political low blow of focusing on the behavior of one.

Members of Congress certainly know, or should know, that the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, also known as the Ethics Committee, has traditionally deferred criminal matters to the Department of Justice. This makes perfect sense. The Department of Justice will carry out an investigation, offer a platform for the proving of innocence or guilt, and allows the adjudication of

citizens before their peers. The resolution offered by the Majority Leader allows this process to occur, and upon its conclusion, for Congress to then make a decision based on the merit of the facts. The Minority Leader's resolution reaches a conclusion before the facts have even come to court. Indeed, it reaches a conclusion before Congressman JEFFERSON is even formally arraigned.

The disrespect this resolution has for our Constitution that we have all sworn to uphold and defend by not allowing our system of justice to work its will; the absolute terrible precedent this resolution makes in establishing guilt based not on facts but politics; and by focusing on only one Member of Congress instead of seeking to reform or address the behavior of all Members of Congress, are the reasons why I cast my vote against this measure.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. BOEHNER. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO RESPOND TO THE INDICTMENT OF ANY MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 451) directing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to respond to the indictment of, or the filing of charges of criminal conduct in a court of the United States or any State against, any Member of the House of Representatives by empaneling an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations not later than 30 days after the date the Member is indicted or the charges are filed.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 451

Whereas on June 4, 2007, Representative William Jefferson was indicted on 16 criminal counts by a grand jury in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia;

Whereas recent credible media accounts indicate that the Department of Justice is investigating the conduct of other Members of the House of Representatives, and these investigations may lead to further indictments;

Whereas the One Hundred Tenth Congress, in its first day of session, strengthened the rules concerning the ethical behavior of Members of the House;

Whereas the House has approved on an overwhelming and bipartisan basis H.R. 2316, the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007, to establish strict standards and penalties concerning the relationship between lobbyists and Members; and

Whereas these actions by the One Hundred Tenth Congress demonstrate that illegal, unethical, or inappropriate conduct by Members of the House will not be tolerated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That whenever a Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, is indicted or otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct in a court of the United States or any State, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall, not later than 30 days after the date of such indictment or charge—

(1) empanel an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations; or

(2) if the Committee does not empanel an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations, submit a report to the House describing its reasons for not empaneling such an investigative subcommittee, together with the actions, if any, the Committee has taken in response to the allegations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Speaker, the minority leader, in closing on the resolution that will be voted on in a short time, correctly observed that every Member of the House needs to be held accountable for conduct which undermines the faith, respect and confidence that the American public has in this institution. We agree with that. In fact, we have been saying that for years and we have acted to effect that objective. This resolution, we believe, furthers that effort.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, what this resolution says, it directs the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to respond to an indictment of or the filing of charges of criminal conduct in a court of the United States of any State against any Member of the House by empaneling an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations not later than 30 days after the date the Member is indicted or charges are filed.

As I said in my statement with reference to the previous resolution, this will be a general process of the House so that every Member knows that this process will be employed, not on a partisan basis, but on the basis of conduct and on the basis of actions that have been taken.

It also says, however, to the committee that if they find that such an investigative committee, under the circumstances that the bipartisan committee reviews, do not feel that going forward is appropriate, they can report that back. That, I think, responds to the concerns properly raised by the gentleman from California. This resolution under this suspension is the general of what the other resolution is on the specifics.

Mr. Speaker, I said that NANCY BOYDA from the State of Kansas came here and offered legislation which essentially said that if Members were found guilty of a crime that adversely affected their service in the Congress of the United States, that their pensions would be at risk. That legislation was overwhelmingly adopted. I congratulate the gentlelady from Kansas for her focus on ensuring the ethics of this body and that the public is not subsidizing criminal or unethical behavior which subjects a Member to removal.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume in support of the suspension to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA).

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last November, voters charged a new congressional majority with a clear mandate: End the scandals and clean up Congress. At first, we embraced the voters' charge. The Democratic majority passed an ethics reform package that banned Members from accepting gifts from lobbyists, we blocked Representatives from flying on corporate jets, and we prevented Congressmen from pressuring private businesses to hire or fire for political reasons.

Now the time has come for another step, and our actions in the next days will determine the strength of our resolve. Did we mean it last November when we said we would change Congress, or were our words just mere election-year slogans?

If we meant what we said, then it is clear what must happen next. First, the House Ethics Committee must launch investigations into public reports of congressional corruption, including accusations that Mr. WILLIAM JEFFERSON committed crimes such as racketeering, soliciting bribes and money laundering. This committee must investigate. No excuses and no delays. And if the Ethics Committee proves unable to complete this, its most basic responsibility, then Congress must create a more independent Ethics Committee, capable of the initiative and oversight that the American people deserve.

But that isn't enough. Although Mr. JEFFERSON should and must enjoy the presumption of innocence granted to all American defendants, as a Member of Congress he has a special pact with the American people. If Mr. JEFFERSON left Congress today, if he were to resign today, as I know many of us wish that he would, then tomorrow he will begin drawing a Federal pension for his service in Congress. According to the National Taxpayers Union, that pension will exceed $40,000 a year.

This, and I mean this word literally, is an outrage. Taxpayers should not fund the pensions of Members of Congress who had to resign or have resigned in disgrace, and Congress has the responsibility to end this state of affairs.

We must strip the pensions of any Member of Congress who commits a major Federal crime while in office. I offered a bill, the Pensions Forfeiture Act, to do precisely that, and it passed the House of Representatives earlier this year. A similar bill has passed the Senate, and now it must be sent to the floor as a reconciled bill that we can finally send to the President.

Let's not permit committee delays or needless procedure to interfere one more day with real, meaningful ethics reform. Let's pass the Pensions Forfeiture Act into law, and, what's more, let's end the revolving door. Let's establish an independent ethics commission, and let's begin to rebuild the trust of the American people.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, but I have to say that I am very, very troubled that we are where we are.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, my very good friend from Detroit, Mr. CONYERS, on the floor. Just before we adjourned for the Memorial Day break, he and I were in a lengthy exchange, both upstairs in the Rules Committee and then here on the House floor dealing with the issue of lobbying reform, and I was very pleased that Mr. CONYERS supported an amendment that I offered dealing with disclosure of post-employment plans for Members. It was a very thoughtful process. Concern had been raised about that, and Mr. CONYERS was very, very generous in looking at that issue, in dealing responsibly with it, and accepting the amendment that I proposed to that issue.

When we were in the midst of debate, and I will have to say when he stood there, I was somewhat concerned over the fact that we saw gross politicization from some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who have continued to try to make campaign speeches on this issue of lobbying and ethics reform, talking about the message that was sent last November.

We all know that the American people want an institution, a United States House of Representatives, that is above reproach. We all know that Members of this institution should in fact be held to the highest possible standards.

But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, what troubles me about where we are at this moment. I just today looked at a report that was issued on the great new openness and the way this institution has been run and how dramatically improved it is. And then we are given, with this resolution, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, a very, very poorly drafted resolution. That is the reason that we have a referral process.

In the 109th Congress, we had many, many issues that we had to address. And original jurisdiction matters that were referred to the Committee on Rules in fact were addressed in hearings, were addressed in markups, and in fact were resolved.

We listened to colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, talk about all of these great reforms that were implemented on the opening day of the 110th Congress and these great changes that have taken place. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that we also have been spending time in the 110th Congress cleaning up the poorly worded, messy language that we dealt with.

One example: In a rule that was passed by this House we self-executed a provision which actually allowed Members to once again attend charitable events. In the opening day rules package that was put into place on this issue, Mr. Speaker, there was a provision that actually denied Members, it denied Members, the opportunity to attend charitable events.

Now, that was rectified. But I use that one example, Mr. Speaker, to point to the fact that if we had handled this issue the way Mr. CONYERS had handled the issue of lobbying ethics reform, which we supported in a bipartisan way, we would not be dealing with a resolution that creates the potential, Mr. Speaker, for Members of this House who face a traffic ticket, Members who might want to protest, as I said earlier in my remarks, at the Sudanese Embassy over policies that are taking place there.

What it would mean, Mr. Speaker, is under this resolution, a Member who gets a traffic ticket, gets a ticket for littering, is arrested for protesting at the Sudanese Embassy, that that would have to be referred to the Committee on Standards.

My friend has just said there is a provision in here, it is the last line, item 2 in the ''resolved'' clause, which says if the committee does not empanel an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations, submit a report to the House describing its reasons for not empaneling such an investigative subcommittee, together with the actions, if any, the committee has taken in response to the allegation.

So, Mr. Speaker, this very, very poorly crafted resolution basically does state that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct does in fact have to deal with this, even if they choose, because it was a protest or a traffic ticket or a littering ticket, they still have to deal with this issue by choosing not to empanel an investigative committee to address that.

Now, our new colleague from Kansas stood up and very proudly talked about the fact that she is dealing with this issue of pension reform. We all want to do everything that we can to make sure that Members don't have the taxpayers subsidizing these pensions of criminals, people who are imprisoned.

□ 1900

We know there was concern raised about family members, but I will say there is nothing in this resolution that we are debating right now, Mr. Speaker, that addresses the issue of ensuring that criminals who have served in this institution are not going to continue to benefit from their pensions. In this very unique case, Mr. Speaker, I will say that we are very troubled over the fact that there are co-conspirators involved in this charge; and, Mr. Speaker, they are in fact family members who potentially could become the beneficiaries of this pension.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will say again I am going to vote in favor of this resolution, but I am very, very troubled about the way it has been worded. I am very troubled over the fact that it was not referred to the Rules Committee of which I am privileged to serve as the ranking minority member. I think this is a very poor way of doing business.

Our Republican leader came forward with an appropriate privileged resolution which simply called for the Ethics Committee to expeditiously take action. We have had to wait for nearly half a year without any action whatsoever being taken to follow up on the action that was taken in the 109th Congress.

I believe everyone should in fact be deemed innocent until proven guilty beyond a shadow of a doubt. I believe that as we look at this, though, it is imperative that we have action taken as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Texas, Judge GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office and was so encouraged to hear the majority leader earlier say, as I understood it, unethical conduct would be pursued no matter where, no matter who. And, of course, we just recently had an allegation by MIKE ROGERS regarding unethical conduct, and the majority leader moved to table that action in that pursuit.

We know the majority leader to be an honorable man. I am deeply encouraged that apparently if Mr. ROGERS will remake that resolution or motion, this time the majority leader would not move to table it, would not marshal forces to stop the pursuit of alleged unethical conduct, and we can get this body on track. And I am greatly gratified.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE), who comes to the Congress replacing Mr. Ney because the people wanted honest representation.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this issue.

I rise today to support this resolution. In order to restore the integrity to this Chamber and restore America's faith in its elected officials, we must continue to undertake substantive action with regard to ethics reform.

This Congress has made huge strides in reforming itself and cleaning up Washington, as our majority leader alluded to earlier this evening, but there

is still more to be done. Our actions today will not only enhance the most fundamental principles of a democratic society, they will remind our constituents that we are a body of the people, and not above the people.

Simply put, when a Member of Congress is indicted, there should, as a matter of course, be an immediate ethics investigation.

Coming from a district whose previous Congressman became mired and then consumed by scandal, my fellow district residents and I understand all too well the perils associated with weak and loosely monitored ethics regulations. We have suffered the frustration, disappointment, and anger associated with a betrayal. We suffered from not having a Member of Congress available to attend the needs of the citizens of our district.

But we are not alone. Other districts have suffered similar tragedies, and that is inexcusable and unconscionable. The people that we serve in this body deserve a Member of Congress that is committed to representing their needs, and we cannot afford to wait any longer in addressing this issue.

The time to act is now. As Members of Congress, we have an extraordinary burden to those who have bestowed this great honor upon us. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure.

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

I would like to once again engage in a colloquy with my very good friend from Maryland, the distinguished majority leader, if I might.

As we are standing here today, I will say, unfortunately, on the House floor this has become sort of the Rules Committee original jurisdiction process. We are now doing it on the House floor because a decision was made by the majority leadership to prevent the Rules Committee from having an opportunity to even consider this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if I might just pretend as if this is a committee hearing and assume that the distinguished Chair has yielded time to me, I would like to inquire of the author of the resolution as to whether or not it is the intent to have Members of this institution who might possibly be engaging in a very, very great protest over which they feel very strongly and they are arrested, I would like to inquire is it the intention of the author of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, to have that measure, have that Member, referred with a potential huge, huge legal fee, $450 to $1,000 an hour, to action taken by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct?

And, similarly, I ask whether or not it is the intent of the author of the resolution to have the measure if someone, a Member of this House, gets a traffic ticket and they have to face a legal challenge there, if it is their intent that the issue of a Member's traffic ticket be referred to the Ethics Committee so the Ethics Committee can decide whether or not they want to empanel an investigative group to look at this, or choose to waive it. Or, as I said earlier, for littering or any other small instance.

My concern with this very poorly crafted resolution, my concern, Mr. Speaker, is we will see a situation whereby Members are faced with that kind of challenge.

I would be happy to yield to my friend to have him respond if that is the intent of his legislation here.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question.

What the resolution anticipates is applying generally that which the resolution offered by the minority leader raises specifically because we believe that the Ethics Committee ought to ensure for the American public that ethical conduct which does not call in question the House of Representatives' standards of official conduct is being pursued.

But I will tell the gentleman further that I have great confidence in this Ethics Committee, led by a former member of the judiciary, I might add, who knows the law and who knows process. And I have full confidence that she and the Members of the Ethics Committee on both sides, and, as the gentleman knows, it is five Republicans and five Democrats, would summarily have a form available to them that would say if someone gets a traffic ticket that is not subject to further action. You and I would agree with that without hesitation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Mr. HOYER. I wanted to fully answer the gentleman's question in this committee hearing we are having.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did say and he talked about the great colleagues we have who serve on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and he did refer to the fact that this measure and the concern over a traffic ticket would, in fact, have to be referred to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. So I am inferring from that that it is the gentleman's intent that a measure like a traffic ticket or a protest at the Sudanese Embassy is to be referred to the Committee on Standards.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield for a very specific response to that.

Mr. DREIER. Sure. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, a traffic ticket is a charge, not a conviction. It is a de minimus charge that I think the committee would summarily deal with.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say if the gentleman were to read the resolution which he has authored, he would see there is no specificity. And, in fact, it is very possible, it is very possible that if we pass this legislation, we would be in a position where the Committee on Standards would be forced to deal with the issue of a traffic ticket, a protest, a littering ticket or any measure like that. My only question of the gentleman was that in fact his intent. He said this was authored in response to the Republican measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I would say to the gentleman, the intent of the resolution I think is clear. And that is to say when charges are made, and the gentleman tries to bring up de minimus charges that no American would think violates the ethics of the House of Representatives or essentially major transgressions.

I think the Ethics Committee, if that was brought before them pursuant to this resolution, would deal with them summarily as not being worthy of consideration as you and I would deem them not worth of consideration.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the only point I am trying to make to my very good friend from Maryland is that this is a measure that clearly should have been referred to the Committee on Rules. The gentleman has on three occasions talked about the intent, the intent of his legislation.

This is drafted. We are about to vote on it. Why is there not specificity as to how Members are treated when dealing with an issue like of a traffic ticket juxtaposed to the 16 counts we are dealing with in the case of Mr. JEFFERSON?

There is not clarity in this measure, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is very important for us to recognize that if we are in fact in this House with a great new sense of openness and a greater deliberative nature, this is a sad commentary on where we are. As I said in my remarks, everyone wants to talk about and is a proponent of holding this institution to high ethical standards. This is not a partisan issue. Unfortunately, it was used as a very partisan issue in last November's election.

But as we have found, there are problems of corruption on both sides of the aisle. It seems to me that as we deal with an issue that is as important as holding this institution to the highest possible ethical standards, Mr. Speaker, it is very important for us to do it right.

Unfortunately, and again, while I am going to vote for this resolution, I think it was very, very poorly crafted. I think we as an institution, Mr. Speaker, can do much, much better than we did with this.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, clearly what the gentleman is trying to do in a debating framework is trying to say we didn't mention every specific instance,

whether very serious, moderately serious, or extraordinarily serious.

The gentleman is correct. I have responded to the gentleman that the Ethics Committee clearly, we believe, can make those judgments; and we believe and are confident that the committee will make such judgments and will not treat de minimus assertions as seriously calling for investigative subcommittees or further action by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the bribery and corruption charges against Congressman JEFFERSON are serious. They go to the very heart of our ability as a representative government to do its job. It is fundamental that the people trust their elected representatives to act in the people's interest, not in their own. The very appearance that these allegations create is damaging to the image of this institution.

In the coming days, Congressman JEFFERSON will answer in a court of law to the 16 charges on which he was indicted. Congressman JEFFERSON is entitled to the presumption of innocence in the allegations against him, including bribery, racketeering, money laundering and obstruction of justice.

However, the Congress should be held to the highest standards. Earlier today, I called for the Ethics Committee to initiate its own investigation into the charges against Congressman JEFFERSON.

I support this resolution which calls for the automatic initiation of an Ethics Committee investigation when a Member of this body is indicted or formally charged with criminal conduct. This principle applies not just to Congressman JEFFERSON but to any Member of this House.

In the opening days of this Congress, I rose on the floor in support of a tough new ethics package.

□ 1915

I said then that Members of Congress should be held to the highest regard by the people they represent. Illegal, unethical or inappropriate conduct by Members of the House cannot be tolerated.

I was elected to this Congress to help change the way we do business in Washington, and I will continue to do so without regard to person or party.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side of the debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my friend from Maryland would be very generous. Most of the time that I yielded was for his very thoughtful explanations as we were going through what I consider to be the Rules Committee hearing process here.

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

Mr. DREIER. Well, 5 minutes, actually I'm going to reserve the time. If the gentleman would like to answer on his own time, the gentleman has twice as much time as I have. We have requests, and we are trying to get through the entire Rules Committee hearing here in a matter of 15 minutes. It's going to be a challenge for us, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman reserve the balance of his time?

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

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman from Maryland has many people who are very interested in speaking on this issue, and I will have to yield to them and use the time to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader, and I rise in support of this resolution. Ethics reform must be more than rhetorical. It simply must be real. I, like many of my colleagues, came to Congress with a promise that corruption should not be tolerated from either party. This is not about partisan politics, but this is rather about upholding strong ethical standards.

I was extremely disappointed to hear that another Member of Congress was indicted on such serious charges and this is not something that we can take lightly. A Member of Congress under such serious charges really should think long and hard about whether or not they can remain in Congress.

This is truly about justice, about doing the right things for the Member of Congress and for the Member of Congress' constituents.

Should the Member, in fighting these allegations, think hard about stepping down? Can the Member truly defend himself or herself and adequately represent the constituents of his or her district?

This is something I think that people under indictment should consider, as well I would encourage Mr. JEFFERSON to take this under advisement and encourage him to step down.

I rise in support of this resolution. Ethics Reform must be more than rhetorical—it must be real. I came to Congress with a promise that corruption should not be tolerated from either party. This is not about partisan politics; it is about upholding strong ethical standards.

I was extremely disappointed to hear that another Member of Congress is indicted on such serious charges and this is not something that can be taken lightly. A Member of Congress under serious indictment does not belong in the United States House of Representatives.

It is my hope that this situation with Congressman JEFFERSON can be resolved quickly and judiciously. However, given the serious allegations and ethical issues the indictment presents, I call on Congressman JEFFERSON to resign from the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to reserve the balance of my time, and I really, really look forward to continuing our Rules Committee hearing process with my friend, the majority leader, after we have our line of very thoughtful speeches being made by our friends on the other side of the aisle. He said he had a whole lot of them, so I'm going to reserve my time if I might, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. He will observe that our speakers have all been from districts where this was a compelling issue in the November election, and that is why they are so interested in speaking about it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, my position is similar to that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I had the opportunity the last 2 days to be down in the gulf coast, to be in New Orleans today, and quite frankly, Mr. JEFFERSON is entitled to a presumption of innocence. That is the way of our judicial system and our code in this country.

Mr. Speaker, first, I rise in support of this resolution. An investigation needs to be conducted. We need to have the Ethics Committee take a look at this.

But I would also suggest to this House that when someone, anyone, is under indictment, it's a difficult position for him to do justice to himself or herself and to also do justice for their particular district, and those concerns were raised by people in New Orleans today, as well as in the newspaper.

So, as with Mr. CARNEY, I would suggest that the Ethics Committee take a good long look at this, that Mr. JEFFERSON obviously is going to take a good long look. I would suggest that he do justice to himself, prepare his defense, and that his district have someone else.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes, with the possibility of an additional minute, to my good friend from the State of Florida, Mr. TIM MAHONEY.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, no party's immune from corruption. Democrats and Republicans alike share the blame for outrageous ethical lapses that have occurred in Congress. In order to rebuild the trust of the American people and restore integrity to this great House, it is clear that we need to change the way ethics rules are enforced.

While I am pleased that the House will consider legislation tonight to strengthen enforcement of ethics rules, I would like to reiterate the need to create an independent ethics office.

We need independent ethics enforcement to prevent the kind of rampant corruption that was condoned in the last Congress and hold all Members accountable for questionable and illegal behavior.

Creating an independent ethics office with the authority to blow the whistle

on questionable behavior would introduce the impartiality and accountability that has been missing from the enforcement of House ethics rules. It would depoliticize ethics enforcement and get the fox out of the hen house once and for all.

We have seen the costs of corruption. It erodes the trust of the American people, hurts our constituents and damages our ability to solve the critical challenges facing our great Nation.

In order to offer real solutions to the many challenges facing our country, we need a solid foundation. I'm committed to supporting efforts to hold all Members of Congress to higher standards of ethics and integrity, but it is time for this body to listen to the will of the American people and establish once and for all an independent ethics office.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my very good friend, the distinguished majority leader, how many speakers he has remaining on his side?

Mr. HOYER. I think that we are concluded with our speakers and I will close.

Mr. DREIER. Okay. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I'd like to during this period of time engage my friend in a colloquy.

And let me say as we begin this process, that I'm very troubled that we have this 40 minutes of debate, and we are in a position right now where we had to hear a whole line of campaign speeches that were, as the gentleman from Maryland said, a very important part of last November's process, the election, and we had to listen to those speeches again rather than trying to clean up this very, very poorly crafted legislation.

Now, I asked my friend to yield earlier, and he refused to yield to me, Mr. Speaker. And as I made that request, I was struck with the fact that the report that was just issued today continued to talk about this great sense of civility, openness and bipartisanship that exists in this institution. So I will say that I was somewhat troubled by that.

Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that the distinguished majority leader has another speaker from which we're going to hear, and before I engage in my colloquy with him, and I hope he might be generous with whatever time is remaining so that we can try to clean up this legislation or at least the intents of it, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we believe this resolution is well-crafted, and it's well-crafted to effect the end that it seeks. And the end that it seeks is very simple, that when issues are raised, the Ethics Committee will pursue them and that they will give confidence to the American public that we are taking seriously the allegations and/or the transgressions that might undermine the integrity of this House.

We think that's what the American people want. That's what we are pursuing. We think this legislation is very clear on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND).

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

I rise today to speak on the issue of ethics. This body must focus its attentions on ethics and accountability. In the last election, the American people demanded such, and I think this resolution offered by Mr. HOYER is something that will begin to address that concern.

The Ethics Committee must begin to respond to allegations of wrongdoing by this House. I think a mandatory 30-day return time makes an extraordinary amount of sense.

As a member of the freshman class who cares a lot about ethics and accountability, we also hope to eventually have an independent ethics counsel which will also provide recommendations to the House Ethics Committee.

I think this is the first step in the progress of making sure that the American people can begin to have faith and confidence in its government and its elected leaders.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

As we've been sitting here listening to what frankly have been a flow of campaign speeches, we've been trying to sort of study and analyze and scrutinize what the majority leader, for whom I have highest regard, describes as well-crafted legislation.

So I'm going to with the remaining time that I have continue to try and inquire about this legislation which should have been referred to the Rules Committee, that should have been an original jurisdiction hearing.

A question that has just come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, and I would be happy to yield to my friend for an answer on this, is whether or not a Member who conceivably receives a traffic ticket, and again, the language here says, ''be it Resolved, That whenever a Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, is indicted or otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct.''

Now, my question to my friend would be, if a Member were to get a speeding ticket, and I was just informed by one of our crack staff people here who is aware of the fact that in the State of Virginia, if someone exceeds the speed limit by 10 miles an hour, they could be out here on the George Washington Parkway, there is in fact a criminal charge leveled against them. If that were to happen to a Member, is that Member under this resolution that we are going to be voting on compelled to actually inform the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct that that person faces that criminal charge?

And I'd be happy to yield to the majority leader to clarify this bit of confusion that we have in this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

My friend continues to focus on traffic tickets. He tries to—

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, when the gentleman says I'm just focusing on traffic tickets, if in fact someone is arrested for a protest at the Sudanese Embassy, is it the intent that that Member be compelled to inform the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of this action?

These are the questions we want to have answered, and I'm underscoring, Mr. Speaker, the fact that there is a lot of confusion about this resolution. I'm happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a short resolution. The gentleman may not think it's well-written, but nor has he well-read it. There is nothing in there that says the Member is compelled to do anything.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, that is the reason we need to have that clarified. Let me read the resolution on which we're about to vote.

It says, ''otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct.'' That is the language that is here. If that happens, then the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is expected to take action, whether or not they choose to empanel an investigative committee or choose to waive it. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is compelled to take action, whether it be a traffic ticket, an arrest at the Sudanese Embassy or a littering ticket.

And I'm happy to yield to my friend if he wants to further clarify the confusion and explain to us what ''otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct'' is, and Mr. Speaker, the reason I'm doing this is to simply underscore the fact that this measure should have been referred to the Committee on Rules so that we could have held an original jurisdiction and done what we've already had to do in this Congress so far, and that is clean up on issues like the charitable events attending, we had to clean that up

through a self-executed measure in a rule that was passed last month.

□ 1930

That's why we have a chance to do it. I believe it should be done.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will tell the gentleman that this resolution that we are now considering does not seek to trivialize the issue. I suggest that the gentleman is trying to trivialize this issue. This issue does not deal with traffic tickets.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, I am not trivializing. I am not trivializing this issue at all.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman wants an answer, then he ought to give me the time to answer.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am not trivializing this issue at all. There is nothing trivial about this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. My time has expired? Will the gentleman from Maryland yield me time to respond?

Mr. HOYER. How much time do I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOYER. I yield the gentleman from California 1 minute.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say there is absolutely nothing trivial about this issue. We are here on the floor because of the fact that we have faced a very serious attack with an indictment against one of our colleagues. That Member happens to be a Democrat.

We have all discussed the fact that this is a bipartisan issue, and there is a goal to ensure that this institution is held to the highest possible ethical standards. We have before us a resolution, which, based on my experience in this House, is very poorly crafted. It is a resolution which creates the potential for all kinds of havoc.

I have been spending the last 40 minutes making a feeble attempt at trying to create some kind of legislative history as to how Members of this institution in the future are going to be treated, as our friends on other side of the aisle have rushed to the floor and tried to politicize this very, very important substantive issue.

They have done it. They have done it through the campaign process last fall, and I believe that we need to do what we can to put this measure before the Committee on Rules so we can, in fact, have a decent hearing on it.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is welcome.

The pain of accountability is evident. What this resolution says, and I am pleased that the gentleman from California is going to vote for it, is that the American people are going to have confidence that when a criminal act is committed by a Member, whatever that act, that the Ethics Committee will look at it.

I said earlier in the course of this debate that I have full confidence that the Ethics Committee will dismiss summarily, summarily, the examples that the gentleman from California raises. That's not what the American public are concerned about.

Yes, perhaps it's politicized. But when Duke Cunningham takes $2.5 million of bribes to put earmarks in bills and calls the Defense Department and says, give Mr. Wade a contract, the American people knows that's something they want looked at. They want action taken. That Member was not expelled until conviction.

When Mr. Abramoff takes trips with a lot of people to Scotland for free, the American people knows that's not a traffic ticket. It's not demonstrating in front of the Embassy of Sudan to say stop the genocide in Darfur. The American public knows the difference.

When a gentleman gets $5,000 in chips to put in his pocket and pay his bills with, they know that's not a traffic ticket, particularly when legislative action is taken shortly thereafter on this floor. They know the difference.

I would hope that every Member would vote for this, because I believe that every Member in this House wants an ethical House, Republican and Democrat. Why? Because unethical conduct, yes, criminal conduct, reflects on every one of us, because the American public too readily assumes, well, if one does it, all do it.

That is not the case. I believe that I am privileged to serve with those of you on the Republican side and those on the Democratic side with some very ethical members of our society who have been chosen by your neighbors to represent them in this body.

All we are saying in this resolution is that, ladies and gentlemen of America, we are going to hold accountable each and every one of us if we do not act in accordance with your justifiably high expectations. I hope every Member of this body votes for this resolution and says to our constituents, this body will be an ethical, honest body representing your interest.

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. HOYER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 451.

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. HOYER. 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 questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 397, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 422, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 430, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 451, by the yeas and nays; adoption of H. Res. 452, 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.

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE IN ESTONIA AND ATTACKS ON ESTONIA'S EMBASSIES IN 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 397, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 397, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge

Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Baca
Becerra
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hunter
Jefferson
Meehan
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

□ 2007

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO STOP GENOCIDE AND VIOLENCE IN DARFUR, SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 422, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 422.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Baca
Becerra
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Hobson

Holden
Holt
Hunter
Jefferson
Knollenberg
McNerney
Meehan
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2014

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN TO RELEASE DR. HALEH ESFANDIARI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 430, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 430, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Baca
Becerra
Braley (IA)
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Holden
Holt
Hunter
Jefferson
Manzullo
Meehan
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2022

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: A resolution ''calling for Iran to immediately release five dual Iranian-American citizens currently being held unjustly.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 428, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

WELCOMING COLE RODGERS

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we are very, very privileged tonight to have a guest on the floor. Little Cole Rodgers is here with his mother, Representative CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO RESPOND TO THE INDICTMENT OF ANY MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 451, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 451.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 10, answered ''present'' 15, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

YEAS—387

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
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
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—10

Clay
Conyers
Doolittle
Filner
LaTourette
McDermott
Nadler
Stark
Whitfield
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—15

Barrett (SC)
Bonner
Brown, Corrine
Delahunt
Doyle
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (WA)
Jones (OH)
Kline (MN)
McCaul (TX)
Roybal-Allard
Schakowsky
Waters

NOT VOTING—20

Baca
Becerra
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Holden
Holt
Hunter
Jefferson
Meehan
Murtha
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2030

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 452, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 26, answered ''present'' 13, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—26

Bishop (GA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Davis (IL)
Doolittle
Ellison
Filner
Gutierrez
Honda
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick
LaTourette
Lee
McDermott
Nadler
Rohrabacher
Rush
Schakowsky
Stark
Stupak
Thompson (MS)
Whitfield
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—13

Barrett (SC)
Bonner
Delahunt
Doyle
Engel
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Kline (MN)
McCaul (TX)
Roybal-Allard
Waters

NOT VOTING—20

Baca
Becerra
Cantor
Cooper
Hastings (FL)
Holden
Holt
Hunter
Jefferson
Meehan
Murtha
Myrick
Paul
Payne
Pickering
Reyes
Tancredo
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2037

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2446, AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM AND SECURITY SUPPORT ACT OF 2007

Ms. SUTTON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–174) on the resolution (H. Res. 453) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE CRAIG THOMAS, A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 454) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 454

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 40

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 40, which was added by the sponsor without my permission.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING HUNGER AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Hunger Awareness Day.

Each day millions of our fellow Americans will go to bed hungry. In my home State of Washington, around 95,000 families suffer from hunger. Each day, approximately 300,000 families in Washington State are forced to choose between putting food on the table and paying their bills. Worst of all, 39 percent of those served by Washington's largest hunger relief agency are children.

In the wealthiest and most agriculture-rich nation in this world, this is simply unacceptable. As Americans, we all must do our part to make sure everyone in our communities, young and old, get enough to eat.

In my district, organizations like the Boys and Girls Club of Monroe, Washington, are using today to hold food drives and benefit dinners to support local food banks. Many organizations across the State and Nation are doing their part to fight the hunger epidemic. We need to match their efforts in Congress.

So as Congress works to reauthorize the farm bill this year, we need to make sure that Federal anti-hunger programs and emergency food assistance programs get the resources they need. I want to thank our local leaders in Washington State and across the country for their work fighting hunger, and I call on my colleagues in Congress to join their efforts.

CONGRATULATING THE CLEVELAND CAVALIERS ON WINNING THE NBA EASTERN CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to all my colleagues, I want you to join me in saying congratulations, Cleveland Cavaliers, Eastern Conference champions. Come on now.

It is such a wonderful experience for the great City of Cleveland to have an opportunity to have a team like the Cleveland Cavaliers, to be led by ''King'' Lebron James. We are so excited, because, Cleveland, we needed a boost, and we got a boost in our basketball team, and we ask you to turn us on, because we will turn you up.

Cleveland Cavaliers, Eastern Conference champions.

THE LAST GAVEL

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, pending before this body June 5, 1941, Mr. Speaker, was a debate on the war in Europe. Everyone listened as Representative John Elliott of Mississippi delivered yet another unfortunate anti-Semitic diatribe. Not even the events of Hitler's rise to power stopped him. Not even knowing there were six Jewish Members of the House stopped him.

When he was done, New York Congressman Mike Edelstein jumped to his feet and responded to this diatribe of anti-Semitism and he said the following words: ''I deplore the idea that men in this House attempt to use the Jews as their scapegoat. I say it is unfair and I say it is un-American. All men are created equal, regardless of race, creed or color, and whether a man be Jew or Gentile, he may think what he deems fit.''

Those were the words of Mike Edelstein, June 5, 1941. He left this podium, went into the Speaker's Lobby and died of a heart attack, and I wanted to recognize this on the anniversary of his passing.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

□ 2045

HONORING PARREN MITCHELL

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise a great man, a former Member of Congress, a former colleague of many who are still here, Parren Mitchell of Maryland.

Today, with the Maryland delegation, our distinguished majority leader, along with ELIJAH CUMMINGS, gave the eulogy today with both Senators present, the Governor of the State, the mayor of the city, all of the clergy, not all but a representation of it, and family and friends of this great man, Parren Mitchell.

Many Members of Congress who still serve here served with Parren, and they know he was a champion for economic and social justice.

Mr. Speaker, I want the rest of our colleagues to know about the Mitchell family. They were in the forefront of the civil rights movement; and, as a native Baltimorean, I knew full well the quality of their leadership and the extent of their effectiveness.

Parren Mitchell was a part of that leadership. He came to the Congress in 1971. He was the first African American from Maryland to serve in the Congress and the first African American since 1898 to come to the Congress from south of the Mason-Dixon line. So he made history when he came here, and he was a fighter who made progress while he was here. He was a pioneer and patriot. He fought for our country on the battlefields of Europe. He received the Purple Heart. He fought in the civil rights movement, and then fought here on the floor of the Congress until he decided to leave Congress.

It was wonderful to hear his nephew speak about him, and other representatives of the family speak about him, as an uncle and a friend and a mentor.

It was wonderful to hear the clergy speak of him as a child of the church, a truly religious person who brought his religion and his faith into public service.

It was wonderful to hear the elected officials sing his praises as ones who had learned from him, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator CARDIN. They had learned from him and worked with him. Again, he was a champion for many issues.

He was a founder of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I am so happy that he lived to see five members of the Congressional Black Caucus become chairs of the full committee in the House. We have Chairman RANGEL, who will be making our economy fairer and all of the economic justice that Mr. Mitchell talked about; and Chairman CONYERS, who did speak today about bringing the civil rights movement into our Congress, into our legislation, protecting and defending our Constitution and our civil liberties.

So it was a happy occasion, although he will be greatly missed. It was a celebration of his life that was enjoyed for many hours today in St. James Episcopal Church in Baltimore, Maryland.

Congressman SARBANES was there, along with his full family, his mother and father, former Senator Paul Sarbanes, his brother, Michael, and of course a Member of Congress we are very proud of, JOHN SARBANES.

And AL WYNN was there. We almost had all of the Maryland delegation, the Democrats, that is. And the delegation is almost all Democratic, but that is for another discussion on another day. AL WYNN was there representing the area nearest Washington, DC, but close to the service of Parren Mitchell.

When I spoke at the service I said we would be gathering here tonight to talk about Parren Mitchell and his wonderful contribution to our country and that they should tune in. But I wanted to tell you tonight what we saw today, which was a community who truly respected this great man and truly loved him and who will miss him sorely.

With the passing of Parren Mitchell, our Nation has lost one of its most passionate champions of justice and equality. I offer my deepest condolences on behalf of all of my colleagues in the House to Congressman Mitchell's family, friends, and all who loved him.

Growing up in Baltimore, I learned to revere the Mitchell family for their dedication to economic and social justice. Parren, his brother Clarence, and indeed his entire family, devoted their lives to ending racism and ensuring that our Nation's bounty was shared by all of its citizens. For that, we have all benefited. That is because their advocacy brought us closer to the ideal of equality that is both America's heritage and our hope.

The story of Parren Mitchell's life tracks the progress we've made. But it also shows how much farther we must travel to truly achieve justice for all.

At age 11, Parren Mitchell understood the reality of racism at its most violent and brutal. His older brother, Clarence, a true champion of social justice in his own right, came home one day and told of having just seen the body of a man who had been murdered—lynched—in Somerset County. In that moment, Congressman Mitchell would later say, he decided to dedicate his entire life to fighting for the rights of African Americans.

Years later, in 1950, after graduating from Morgan State, the University of Maryland refused to admit Congressman Mitchell to its College Park campus, telling him that it was "inadvisable" for blacks to attend. But that injustice would not prevent Parren Mitchell from pursuing his dream. He fought back. He won his court case. And Parren Mitchell became the first African-American graduate student at the College Park campus, and earned his master's degree in sociology. Because Parren Mitchell refused to see his dream of attending graduate school denied, many more were able to pursue their own dream of a graduate education.

Then, in 1971, when first sworn in as a Member of the House, Congressman Mitchell became the first African-American Member of Congress elected from the State of Maryland. This achievement must have been tempered by the knowledge that he was the very first African-American elected to Congress from below the Mason-Dixon line since 1898. It took almost a century for a Black American from the South to find a seat here in the People's House.

Across the 85 years of Parren Mitchell's life—in his own story and the story of America—we see the slow march of progress. We celebrate today a man who made sure that, however slow at times, we continue to march in the right direction—toward peace, understanding, and justice for all.

Congressman CUMMINGS recently described Mr. Mitchell as "never concerning himself about fame or fortune but, rather, devoting himself entirely to uplifting the people he represented." That was apparent through his leadership as the first African American to chair the House Small Business Committee. There, he put into law guarantees that minority-owned business would share in public works and transportation contracts.

It is also a great testament to the leadership of Parren Mitchell that the organization he helped found—the Congressional Black Caucus—continues to serve as the conscience of the Congress and increase its ranks to the benefit of all Americans. I am sure Mr. Mitchell is looking down upon us today and that he is pleased that so many CBC members are here to honor him today.

With Congressman Mitchell's passing, we have lost a friend, a former colleague, and a passionate advocate for seeing that America's promise of freedom and equality are realized by all of our citizens. Whether in the Army, where he earned a Purple Heart, teaching at his alma mater, Morgan State, or serving his community as a social worker or a member of this body, Parren Mitchell dedicated his life to service. His loss leaves a void that we must work together to fill.

I hope it is a comfort to Congressman Mitchell's family and friends that so many people mourn their loss and are praying for them at this sad time.

REMEMBERING PARREN J. MITCHELL

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as a young man I worked on Capitol Hill for a United States Senator, along with the Speaker, Senator Daniel Brewster.

From time to time, Clarence Mitchell, Jr., one of the giants of American history in civil rights in America, would visit Senator Brewster; and I would have an opportunity to meet him. I was honored and awed to meet him. Many called him the 101st United States Senator. Clarence Mitchell, Jr., was the brother of Parren James Mitchell.

Shortly after I graduated from law school, I was honored by the citizens of my district who elected me to the State Senate. I went to the State Senate as a young man, but there was a young man 6 months younger than I. His name was Clarence Mitchell, III, Clarence Junior's son. We served together.

Over the years, I got to know very well Juanita Mitchell, an extraordinary family, an extraordinary family whose matriarch, Ms. Jackson, was an extraordinary leader in her own right.

Parren J. Mitchell was my friend. In 1981, many years after I met the Mitchell family for the first time, I ran for Congress. Juanita Mitchell and Parren Mitchell and Clarence Mitchell, III, were very helpful to me in that campaign. I represented a large African American population. They have always been very supportive of me and I of them. Parren Mitchell did a radio ad for me during the course of that campaign urging all in Prince George's County to elect me. That was a significant help, in my opinion, to my election.

He has been succeeded when he decided voluntarily to leave the Congress by two extraordinary representatives. One was Kweisi Mfume, who spoke at the funeral today; and the other was my colleague and my friend, the immediate past chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus which was founded by Parren J. Mitchell with Lou Stokes and others.

ELIJAH CUMMINGS spoke. He spoke powerfully and eloquently about the relationship that he throughout his life had with the Mitchell family and the impact that they made on him as an individual. The Mitchell family and Parren J. Mitchell in particular were extraordinary servants of the people, of our democracy, of our country.

When Parren J. Mitchell was sworn in as the first African American to represent the people of Maryland in Congress, he joined this institution at a landmark moment for equality in America. It was 1971. The Voting Rights Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1968 had already been signed into law. African Americans were making strides that once seem unimaginable; and the assassinations of leaders like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X and Robert Kennedy raised questions as to what the future of the civil rights movement would be.

Parren Mitchell. Parren Mitchell, a man who took it upon himself to not only protect the legacy of the civil rights pioneers who had come before but to build upon the progress that made it possible for him to come to Washington in the first place.

Rather than be satisfied with how far the struggle for freedom and equality had come in recent years, Parren took responsibility for moving America even further, dedicating his life to ensuring that American society reflected the values and the principles for which this great country stands.

Parren was a founding member, as I have said, of the Congressional Black Caucus, a body that has transformed the way we approach issues of social and economic justice through an understanding that unity is the key to lasting change here in the United States.

Parren fought for fairness in American workplaces and institutions of higher learning as a staunch advocate of affirmative action programs that opened the doors of opportunity to thousands of minorities. As the Speaker said today in her remarks, he was not only committed to equality but understood that equity, particularly ownership in our society, a piece of the pie, was absolutely essential as well.

Parren helped to enhance the fortunes of America's minority business community by introducing legislation ensuring that minority owned business enterprises have a fair shot at Federal contracts, a provision we see mirrored in local and State government contracting practices all over our Nation today because of the leadership and commitment of Parren Mitchell.

Parren's life was one of historic firsts, from the first African American congressman from Maryland to the first African American to receive a degree from my alma mater, the University of Maryland.

His life was also one of service, serving his country proudly and honorably as an officer in the 92nd Infantry Division during World War II and serving the people of Baltimore and our Nation as a man who would never give up fighting for what he knew to be right and just.

Coretta Scott King once said that struggle is a never-ending process, and freedom never really won; you earn it and win it in every generation.

We are all profoundly fortunate that a leader like Parren Mitchell was here to carry the torch of human progress that was passed down to his generation, and we all are profoundly grateful for his contribution to expanding the reach of civil rights and equal opportunity in America.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the life of Parren J. Mitchell, I would like to offer my sincere condolences to his family and loved ones and many friends, to express my deep gratitude for his years of service to this House, the State of Maryland and this great country.

Parren J. Mitchell was short in stature, but he was a giant of a man. He stood tall. He stood with courage, he stood with commitment, and he stood with conviction for the rights of all Americans, not just those who were African Americans but of all Americans, irrespective of who they are, what they were, where they came from, how they worshipped. He knew that equality for one was absolutely essential if there was to be equality for all. America was blessed by the service of Parren J. Mitchell.

Today we heard of the love, the respect, and the honor with which he was held by his community. I am proud to join Speaker PELOSI from his beloved city of Baltimore; ELIJAH CUMMINGS who represents that city so well today and that district that Parren represented. He would be so proud, ELIJAH, of the representation you give to the 7th Congressional District. And to JOHN SARBANES whose father served shoulder to shoulder with Parren Mitchell in this House from 1971 to 1976. He would be so proud of you, JOHN, and the role you play in representing that great city.

I was blessed, Mr. Speaker, to serve with Parren Mitchell for the time that he served and I served together. I learned from him. I am better because of him, and I miss him deeply.

□ 2100

HONORING THE MEMORY OF PARREN J. MITCHELL

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great honor this evening to talk about my good friend and mentor, former Congressman Parren Mitchell.

I said today at his memorial service that Parren Mitchell was without a doubt a man of great humility. He was a mentor of mine; and many, many years ago we came in contact with each other. One of the things that he made clear was that being in elected office is not about seeking to be a celebrity. It must be about service. He was one who made it his business to serve his constituents to the nth degree.

If you were to ride around the 7th Congressional District, much of which is in the inner city of Baltimore, you would hear people, from presidents of corporations to the folks working in the markets to the bank tellers, call him PJ. They called him PJ not out of disrespect. They called him PJ because of their love for him and because of his humble spirit.

It was not unusual for Parren Mitchell to show up at a church or show up at a funeral or show up at somebody's Eagle Scout ceremony. He was the kind of guy who spent his lifetime trying to lift up other people.

The interesting thing, too, is that he did something for African American young people that very few have been able to do. When he ran for office in 1968, he lost by about 5,000 votes. Now, in many instances, if somebody got a total of 15,000 votes, which he did, and lost by 5,000, which he did, they would give up.

Two years later, Parren Mitchell came back and in 1970 was elected by a tremendous landslide margin of 38 votes, and that was so significant for us because back then I was in high school, and it showed me that an African American could be elected to the Congress of the United States of America.

In other words, what Parren Mitchell showed us was what we thought to be impossible was possible, and since that time we have seen Kweisi Mfume come to this body, and yours truly, and we've seen African American Congressmen from all over this country, and I would venture to say that he had a tremendous impact on others, in the Hispanic community and women and

many others, who may have thought at one time it was almost impossible to come here.

And so we pay tribute to this great man. His record is clear: a staunch advocate for small business; a staunch advocate for those who have been left out; a staunch advocate for making sure that civil rights are adhered to.

And finally, let me say this, Mr. Speaker, as I summarize Parren's life in a written piece for the Afro-American newspaper, Parren Mitchell was one who built bridges to opportunities and tore down walls which caused people not to be included in this society.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CONGRESSMAN PARREN J. MITCHELL

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join others in commemorating the life and legacy of Congressman Parren J. Mitchell. Growing up in Baltimore, I came to understand the tremendous positive impact this great man had on my community, the State of Maryland and indeed this country.

The first African American Congressman from my State, Parren Mitchell fought against racism at every turn, but he fought on other fronts as well, wherever he saw injustice, and inhumanity. At his memorial service earlier today in Baltimore, we heard again and again of a man unafraid to speak truth to power.

I would like to share my own personal story of how I felt the presence of this man.

Some years ago, Congressman Mitchell was honored at the 15th anniversary of the Public Justice Center, an organization committed to building systemic change in our society.

It was an easy choice to salute Congressman Mitchell, but it was not easy for him to attend the event. He was by then quite frail, and as he was helped to the stage to receive the honor, I remember wondering whether he would have the energy to speak.

I needn't have worried. A steady and resonant voice filled the hall, and from this slightly built man, at that point in his life no longer able to stand up, came simple and powerful words of gratitude and inspiration.

He spoke at length and without hesitation about his core principles of honesty, justice and compassion. It was, Mr. Speaker, a tour de force. I can only imagine what that voice was like when it held forth in this Chamber and carried the day on so many critical issues.

Something else happened that night that is worth relating. After Congressman Mitchell finished speaking, the organization honored a young man from the community who had struggled and succeeded in overcoming unfair labor practices in his industry. That young man, looking out on a crowd of 500 people, said this: ''We need to make sure that the big corporations pay the little guy for the hard work.''

I looked at Congressman Mitchell, and I saw a smile creeping across his face. It was truth to power at its very best, all that Parren Mitchell had ever stood for.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to salute this fine American and great son of Baltimore.

TERMS OF SURRENDER

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, the United States is being invaded by millions of people from many countries throughout the world.

The invasion has taken place by land, sea and air. The rulers of some of those Nations have encouraged the invasion, by words and other methods such as providing tactical maps as to how to illegally enter the United States.

The people coming here want what the United States has. Some claim the land in the Southwest actually belongs to their native country and are retaking it. Some here are to commit lawless acts, but most are here as occupiers that have intentions of living here and reaping the benefits of the United States. No matter the reason, they are all here illegally. It is an invasion when masses of people move to someone else's country without permission.

So, we have been invaded by people from other Nations. So what do we do? Some want the invasion to stop. I am one of those. Some in the United States want the invasion to continue. And some here in the United States are indifferent.

But what about our government? Is it fighting to protect our sovereignty? Well, no. Rather than protect the United States border, the United States Federal Government is raising the white flag and has already drawn up terms of surrender. It is called the ''Grand Bargain.'' It's a plan to allow the illegal occupiers to just stay in America. The United States Government appears to take the position that it cannot stop the invasion so it will just legalize the invasion. So the occupiers will win the day and they will get to stay.

The propaganda machine of our government is trying to convince Americans that this proposal is not amnesty. The idea is to change the meaning of the word ''amnesty.'' Sort of a new take on what definition of ''is'' is. The political propaganda people are trying to convince Americans it is better to surrender to the occupiers than to prevent illegals from coming across our borders, but it's still amnesty.

Even though I was a judge in Texas for over 20 years, you don't have to have a law degree to know that amnesty means forgiveness or pardon. To give you an example, if somebody trespasses on your land or is a squatter on your land, as some people call it, if that person is caught and they pay a fine but they get to remain on your property, it's still trespassing, and if they get to remain on your property, even paying a fee, it is amnesty.

Trespassers are required to leave when caught, no matter how long they have been trespassing on somebody else's property. This has been the law of nations for thousands of years. But our government's going to legalize trespassing and let squatters stay whether Americans and legal immigrants like it or not.

Make no mistake. This plan, or treaty of capitulation, lets the illegal occupiers stay here. It's cold hard amnesty. The Feds have their priorities wrong.

When a Nation is invaded, the duty of government is to stop the invasion. That is the first duty of our government, to defend, protect and secure the Nation. We protect the borders of other nations, but we don't protect our own. Our government has not protected the border but talks about legalizing the illegals. In other words, agree to the invasion and give in to the demands of the occupiers. And this is absurd. This is surrender.

The first answer to an invasion is to defend the land, seal the border. Stop the people from coming here and don't give in to them. Simply stop the invasion.

It's in the best interest of America that the government realizes there's a border war going on, and rather than surrender the government needs to get on the right side of the border war, the American side, and stop the invasion. Secure the border, then decide what to do with the people that are here illegally. But if the border's not protected, more occupiers will continue to come here illegally, and our government will continue to be missing in action.

And that's just the way it is.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN IRAQ

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, there is hardly anyone asking the right question at this time, and it is whether the U.S. involvement in Iraq will end as it did in Vietnam or last forever as it has in Korea. Last week, the President declared his intention to keep America in Iraq forever. That's a sure sign the President's been talking to the Vice President again.

Iraq looks nothing like Korea did in 1952. There is no DMZ and no 38th parallel separating the opposing forces. In Iraq, the war is everywhere. In Korea, the DMZ is one of South Korea's most popular tourist destinations, with buses hauling people back and forth. It's so popular you have to book the

trip weeks in advance. It costs $42, by the way, and that's without lunch.

At the DMZ, you can visit the small building where an armistice was signed, and risk stepping across a painted line on the floor separating North and South Korea, which remain technically at war. Is this the President's vision of Iraq? Hardly, but that's what he would like the American people to believe.

It sounds so simple and so safe and so utterly detached from Iraq, where every street corner in Baghdad is a war zone. The President wants an indefinite military presence in Iraq, but a majority of the Iraq parliament signed a petition demanding a timetable for the U.S. to leave, which the President ignores.

The President wants permanent military bases in Iraq despite the thoughtful and bipartisan conclusion of the Iraq Study Group. That group said, ''The United States can begin to shape a positive climate for its diplomatic efforts internationally and within Iraq, through public statements by President Bush that reject the notion that the United States seeks to control Iraq's oil or seeks permanent bases within Iraq.''

But the President rejected their common sense and ordered the base building to go forward. What exactly are we protecting with the Iraqi people fleeing by the millions? South Korea never looked like this.

In Iraq, students graduating from college used to dream about getting a good job and raising a family. Now they dream of getting out of Iraq alive and as quickly as possible.

Just today, the United Nations issued a new report that says 4.2 million Iraqis have been displaced, half driven out of their homes by rampant and unrelenting bloodshed, and the other fleeing the country. It's estimated by the U.N. that 30,000 Iraqis cross into Syria every month, and Syria says the actual number is much higher. Jordan, meanwhile, has already taken over 1 million Iraqis. What have we done? We have granted 701 Iraqi refugees asylum in the United States.

The President recently announced we're willing to accept up to 7,000 Iraqis. Over 2 million Iraqis have fled their homeland so far, and we're going to take in a few thousand.

When we left Vietnam, we took hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese with us. Within a few months 130,000 Vietnamese had resettled here, and within a few years the number topped 320,000. These were our Vietnamese friends, people who had risked their lives to help us in Vietnam. We didn't desert them and they didn't desert us.

In Iraq, the President says we're willing to take a few thousand in a Nation losing millions of its people. The Iraqi people are fleeing their homes and their homeland in increasing numbers, flooding into nearby countries unable to cope with the refugee crisis.

Millions of peaceful, law-abiding Iraqis from its intellectual establishment, to its merchants, professionals, civil servants, and ordinary citizens are doing whatever they can to leave. And the President is doing everything he can to stay, building bases and demanding a so-called law to gain access to Iraqi's oil.

The President's stay-the-course strategy has evolved into his stay forever strategy. It hasn't worked before and it won't work now.

The President's military escalation is an absolute failure, and the sooner the President admits his mistake, the faster we can develop a national exit plan that protects our soldiers and gives Iraq back to the Iraq people, no strings or military bases attached.

Mr. Speaker, please pass the message to our President. It's time to bring the troops home. A hundred a month are dying, more and more. Last month, the third highest month in the war. It's not getting better. We've got to bring the troops home.

□ 2115

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

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

INFECTIONS AND HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am here to talk about a sad but true problem in our health care institutions in this country, and that is this. The Centers for Disease Control tells us in any given year some 2 million people will catch an infection while either in their hospital or health care center. Some 90,000 people will die, and some $50 billion is spent on this each year in our hospitals.

Now this chart here depicts what we have as of this evening, 853,747 cases so far, over 38,000 deaths and over $21 billion already spent as of today. These are bacteria, viruses, fungi and parasites that cause these common hospital infections. Most common are influenza, flu or colds. The thing about this is so many can be prevented, but a huge problem among the bacteria types, some 70 percent of the bacteria are resistant to at least one medication. There is a huge problem in American hospitals, which is causing so many deaths and a big part of our health care costs.

Now these microorganisms can be present when a patient comes in, and that's why it's so important to understand how the staff, the hospital staff, the doctors, the visitors, the patients themselves need to adhere to some special procedures in order to prevent this problem from occurring and killing so many and costing us so much on our health care dollars.

For example, diseases are passed on by poor hygiene from poor hand washing; clothes that are not necessarily clean on even the doctors, nurses and visitors; unclean equipment, catheters that are left in too long that lead to urinary tract infection; respiratory infections from those with colds or flu who are around patients; bed sores. The list goes on and on.

This is not rocket science how we prevent this, and some estimates are as high as 25 or 30 percent or more of things such as methicillin or resistant Staphylococcus Aureus can be prevented by hand washing before and after contact with any patient.

Many of these diseases can be prevented by sterilizing all equipment used with patients, including making sure that hospital staffs have clean stethoscopes, otoscopes, thermometers, et cetera, making sure they clean up after every procedure, the proper use of antibiotics, pretesting patients on admission to evaluate the presence of an infection, wearing masks if someone is suspected of having some illness, using infection control boards at hospitals to monitor and manage patients, empowering staff to stop or intervene on any procedure when clean rules are violated, and using aggressive educational campaigns for staff and visitors in the hospital.

The point is it can be done. Yes, indeed, it can be done. As a matter of fact, Allegheny Hospital in Pennsylvania reduced the rate of central line-acquired infections from 19 to almost zero within 90 days through staff training and control.

A major teaching hospital in Saint Louis found that they saved costs up to $1.5 million. Mercy Hospital in Oklahoma performed 400 surgeries without any infections. The VA Pittsburgh Healthcare system has reduced MRSA infections by 85 percent in an inpatient surgical unit because they paid attention to these things.

Now here is one of the sad truths in America. Hospitals don't have to report when they have infections. Although 13 States are considering legislation, only 6 States require reporting of health care associated infections: Florida, Illinois, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia. Pennsylvania is the only State that makes its information available to the public.

It is time we change this. I have introduced H.R. 1174, the Healthy Hospital Act, to encourage others to reduce and eliminate these deadly infections and to take some of the savings from this and set aside 10 percent to allow the Secretary of Health to use this for grants back to hospitals that reduce their infection rates to zero.

We have got to transform our health care system into what it needs to be: an affordable, accessible, quality health care system that focuses on patient safety, patient qualify and patient choice. But in order to do that,

we need to have this information available.

Now, another sad truth. While I have been speaking, the number of cases has gone up. While I have been speaking, another person has died in the hospital. While I have been speaking, the costs have gone up $100,000.

Something is terribly wrong with this system. We know hospitals can clean this up. We also need to know that we need to stop wasting our health care dollars on preventable infections. Let's join together as a Nation and pass H.R. 1174.

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2007 AND 2008

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

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 207(f) of S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revised 302(a) allocations for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal years 2007 and 2008. I am also providing current law mandatory allocations for informational purposes only.

REVISED ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2007 [1]	2008
Discretionary action:		
BA	950,316	953,053
Outlays	1,029,465	1,028,398
Current Law Mandatory:		
BA	549,102	548,676
Outlays	533,495	536,972

[1] Includes emergencies incorporated into the Congressional Budget Office March baseline.

IRAQ AND U.S. SECURITY

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

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, I commanded an aircraft carrier battle group of 30 ships off Afghanistan during the war from the Indian Ocean. We were told one day to take those 30 ships into the Persian Gulf, which some thought would be the running start to the Iraqi war.

Of those 30 ships, 20 of them were not United States' ships. They were Japanese. They were Australian. They were Italian. They were Greek. There were many other ships from throughout this world. But when we entered through the Strait of Hormuz into the Persian Gulf, none of those ships came with us except the British and the Australians. At that time, I knew that this war in Iraq would be a tragic misadventure.

Two months after the war in Afghanistan commenced, I was actually on the ground in Afghanistan. I saw for a very short period of time what needed to be done in order to bring about a successful resolution of that conflict.

After the war in Iraq was over and I left my carrier battle group, I was on the ground again for a short period again in Afghanistan and saw what had not been done, because we had diverted not just our attention but our resources, our PSYOPS forces, our special forces, our civil affairs units to Iraq. To me, Afghanistan is a poster child, as it is pre-terrorist and the Taliban have shifted into the southern provinces again and what Iraq has done to U.S. security worldwide.

So, therefore, I believe that the only strategy that we can pursue for success in Iraq is to have a date that is certain by which we will redeploy out of Iraq. We have to do this for two primary reasons.

First, a date certain changes the structure of incentives within the countries that are in that region to change the behavior. Iraqis need to step up to the plate, understanding we will not be there providing political and military cover to pursue the personal fiefdoms within the ministries of Baghdad's governments.

Also, Iran and Syria are involved destructively in this war. Once they know that we will not be there, they have an incentive to work for stability. They do not want the more than 4 million refugees that are dislocated within Iraq, and some have already filled our borders, to continue to overflow it, if we are not there to contain that instability.

Second, they do not want a proxy war between these two allied nations, Syria, Sunni and Iranian Shi'a. If we are not there, they do not want to fuel a proxy war between themselves as they support different religious factions.

But there is a second reason why we must have a date certain with sufficient time to redeploy our troops.

It took us 6 months to redeploy out of Somalia, a much smaller force. In Iraq, we have 140,000 troops and over 100,000 civilians. No one should ever try to redeploy those troops, and what is the hardest military operation to do is withdrawal, when they are most vulnerable in a short period of time.

We must have a date certain as a strategy, as the only leverage remaining to change the behavior of nations within that region to work for stability and to have our troops, those who wear the cloth of this Nation, that we sent there to have a redeployment that can be safe.

I ask this Congress to think the next time, as we must work for an end to this open-ended commitment, that we do so with sufficient time, as my bill said, by the end of December 31, but on an authorization bill, not an appropriations bill, where we again would be forced to vote, as I had to, for the safety of our troops versus the need to redeploy from Iraq, under a strategy which can leave behind an unfailed state.

To bring about greater security, an authorization bill is needed. Being in the military is a dangerous business. It has the dignity of danger. It should never be unsafe because we are forced in an appropriations bill, with a short period of time, to not provide the resources for our forces.

I therefore say that it needs to be an authorization bill with a date certain to bring about a greater security for the United States.

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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HONORING THE HOUSTON FOOD BANK ON THEIR 25TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of us have experienced hunger in our lives. I wonder how many recognize the number of Americans who go to bed every night hungry.

It is for this reason that I rise to salute the Houston Food Bank on its 25th anniversary and to acknowledge the 25 years that the Houston Food Bank, connected to many food banks around America, has served our community, serving nearly 500,000 hungry men, women, children and their families.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to the staff, the board of directors, volunteers and friends of the Houston Food Bank that have generated this most important and especially deserving organization in our community.

Hunger is devastating, but, more importantly, hunger can kill. It can kill, because those who suffer can have low nutrition that leads, if you will, to their vulnerability to disease and, yes, ultimately death. Most Americans are not familiar with the extremes of hunger. But, yet, it faces our community, or we are faced with it every single day.

In southeast Texas alone, more than 900,000 people are food insecure, meaning they do not know where their food will come from or the next meal will come from. Many children go to school, and their only meal are the free lunches and breakfasts.

So it is with great honor and privilege that I pay tribute to the Houston

Food Bank and for the celebration that they had today on the steps of City Hall. I was delighted to be able to briefly attend, as I headed back to Washington, and I am even more privileged to be able to salute them tonight.

Might I also acknowledge the End Hunger Network, whose programs remove the barriers, lack of transportation, marketing and experience, that prevent Houston from using available food resources. They are a very able partner to the Houston Food Bank.

But let me acknowledge again that this organization that acknowledges the fact that nearly 900,000 individuals in southeast Texas are food insecure and this very organization that on a given day in the greater Houston area, where more than 33,000 people suffer from hunger, the Houston Food Bank feeds more than 80,000 people each week, because they are very much aware of the struggles that people who cannot feed themselves or provide for themselves engage in.

This organization was first developed in the mid-1960s by retired businessman John van Engel, using surplus crops from local farmers. The Houston Food Bank first opened on March 8, 1982, operating from a donated storefront in a local shopping center.

That organization now is on the 59 North freeway in the 18th Congressional District, which is my congressional district. During its first year alone, the organization was able to distribute 1 million pounds of food to hungry families in the Houston area. By 1984, the Houston Food Bank had joined the Second Harvest Network, an organization formed in the mid-1970s, to set up food banks throughout the country. This is part of a national commitment and a national passion, a national avocation.

I believe that we should, in our lifetime, stamp out hunger. By the end of 1984, the Houston Food Bank was handling more than 3 million pounds of food. Since that time, the Houston Food Bank has continued to exponentially expand its operations, moving to a new permanent home and reaching more and more needy citizens, again located in the 18th Congressional District.

My community has also been represented in the past by the Honorable Mickey Leland. The Houston Food Bank is a tribute to him. Mickey Leland lost his life on the side of an Ethiopian mountain trying to deliver food to the starving Ethiopians in the 1980s.

Today around the world, people are hungry, and here in the United States they remain hungry. One in four children in Houston lives at or below the poverty level. On any given day, as I said earlier, 33,000 gulf coast residents are hungry. But we are grateful for the Houston Food Bank for its 38 million pounds of food distribution last year, the 80,000 people fed each week, nearly 400 hunger programs that are supported by the food bank in 18 southeast Texas counties, church food pantries, homeless shelters, safe havens for the battered and abused, nutrition sites for children and the elderly, more than 100,000 volunteer hours contributed annually, and 73,000 square foot central warehouse and other space truck fleet. We can be assured of the fact that the Houston Food Bank is on the front lines of the war against hunger. It is my privilege to pay tribute to them today for 25 years of selfless, hard work of the volunteers and the leadership of their organization.

Might I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, as I close that they also serve the Kids Cafe, the Backpack Buddy Club, Operation Frontline, Community Kitchen Culinary Academy, and today Kroger food store gave $100,000 to the Houston Food Bank.

Keep the fight up for another 25 years for together we will stamp out hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to the Houston Food Bank, on the occasion of their 25th anniversary. For the past 25 years, the Houston Food Bank has been serving our community, feeding nearly 500,000 hungry men, women, and children. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the staff, Board of Directors, volunteers, and friends of the Houston Food Bank for all their courageous work, and commend them for making a positive difference in the lives of hundreds of thousands of people in the Houston area.

Hunger is a devastating condition that plagues communities in America, as well as nations throughout the world. We have all experienced the symptoms of temporary hunger, and we know all too well the lethargy, weakness, and inability to concentrate that hunger pains can cause. Even with this knowledge, it is difficult to imagine living with these symptoms daily, always wondering where the next bit of nourishment will come from. It is unthinkable to fathom the plight of parents, forced to choose between feeding their children and paying to heat their homes. It is nearly impossible to envision the prospect of facing the world with a perpetually empty stomach.

And yet, this is a scenario that is all too real for hundreds of thousands of Americans. In southeast Texas alone, more than 900,000 people are "food insecure," or they do not know where their next meal will come from. Nationwide, the statistics are just as staggering, with one in 100 households experiencing hunger, and 11.9% of families nationwide suffering from food insecurity.

Particularly vulnerable are children. In southeast Texas, 44% of those hungry are under 18 years old, while nationally one in every five children does not know where their next meal will be found. These children suffer particularly in the summer, when schools are closed. Mr. Speaker, our children should be concerned about their grades in school; they should spend their days studying, dreaming up and planning future careers, engaging in athletic activities, and socializing with their friends. They should not be expected to worry about food; they should not have to wonder where they might find proper nourishment.

Into this bleak situation come organizations like the Houston Food Bank. Food banks were first developed in the mid-1960s by retired businessman John van Engel, using surplus crops from local farmers. The Houston Food Bank first opened on March 8, 1982, operating from a donated store-front in a local shopping center. During its first year alone, the organization was able to distribute 1,000,000 pounds of food to hungry families in the Houston area.

By 1984, the Houston Food Bank had joined the Second Harvest Network, an organization formed in the mid-1970s to set up food banks throughout the country. By the end of 1984, the Houston Food Bank was handling more than 3,000,000 pounds of food. Since that time, the Houston Food Bank has continued to exponentially expand its operations, moving to a new permanent home and reaching more and more needy citizens.

Today, the Houston Food Bank distributes 38 million pounds of food each year to nearly 400 hunger agencies in 18 counties in southeast Texas. This food reaches 80,000 different people each week, and about 498,000 people a year. These numbers are absolutely staggering. That's nearly 500,000 grateful men, women, and children, who, thanks to the tireless efforts of the staff, volunteers, and supporters of the Houston Food Bank are granted some security in their uncertain worlds.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud to mention the Houston Food Bank's programs for children. Of the 80,000 individuals that the food bank feeds each week, about 44% are children. Children who are hungry cannot concentrate in school; they will not have the energy to play sports or enjoy other activities with their peers. They are also more prone to illnesses and other health issues. With these unfortunate facts in mind, the Houston Food Bank has developed the Kid's Café program, one of the nation's largest nutrition education programs, providing children with the nourishment they may not get at home. Through the collaboration of local chefs, dietitians, students and volunteers, Kid's Café is able to provide 500 kids each month with nutritious meals in safe surroundings. The program goes on to emphasize food safety, nutrition education, and hands-on instruction, helping to instill in these children the skills and knowledge they need to create healthy lifestyles.

The Houston Food Bank also touches the lives of needy children through the Backpack Buddy Club. Because many hungry children receive meager or no meals on weekends, the Houston Food Bank has implemented a program to give children backpacks, filled with food that is child-friendly, nonperishable, easily consumed and vitamin fortified, every Friday in participating schools. This program ensures that local children can receive proper nutrition even on days that they are not in the classroom.

In addition to these two programs, the Houston Food Bank operates a number of other initiatives designed to provide nutrition education, outreach, and job training to the local community. These programs are crucial to the development of positive nutrition habits, and they speak to the very real long-term needs of the community.

The Houston Food Bank has also proven its leadership in disaster relief, successfully accommodating the sharp increases in demand following the catastrophic Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Since September 2005, volunteers

traveling from as far away as Hawaii have distributed nearly 9 million pounds of food in disaster relief. The Houston Food Bank successfully provided relief to hurricane evacuees displaced from their homes, their belongings, and their livelihoods. Organizations like the Houston Food Bank have been a crucial aspect of ensuring that hurricane victims have felt welcome and well-treated in Houston.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Brian Greene, the President and CEO of the Houston Food Bank, together with the Board of Directors, the staff, the many dedicated volunteers, and all other supporters of the Houston Food Bank. These individuals are making a profound impact in their local community, and they are changing the worlds of thousands of hungry children. I thank you for your service to our community and your compassion to your fellow humans, and I wish you every success in future endeavors.

□ 2130

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

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

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

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

IMMIGRANT SOLDIERS

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I stand here today to honor the contribution of immigrants that have been made to our Nation, particularly defending our Nation in support of comprehensive immigration reform.

We need effective legislation that strikes the right balance between national security and reforming our current immigration system. This should include a path to permanency for millions of law abiding and tax paying immigrants who call the United States their home.

It's my hope that the Senate finalizes debating their immigration reform bill, and that our Chamber continues to work to adopt legislation that will truly reform the system and enhance our Nation's security.

Immigrant families are an important part of our social fabric and our economy. Undocumented workers, you may not know, contribute as much as $7 billion a year in Social Security into our system and $1.5 billion in Medicare every year, yet do not collect those benefits.

Immigrants, you may know, play an important role in defending our Nation. In all of our wars throughout our history, immigrants have fought side by side and have given their lives to defending America's freedoms and ideals.

Twenty percent of the recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest honor that our Nation bestows on our war heroes, has been granted to sons and daughters of immigrants. Their bravery is proof that immigrants are as willing as any other Americans to defend our country's freedom, and their service is no less important and valuable because of their immigrant status.

For example, as of May 2006, 33,449 noncitizens served in our Armed Forces, and more than 26,000 servicemembers have become U.S. citizens since the Iraq war began, and 75 servicemembers received posthumous citizenship.

Immigrants make up 5 percent of all enlisted personnel on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces, and immigrants continue to demonstrate that they are a part of this country through their service in the military.

Without the contribution of immigrants the military, as we know it today, could not meet its own recruiting goals. Without the assistance of immigrants, the military could not fill the need for foreign language translators, interpreters and cultural experts.

Immigrants provide unique incredibly valuable contributions to the military, and it's critical that we continue to recognize and appreciate their efforts and that of their families.

In the district I represent in California, we've unfortunately suffered several casualties, including that of immigrant servicemembers who gave their lives for our country. One is the fallen Marine Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores who died while serving overseas in Iraq. At the age of 21, and only 2 weeks away from gaining U.S. citizenship, Francisco was killed in the line of duty. He was one of thousands of lawful permanent residents who have volunteered their service to protect the United States by joining the U.S. military.

On April 2003, Francisco was granted posthumous U.S. citizenship and Congress honored his memory by passing a bill that I authored to celebrate his life in the City of Duarte by naming a Post Office after him.

But in 2003, Sergeant Atanacio Haro-Marin, from the City of Baldwin Park, from my district from California also died in Iraq. He came under heavy enemy fire. This young man was born in Zacatecas, Mexico and moved to Los Angeles at 2 years of age. He'll be remembered as a proud and courageous soldier who was living out a long held dream of serving in the U.S. military and will be honored by having a Post Office named after him in the City of Baldwin Park.

The sacrifices that my constituents made inspired me to pursue legislation to help other legal permanent residents who risk their lives every day and die protecting our country's liberties and values, achieve the dream of becoming a citizen.

And in 2003, I introduced the Naturalization and Family Protection for Military Members Act. The bill, which was included in the Department of Defense Authorization Conference Report, was signed into law, and recognizes the enormous contributions of immigrants in the military by providing them with easier access to naturalization and immediate family immigration protections for those killed in action.

It is a tribute to them and their families and all veterans for the enormous sacrifices they've made so we and others around the world can live in freedom.

I'm proud today to tell you that I support our military men and women, and especially those that continue to serve us that are legal permanent residents. We need to see an immigration reform program come forward that is comprehensive, and salute soldiers such as this who have given their ultimate sacrifice for our country.

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

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

BLUE DOG COALITION

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, as I do most Tuesday evenings, on behalf of the 43-member strong, fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. Some people may say, what's the Blue Dog Coalition and what's it all about?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're a group of fiscally conservative Democrats that are trying to restore fiscal discipline and common sense to our Nation's government. We're a group of conservative Democrats that were founded back in 1994 after the Republicans took control of the Congress. And at the time, it was a group that felt like they were being choked blue by the extremes of both parties. And today, we believe that we are in the middle, which is where we believe the majority of the people in America are.

We talk a lot about fiscal discipline. We talk a lot about accountability, because it is important, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress and this administration is responsible and accountable for how your tax money is being spent.

As you walk the halls of Congress, it is not difficult to know when you're walking by the office of a fellow Blue Dog Member, a fellow fiscally conservative, common-sense Democrat, because you will see this poster that says

the Blue Dog Coalition, and it reminds Members of Congress and the constituents, the citizens of America who walk the halls of Congress that today the U.S. national debt is $8,831,299,779,793. Again, 8,831,299,779,793. That's a big number. But if you were to divide that by every man, woman and child living in America today, including those born today, every one of us, our share of the national debt is $29,242. It's what those of us in the Blue Dog Coalition refer to as the debt tax, D-E-B-T tax. And that is one tax that cannot be cut and that cannot go away until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

So for the past 6 years we've seen record deficit after record deficit, which has resulted in this record debt. Now that the Democrats have a majority in this Congress, we, as members of the Blue Dog Coalition, are trying to put our Nation's fiscal house back in order. We are trying to restore fiscal sanity to our Nation's government. We are trying to restore common sense to our Nation's government.

As a small child growing up, I always heard it was the Democrats that spent the money, and it was the Republicans that balanced the budget. And after 6 years of the Republicans controlling the White House, House and Senate, what did they leave us? They left us the largest debt ever, ever in our Nation's history and they gave us record deficit after record deficit.

When I first came here in 2001, the first bill I filed as a Member of Congress was a bill to tell the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off the Social Security Trust Fund. Republican leadership refused to give me a hearing or a vote on that bill and now we know why, because they have continued to raid the Social Security Trust Fund to fund tax cuts for folks earning over $400,000 a year, and they have continued to pass record deficit after record deficit and leaving our children and grandchildren with the bill.

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. Mr. Speaker, this is a doubling, a doubling of the 211-year debt in just 10 years. Interest payments on this debt are one of the fastest growing parts of the Federal budget, and the debt tax, D-E-B-T is one that cannot be repealed until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order and return to the days of a balanced budget.

At the Ross household in Prescott, Arkansas, my wife makes sure that we live within our budget. And I can assure you that most of the people in America live within their budget. Small businesses, big businesses, the majority of businesses in America live within their budget. Farm families live within their budget, and I don't believe it's asking too much to ask our Nation to do what 49 States are doing, and that's living within their means, requiring a balanced budget.

Why do deficits matter? Deficits reduce economic growth. They burden our children and grandchildren with liabilities.

They increase our reliance on foreign lenders who now own 40 percent of our debt. Let me repeat that. They increase our reliance on foreign lenders who now own 40 percent of our debt. The U.S. is becoming increasingly dependent on foreign lenders. Foreign lenders currently hold a total of about $2.199 trillion of our public debt. Compare this to only $623.3 billion in foreign holdings in 1993.

Who are they? Our Nation continues to borrow money not only from the Social Security Trust Fund, but under the past 6 years of Republican rule, not only have they borrowed money from the Social Security Trust Fund, with absolutely no provision made on how it's going to be paid back or when it's going to be paid back, but they've also borrowed money from foreign central banks and foreign investors.

And much like David Letterman, we have a top 10 list. The top 10 current lenders, countries loaning money to the United States of America that, for the past 6 years, under these failed policies of the Republican leadership, have given tax cuts to people earning over $400,000 a year leaving the rest of us to foot the bill.

□ 2145

So who are they? Rounding out the list, number one, Japan, our Nation has borrowed $637.4 billion from Japan; China, $346.5 billion; the United Kingdom, $223.5 billion; OPEC, imagine that, $97.1 billion; Korea, $67.7 billion; Taiwan, $63.2 billion; the Caribbean Banking Centers, $63.6 billion; Hong Kong, $51 billion; Germany, $52.1 billion.

And rounding out the top 10 countries that lend money to the United States of America to help us pay off these massive debts: Mexico. That is right. The United States of America has borrowed $38.2 billion from foreign central banks and foreign lenders in Mexico to fund tax cuts in this country for folks earning over $400,000 a year.

Record deficit after record deficit equals what? The largest debt ever in our Nation's history: $8,831,299,779,793. That is right. Today, the U.S. national debt, $8,831,299,779,793 and some change, but we ran out of room on our poster.

Well, as I mentioned earlier, another reason deficits should matter is because interest payments on the debt are one of the fastest-growing parts of the Federal budget. In fact, our Nation is spending about a half billion dollars a day, that is with a ''b.'' Our Nation is spending about a half billion dollars a day paying interest on the national debt. And that, Mr. Speaker, is before we borrow an additional billion dollars every day. And that is money that cannot go to education, to homeland security, to veterans' benefits, to build highways and roads, that can create jobs and economic opportunities, because it is going to pay interest on the national debt. It is going to pay interest to Japan, China, United Kingdom, OPEC, Korea, Taiwan, Caribbean Banking Centers, Hong Kong, Germany, and Mexico.

In my district, I represent about half of Arkansas, 29 counties. About 13 of them are in the delta region, one of the poorest regions in our country. A lot of hope in that region that I–69 will some day bring jobs and economic opportunities. I–69 was announced 5 years before I was born in Indianapolis; and with the exception of 40 miles in Kentucky and the section they are now building from Memphis to the casinos, there has not been any of it completed in 50 years south of Indianapolis.

We need about $1.6 billion to complete Interstate 69 across my district in Arkansas. That is a lot of money. At least for a country boy from Prescott, Arkansas, that is a lot of money. But, Mr. Speaker, we will spend more money paying interest on the national debt in the next 4 days than it would take to build I–69 across the delta region of my district, the delta region of this country, creating jobs and economic opportunities for generations to come. That is on the eastern side of my district bordering Mississippi.

On the western side of my district, bordering Texas and Louisiana to the south and also Oklahoma to the west, there is a lot of hope for the completion of Interstate 49. It will be the first north-south corridor through the middle of our country. We need about $2 billion to complete Interstate 49. They have been talking about it since I was a small child. About $2 billion is needed to complete Interstate 49. A lot of money. But, again, we will spend more money paying interest on the national debt in the next 4 days than it would take to complete I–49 across Arkansas.

There are a lot of people that would like to see U.S. Highway 82 four-laned across Arkansas from Texas to Mississippi. It is the only section of U.S. Highway 82 that is not four-laned. I don't know. It would take $3 or $4 million to do it. We will spend more money paying interest on the national debt today than it would take to four-lane U.S. Highway 82.

Interstate 530 is under construction in my district. We need $300 million to complete it. It will connect I–30 and I–40 in Little Rock and Pine Bluff with someday I–69 between Monticello and Warren, Arkansas, and eventually, hopefully, find its way to connect with I–20 in Louisiana at Bastrop, Louisiana. We need, depending on what section of it you want to complete, between $300 million and $800 million to complete that highway. A lot of money. But, again, we will spend more money paying interest on the national debt in the next 2 days than it would take to complete this interstate, creating jobs and economic opportunities.

If you think back with me, the last two Presidents to make any significant

investment in our Nation's infrastructure was Roosevelt with the WPA program and Eisenhower with the interstate program. It is time that we invest in this Nation's infrastructure. We can create jobs and put people to work to build this Nation's infrastructure; and, once it is completed, it will create economic opportunities and jobs for many generations to come. But as long as we are spending half a billion dollars a day paying interest on the national debt and borrowing another billion dollars each day from places like Japan and China and Mexico, we will continue to neglect our Nation's infrastructure. And that is one reason why it is important that we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Let me tell you another reason that interest payments on our national debt do matter, and this chart makes it crystal clear. In the red, Mr. Speaker, you will see the amount of money that we spend each year paying interest on the national debt. That is the red bar. Contrast that to what we spend on education.

We say we love our children. We talk about how we want to ensure that they receive a world-class education. We talk about making college education more affordable for our young people. We talk about giving 3- and 4-year-olds a fighting chance, and we should.

We live among the freest of all people in the world. One of the few things in life we do not get to choose is who our parents are. Some children get really lucky; some don't. I did, and I can tell you that as an American citizen and as a Member of this House I believe that we have a duty and an obligation to be there for all of God's children. We can invest a little bit in them at an early age and have a good chance at turning a lot of children that have been neglected at home into productive, taxpaying adults. Or we can continue to neglect them and do what? Spend tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of dollars warehousing them for a lifetime behind bars. I believe that we should commit ourselves to education.

But look at the light blue bar. Look at how much we are spending on our children's education compared to the red bar, how much we are spending simply paying interest on the national debt.

Homeland security, a lot of talk these days about homeland security. But look how much we are really putting into homeland security. Again, the red bar demonstrates the amount of money that we are spending of your tax money, Mr. Speaker, paying interest on the national debt. Contrast that to the light green bar, which demonstrates how much money we are spending protecting our homeland.

And, finally, and very sad, the dark blue bar, look at the amount of money we are spending on our veterans, on our veterans. And we all know that we have got a new generation of veterans coming home from places like Iraq and Afghanistan. Contrast the dark blue box, the amount of money we are spending taking care of our veterans, keeping our promises to our veterans, ensuring that they receive health care, compare how much we are spending on our veterans to how much we spend paying interest on the national debt. And I believe that chart very clearly demonstrates why deficits matter, why debts matter, and why the 43 members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition are committed to commonsense principles that will help get this Nation's fiscal house back in order.

One of the new Members of Congress and new member of the Blue Dog Coalition is my good friend from Indiana, Mr. JOE DONNELLY. At this time, I yield to him and thank him for joining me this evening.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you, Mr. ROSS. It is a privilege.

And as you look at that chart and you see the indicator of how many of our veterans are waiting for service, waiting for care, when we are spending $300 billion, Mr. ROSS, on interest payments and on the veterans approximately $25 billion, I have the privilege of being on the Veterans Affairs Committee, and we have crying needs in almost every part of this country.

We were blessed in my home area just this past week. We were able to announce that there will be a new veterans' clinic opening in approximately 8 months in Elkhart County, Indiana. But, Mr. ROSS, we need so many more. There is a need in the southern part of my congressional district down around Cass County and Fulton County, but we have to plan so carefully because our financial needs require that we spend $300 billion on paying down interest.

Mr. ROSS, I ask you to think of what we could do for veterans, opening new clinics and new hospitals, if just a small portion of those funds could be used instead of paying down a national debt that has exploded over the last years.

Mr. ROSS. The gentleman is correct. I mean, we talk a good game when it comes to our veterans, but then we saw the truth about what was really going on at Walter Reed. And tomorrow there will be a hearing with the Armed Services Committee that is a follow-up to a series that NBC News did about whether or not our men and women in uniform are really getting access to the very best body armor on the market today.

I don't care who makes it. I don't care where it comes from. I would prefer for it to come from America. I believe that is important. But if our Nation is going to continue to send $12 million an hour, $12 million an hour of your tax money to Iraq, I believe it is time to tell the Pentagon and this administration and the Iraqis that it is time for them to be accountable for how this money is being spent. And part of that is ensuring that our brave and dedicated men and women in uniform and, yes, my brother-in-law is in his 18th year in the Air Force, and I am very proud of him. My first cousin is in the Army and getting ready to go back to Iraq for a second time.

We all have been affected by this war. We all know someone who has been to Iraq. Unfortunately, too many of us know people who have been injured or have died; and I question this government on how many of those deaths and life-changing injuries could have been avoidable had we ensured that our men and women in uniform were properly equipped.

So this hearing tomorrow is going to be about body armor. And, again, I don't care who makes it. I don't care where it comes from. I want it to come from America. But just because our men and women were receiving the very best body armor when the war began in 2003 does not necessarily mean that in 2007 that that is still the very best body armor on the market.

And John Grant, I want to thank John Grant from Pearcy, Arkansas, in Garland County, the father of a soldier in the 39th Brigade of the Arkansas National Guard. His son has been to Iraq once. You know the deal with the Guard. You are supposed to go once every 5 years, but the President did that waiver thing, and now they are headed back again.

□ 2200

They haven't even been home 3 years. It is my understanding that by Christmas, or shortly thereafter, they will be back for a second tour of duty. These are not full-time military, these are members of the Arkansas National Guard, 39th. John Grant wants to ensure that his son and all soldiers, not just the 39th, but all soldiers in Iraq are receiving the very best body armor possible.

This hearing tomorrow before the Armed Services Committee tomorrow will be very important. I am committed, as are some 42 Members of Congress that signed a letter with me to the Pentagon, in ensuring that our brave men and women in uniform are provided the very best in equipment and the very best in body armor so that we can ensure their safe return.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. We, in my hometown of South Bend, just this past weekend, last Saturday, sent off 175 young men and women who will be going over to serve in Iraq, and again, a number of them on their second tour of duty. The best, the bravest, the finest you could ever see. I want to make sure that they have the finest body armor that they could possibly have; the best vehicle protection that they could have; the best equipment; the best training. All of that costs funds. We want to make sure those funds are there, and we will.

But think, Mr. ROSS, of $300 billion just to pay down a debt that never should have been run up in the first

place. Those Guardsmen, as they were leaving, I was telling them all good luck, Godspeed. And they said, sir, it's our privilege to serve this country. It is a right that we look at and cherish, and it is a great honor for us to have this opportunity. Well, our obligation is to make sure they have everything they need. As you said, there is a hearing tomorrow on body armor.

I have been fortunate enough over the last few months to have gone to Walter Reed Army Hospital on a number of occasions. I went through Building 18. I saw the holes in the ceiling; I saw the mold on the wall; I saw the wallpaper peeled off and hanging down. I saw plastic buckets along the floor because the roof was leaking in a United States medical facility, an outpatient housing center. And living in there were our brave Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who had been wounded and come back, and what they received when they came back was a room with a leaking roof, with mold. This facility is being closed in 2011, but part of the concern is do we have enough funds to cover everything? And here we are sending $300 billion a year to the Chinese, to the Japanese, to the Mexicans because they are holding our paper.

Our obligation is to clean up this mess. That is what we are trying to do with PAYGO and similar systems that the Blue Dogs have sponsored and have brought to the floor of this House. So, I am proud to be an Indiana Blue Dog, along with my fellow Hoosier Blue Dog, BRAD ELLSWORTH of Evansville, BARON HILL of the Ninth District, along with my 40 other colleagues. And I know we are hoping next week to add approximately five more. We will continue to try to bring common-sense, moderate policies, not partisan fights, to this country so we can restore sanity back to the operations of this country again.

I yield to my good friend, Mr. ROSS.

Mr. ROSS. Well, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) for his insight and for his work on the Veterans Committee, among others. We appreciate what he's doing there to try to help our veterans and our men and women in uniform.

These are examples of why it is important that we get our Nation's fiscal house in order. As long as we've got record debt after record debt and record deficit after record deficit that the Republicans have given us, and we can't turn this thing around overnight, but we've got a budget that's going to put us back in balance by 2012, perhaps sooner. That is important if we are going to meet America's priorities, improving our infrastructure, improving and making health care more affordable and more accessible, funding education at the level it deserves to ensure our children receive a world-class education, keeping our homeland safe, making homeland security a lot more than just a buzz word. Let's put our money where our mouth is and ensure that every American citizen in this country is safe from terrorists. And of course, making sure that our veterans have the health care and have the things they need and were promised for their service to our country.

A lot of talk about Iraq. If you ask a hundred different people what they think about this Iraq policy, you get about a hundred different answers. I can tell you one of the things that the Blue Dog Coalition is united on is demanding accountability for how your tax money, Mr. Speaker, is being spent in Iraq. Now, for the last 4 years, if you had questioned the funding in Iraq, the President would tell you you're unpatriotic. Well, members of the Blue Dog Coalition are now standing up and saying enough is enough, and we demand accountability for how your tax money, Mr. Speaker, is being spent in Iraq.

What are the Iraqis doing with your tax money, some $12 million an hour? Is enough of it going to protect our men and women in uniform? Is enough of it going to provide them the most advanced body armor on the market today? Well, we all know that waste, fraud and abuse of taxpayer dollars has happened in the Iraq war. In fact, over the past several years, media and government reports have detailed examples of the abuse of taxpayer dollars in the government's funding of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. As recently as April of this year, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, has released reports detailing examples of how long-standing problems with the management of government contracts, yes, government contracts, continue to provide opportunities for fraud, waste and abuse in the funding of the war in Iraq. Specifically, the GAO identifies the following major factors contributing to the mismanagement of contracts and ultimate waste of taxpayer dollars.

Number one, military commanders and senior officials at the Department of Defense do not have visibility over contractors, which prevents the Department of Defense from knowing the extent to which it is relying on contractors for support in Iraq. Also, the Department of Defense lacks clear guidance and leadership for managing and overseeing contractors. The Department of Defense personnel lack the most basic ability to make sure that government contractors even provide the services they are being paid to provide. The report finds that the Department of Defense's limited visibility has unnecessarily increased contracting costs to the Federal Government and introduced unnecessary risk.

For example, one Army official estimates that about $43 million, $43 million is lost each year on free meals provided to contractors' employees at deployed locations who also receive a per diem, food allowance. Additionally, the GAO found that the Department of Defense and its contractors all too often do not have a clear understanding of reconstruction objectives and how they translate into the terms and conditions of a contract. As a result, at least $1.8 billion of taxpayer money has been obligated on contracts without Department of Defense and the contractors reaching an agreement on the final scope and cost of the work.

The report gives one particularly shocking example of this, where the government allocated $84 million for an oil mission and never agreed upon the final terms of the task order until more than a year after the contractor completed the work. The GAO estimates that the United States has obligated about $14 billion to restore essential services such as oil, electricity and water, and more than $15 billion to train, equip and sustain Iraqi Security Forces. However, the Iraqi government continues to be fraught with corruption, operating ineffectively and inadequately resourced accountability institutions.

U.S. officials estimate that a shocking 20 to 30 percent of the Iraqi Ministry of Interior personnel are ''ghost employees,'' nonexistent staff paid salaries with your tax money, Mr. Speaker, that are collected by other corrupt officials in Iraq.

The GAO also highlights in its report the weaknesses in the $15.4 billion program to support the development of Iraqi security forces. Consequently, poor security conditions have hindered the management of the more than $29 billion that has been obligated for reconstruction and stabilization efforts since 2003. Additional government and media reports have exposed equally as outrageous examples of waste, fraud and abuse in the funding of the war in Iraq. Is this $12 million an hour we are sending to the Iraqis being used to protect and equip our brave men and women in uniform?

One such report details an instance where U.S. administrators could not account for $20.5 million in development funds for Iraq grants. Another government report exposed a situation where $7.3 million was mismanaged, and $1.3 million entirely wasted during construction of a police academy in Iraq. The Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction just recently released its quarterly report to Congress. As in previous reports, this most recent one again describes continued abuses in the government's funding of the war in Iraq. And we are going to go into more of this in just a little bit. We are going to provide specific examples of what was contained in that report.

But at this time I want to yield to my fellow Blue Dog, a new Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, a veteran of the Iraq war, a captain that served in Iraq, and that is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Congressman ROSS.

Last month, the Blue Dogs joined a wide bipartisan margin of our colleagues in passing the National Defense Authorization Act. This bill funds defense spending at a level 10 percent

higher than in 2007. It also calls for a much needed pay raise for our troops, and a benefit boost to spouses who had to face the worst news of all.

The other thing this bill does is it institutes some much needed accountability into the management of the war in Iraq. We owe special thanks to Chairman IKE SKELTON, and to our fellow Blue Dogs who worked so hard to introduce this long overdue accountability and fiscal discipline over Iraq war operations.

Mr. Speaker, report after report has shown that billions of dollars have vanished, and thousands upon thousands of weapons have gone missing. And until recently, there have been no tough questions and no accountability. With this bill, we said that it will no longer be acceptable for blatant mismanagement to take place when our soldiers' lives are on the line.

As a former soldier who fought in Iraq, it makes me very proud to be able to fight for accountability and oversight in Iraq and to demand answers here at home. It is astonishing to me that until now no one has tried to establish a clear sense of which American agency carries out contracts in Iraq. I assure you, to our troops in harm's way, missing money and missing weapons translate into increased danger. It is that simple. Having these rules and procedures in place will be very important to our troops.

This is a war that is perhaps different than any other; there is no front line. The enemy doesn't belong to a single country. They don't wear a uniform. And they are willing to sacrifice themselves and even their children to kill Americans.

Understanding the rules of engagement and knowing exactly who is on the ground and what they are allowed to do will be vitally important in keeping American service men and women safe.

The accountability provisions also establish a database so that everyone knows which American agency is servicing a contract. These provisions that all of us fought for and Chairman SKELTON thought were worth including in the defense bill will establish the necessary oversight and fiscal discipline we have needed for a long time in Iraq.

□ 2215

Clear rules and accountability are vital to winning the war on terror. It has been more than 4 years since we invaded Iraq and since President Bush declared ''mission accomplished,'' and yet our troops are still refereeing a religious civil war, while too many Iraqis continue to sit on the sidelines.

While Iraq continues to smolder, Osama bin Laden, the murderer of more than 3,000 innocent Americans, is still at large. President Bush, when asked recently why bin Laden hadn't been brought to justice yet, said, ''Why is he still at large? Because we haven't got him yet. That is why. And he is hiding, and we are looking, and we will continue to look until we bring him to justice.'' That is unacceptable.

Meanwhile, the Taliban is resurgent in Afghanistan, and American commanders on the ground there are asking for more troops to fight terror, hunt down al Qaeda and kill Osama bin Laden.

We need to win the war on terror, and that means being successful in Afghanistan. Our troops over there are doing an amazing job and they deserve our continued support. It is getting harder for them, especially along the border of Afghanistan and Pakistan and some of the areas where we believe bin Laden is still at large.

Mr. Speaker, when I was elected, I said that we need to be tough and smart in fighting the war on terror, and I also promised to ask the tough questions of this administration. One question that needs to be asked is about Pakistan President Musharraf. Right now we can count President Musharraf as an ally, but is he doing all he can to hunt bin Laden? We need to jump-start this debate, because we cannot afford to let a mass murderer slip through our fingers again.

The U.S. has sent $5.6 billion in military reimbursements to Pakistan for counterterrorism efforts. That is $80 million per month. Just as we demanded accountability in Iraq, we have some benchmarks and goals for this funding as well.

In the early days in the war in Afghanistan, President Bush decided to outsource the hunt for bin Laden in Tora Bora, and he escaped. Now we need to examine are we relying too much on Pakistan and their accord with tribal warlords near the Afghan border for the same reason? Why is the United States continuing to make large payments, roughly $1 billion per year, to Pakistan, even though Pakistan decided to slash patrols through the area where al Qaeda and the Taliban fighters are the most active?

Why, as Senator REID said, are we not paying for specific objectives, rather than reimbursing Pakistan for their efforts?

Is it true, as two American analysts and one American soldier reported, that Pakistani Security Forces fired in direct support of Taliban ground attacks on an Afghan army post?

Blue Dogs have a long tack record of asking the tough questions and demanding accountability. I hope over the coming weeks and months this Congress gets answers to these vital questions, so we can effectively prosecute the war on terror.

Blue Dog Democrats know how to win the war on terror, and part of that is by demanding results after more than 4 years in Iraq and nearly 6 years in Afghanistan. We cannot let Afghanistan become the forgotten war. We cannot stop asking the tough questions and demanding answers from this administration. Our troops are fighting bravely over there and they need all the help we can give them.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY, an Iraq war veteran, for his insight and leadership within the Blue Dogs and within this Congress on restoring accountability, on how our tax money is being spent in Iraq, and ensuring that it is being spent to protect our men and women in uniform.

The gentleman raised an interesting point. We are in year five of this thing now, and a recent survey indicated that 71 percent of the Iraqi people don't want us there. In fact, 60 percent of them think it is okay to kill a U.S. soldier. You contrast that with Afghanistan, where 80 percent of them are glad we are there. The last time I checked, Osama bin Laden was spotted closer to Afghanistan than he was to Iraq.

So, while we continue, and I think this is just me personally, I think we have got to demand more from the Iraqi government to train Iraqis to be on the front lines, providing the police and military force for them in this civil war.

This line that it is better to fight the terrorists there than here, I don't buy that. If there are some 10 to 14 to 20 million illegal immigrants in this country, do you think we only allowed illegal immigrants into this country? Terrorists are already here in America, and that is why we need to do more to protect our homeland by properly funding the Department of Homeland Security. That is why we need to demand more of the Iraqis and to do more in Afghanistan, that is becoming more and more neglected every day.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting over Memorial Day weekend, I was back home and went to a Memorial Day service in Rolling Prairie, Indiana, which is in LaPorte County, a beautiful county right next door to where I live, and some of the World War II veterans said to me, ''You know, Joe, when we went to war, everyone sacrificed. We were all in this together.''

Then I was fortunate enough a few days later to read a book called ''The Price of Liberty'' by Robert Hormats. This book explained a simple factor, that in this war we have been asked to go shopping, while the military sacrifices every day and their families sacrifice every day.

Mr. Speaker, what was pointed out in the book is that this is the first war in history where at a time we were going to war, we also decided to cut taxes and increase other spending, and this formula has resulted in explosive deficits.

My good friend from Arkansas, next to him is a poster detailing the cost of Operation Iraqi Freedom, close to $400 million, heading to $500 billion. When this was first discussed, the Office of Management and Budget some years ago said the top cost we would have was $50 billion to $60 billion. We were told, my dear friend from Arkansas,

that the oil revenues would cover all the costs.

Look where we are some years later. There has been an air of unreality from the start in facing up to the fact that, in the past, all Americans sacrificed together. And instead of sacrificing, we borrowed the money from the Chinese, we borrowed the money from the Mexican government, we borrowed the money from the Japanese government.

My good friends throughout my district, the veterans in Cass County and in Carroll County, would roll their eyes if they knew that we were funding our war by borrowing money from the Chinese. They would say, ''Joe, how crazy is this? How does this make any sense at all?'' And the answer is, it doesn't.

Instead of looking each other square in the eye and saying we have obligations, we have responsibilities, we have a sense of shared sacrifice, this administration has told us we can take a pass. Well, my good friend, we cannot take a pass, and the policy of cutting taxes and increasing spending on other government programs while funding this war continues on, the hole gets bigger, and the burden we are passing on to our children grows every day.

So I yield back to my good friend from Arkansas, with the hope that at some point we will understand that we are all in this together and that not all the burden should be placed on our military families.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana, a fellow Blue Dog Member, Mr. DONNELLY, for his insight, and invite him to continue to stay with us for the remaining 15 minutes or so we have got here this Tuesday evening on the House floor to talk about accountability, on how your tax money, some $12 million an hour of your tax money being spent to Iraq is being spent.

You can see the cost of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Starting in 2001–2002, $2.5 billion; $51 billion in 2003; $77.3 billion in 2004; $87.3 billion in 2005; $100.4 billion in 2006; and $60 billion in 2007. That was before the supplemental that we passed about a week ago which was about $100 billion. So we are actually up to about $160 billion for 2007, which brings this number not to nearly $400 billion, but to now nearly $500 billion, nearly half a trillion dollars.

Now, I promised to show a few of the examples of the waste, fraud and abuse of taxpayer dollars that was detailed in the report from Iraq.

Number one, of 150 primary healthcare centers that were originally planned to be built, only 15 have been completed. Of those 15, only eight are currently open to the public. In addition, eight primary healthcare centers have stopped work altogether.

Number two: The U.S. Agency for International Development Office of Transition Initiatives was supported by $350 million to focus on democracy building, human rights, civic programs and investigations of crimes against humanity. However, USAID could not determine whether the intended outputs of the 4,789 grants under this contract were even accomplished because of ''insufficient documentation.''

Number three: The report also found water damage in one healthcare facility that caused bathroom floor tiles to break and ceilings in lower floors to leak and collapse, increasing the health risk to patients.

Number four: A shortage of sinks and toilets combined with workmanship deficiencies, inferior materials and insufficient maintenance, caused significant deterioration to the barracks at one military base, a facility which cost our government $119.5 million.

The report also details construction and equipment installation at the Iraq Civil Defense Headquarters that did not comply with the international standards required by the contract and task order. This particular project cost the Federal Government, our government, our tax money, Mr. Speaker, some $3 million. We will come back to this in a little bit.

Number six: At the Baghdad International Airport, an enhancement project costing the Federal Government $11.8 million required the installation of 17 new generator sets. However, when the airport was recently inspected, 10 of the 17 generator sets were not even operational.

And the list goes on and on. We will come back to it.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arkansas, and point out when I was in an earlier deployment before Iraq, I was in Bosnia in 2002. Our soldiers on the ground there would often call the contractors Kellogg Brown & Root ''Kellogg Brown & Loot,'' because of the looting, of what they were doing to their own country when it comes to our fiscal dollars. And I am not trying to be cute or funny. That is a sad commentary on what is really going on over there in these deployments.

Mr. Speaker, when I heard my colleague, Mr. DONNELLY, here from the great State of Indiana, and I know he went to the University of Notre Dame, I was with a colleague of mine on the phone yesterday. I was driving back from a memorial service for Private First Class Bobby Dembowski, who was a paratrooper in the 82nd Airborne Division who was killed recently in Iraq. He was from Bucks County, in my district.

When I was driving back from his memorial service yesterday with a heavy heart, I called my buddy, who is also a University of Notre Dame graduate, Captain Kobe Langley. I called Kobe, Mr. Speaker, and I said to him, ''Kobe, I am coming back.'' He said, ''How are you doing, Murph?'' I said, ''Kobe, not too good. I am coming back from another memorial service for one of our heroes that gave the ultimate sacrifice.'' He said, ''Well, you got to keep fighting. You got to keep doing what you are doing.''

□ 2230

He asked, What was the press conference you gave the other day?

I said I was standing up to this administration. I have the great honor of serving on the Armed Services Committee. I know my colleague and my fellow Blue Dog Representative DONNELLY serves on the Veterans Affairs Committee. We were both cosigners for House Resolution 162 because we want to hold this administration accountable when the Armed Services Committee says our troops deserve a 3.5 percent pay increase and there is already a wide gap between military pay and civilian pay.

The people who join the military are not trying to get rich. But if you are a private in Iraq, I don't think making $18,000 a year is too much to ask for. We were trying to give those privates and everyone across the board a 3.5 percent pay increase to lessen that gap. President Bush in writing said a 3.5 percent pay increase for our troops is, I quote, ''unnecessary.'' Unnecessary. A private first class making $18,000 a year in Iraq is unnecessary. It is too much money to ask for.

So this House bill in which the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. DONNELLY cosponsored says a sense of the Congress is it should be a 3.5 percent pay increase. We support the troops and understand their sacrifice. We can find the money through PAYGO rules which the Blue Dogs believe in. As the gentleman from Arkansas says, $9 trillion is what we owe in debt.

So my daughter Maggie, who is home with my beautiful wife, when my daughter was born in Lower Bucks Hospital 6 months ago, she was born $29,000 in debt, a debt that we all owe combined, every man, woman and child, $9 trillion.

Some folks, when I am meeting folks in my district, they would say, Patrick, we are at war. Of course, it is going to cost money. I tell them this Iraq war has cost $450 billion, now up to maybe $500 billion. We owe $9 trillion to Communist China, to Mexico and to Japan. In March, 2007, the interest that we pay on that debt was $21 billion.

Now I know those folks at home who believe in what the Blue Dog Democrats believe in, of fiscal responsibility, of accountability. They say to themselves, wow, Congressman MURPHY, $21 billion just in interest.

When I tell them how I used to be an educator at West Point and how we need to be more and more competitive in a global economy, I show them the numbers, we only spent $5 billion in education in March, 2007, yet $21 billion on the interest rate and the debt that we owe that we continue to rack up and rack up.

Finally, the Blue Dogs are taking such an incredible leadership role, establishing a PAYGO system and doing

the things necessary to put our fiscal house back in order.

Mr. Speaker, I know you cannot speak, but I know you are a Blue Dog, and I am proud that you are up there; and, Mr. ROSS, I am proud you are one of our leaders of the Blue Dog Coalition. I am also proud of the freshmen Blue Dogs that I serve with, because we will demand answers and we will demand accountability of this administration and the next administration, hopefully a Democratic one, to make sure that we continue the progress that we are making in this 110th Congress.

Mr. ROSS. I thank Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania for joining us this evening and for helping write House Resolution 97, providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom Cost Accountability. We are not just talking about this. We are trying to do something about it.

In fact, some of these key provisions were included in the defense authorization bill, and we want to thank Chairman SKELTON and members of Armed Services for doing that.

It does four things. It calls for transparency on how Iraq war funds are spent. It calls for the creation of a Truman-like commission to investigate the awarding of contracts. It provides a need to fund the Iraq war through the normal appropriations process and not through the so-called emergency ''let's hide the real cost of the war'' supplementals. And, finally, it encourages the use of American resources to improve Iraqi assumption of internal policing operations. In other words, put Iraqis on the front line and get our soldiers off the front line and provide our soldiers to train their soldiers so they can fight their own civil war.

I yield to Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. DONNELLY. I know we are starting to run short on time, so I just want to sum up what I have been thinking and saying here tonight with this: How far have we gone askew? How confused have we become with this administration when a 3.5 percent pay raise is unnecessary, but we lose $12 billion in Iraq that there is no trace of, that was loaded onto skids into an airplane and can't even be found. But we can't give a 3.5 percent pay raise to the best, the bravest, the finest who have ever served this country.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. ROSS, that's part of the reason we need this Iraq War Accountability Act, just one of the many glaring things, but I leave that with the American people and let them know these Blue Dogs are on the hunt to get that fixed.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his insight and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any comments, questions or concerns, you can e-mail us at BlueDog@mail.house.gov. That is BlueDog@mail.house.gov.

I am talking about House Resolution 97, providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom Cost Accountability. We are not just talking about a problem. We are trying to fix the problem. There are only 43 of us in the Blue Dogs, a group of conservative Democrats, and yet we already have 63 cosponsors on this bill.

House Resolution 97 also calls for the Iraqi government and its people to progress towards full responsibility for internally policing their own country.

Recently, members of the Blue Dog Coalition worked together with House Armed Services Committee Chairman, IKE SKELTON, to include key provisions of House Resolution 97 in the fiscal year 2008 National Defense Authorization bill. With the passage of this bill, we took the first step towards ensuring complete fiscal transparency in the funding of the war in Iraq.

The American people deserve to know that their tax dollars are being spent wisely and that our troops have the resources they need to succeed. The Blue Dogs are committed to passing legislation that accomplishes this goal.

Members of the Blue Dog Coalition also believe strongly that funding requests for the Iraq war should come through the normal appropriations process, as I mentioned earlier. Since 2003, the Republican-held Congress has been funding the war through emergency supplemental requests, two of them in 2003, another one in 2004 and 2005 and 2006 and 2007. It is time we stop hiding the cost of this war. We demand fiscal accountability in Iraq.

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my leadership for the opportunity once again to come to the floor and to shed a little light. Tonight, we are going to shed a little truth on some of the messages that we have heard just now and maybe previously here in Washington.

This is another edition of The Official Truth Squad. The Official Truth Squad is a group of Republicans who desire to make certain that some sense of factual information is provided, Mr. Speaker, as we talk about the issues that are dealt with on the floor of this House.

We have a favorite, a number of favorite quotes. One of them is from Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Senator Moynihan said, everyone is entitled to their own opinion but not to their own facts.

Mr. Speaker, it is curious to hear my friends on the other side of the aisle and their righteous indignation, the righteous indignation that they have about so many various things, particularly tonight when they talked about spending and funding the troops.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is curious because the bill that this House passed under the leadership on the other side, the majority party leadership, just 2 weeks ago, I know you will find this amazing, but that is a bill that could have been passed the first or second week of January of this year to appropriately fund the troops who are standing in harm's way, who are defending our liberty and our freedom and attempting to carry out what they believe, we believe, to be a role that will result in a more safe and secure Middle East and a more safe and secure United States of America.

That bill was held up literally for 5 months because of political posturing and gamesmanship and all sorts of things that, frankly, Mr. Speaker, Americans are tired of. They are tired of it.

We all got back in Washington from a week at home. Most of us went home to our districts. It is good to go home and hear what people are really thinking. The folks in my district on the northern side of Atlanta, they are mad as can be about the partisan games that are played here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to bring a little truth and light and fact to many different areas. But I think it is important for everybody to appreciate, especially in this body, that the bill that was passed to appropriately fund the troops, 2 weeks ago we passed that bill, that is a bill that could have been passed by virtually every single positive vote in this House the first or second week of January had our good friends, the Blue Dogs and others, not participated in the kind of gamesmanship that the American people are, frankly, tired of.

I want to talk a little bit about the fiscal house being put back in order. Our good friends on the other side of the aisle talked about putting the, quote, ''fiscal house back in order'' which is why the Blue Dogs felt that they increased their numbers and assisted the election of the majority.

I think it is curious when they talk about putting the fiscal house of this Nation back in order. Because if you look at the truth, if you look at facts, if you listen to facts and not just opinion, Mr. Speaker, you will appreciate I know that what has happened over the first, a little over 5 months of this new Congress under new leadership is that we have seen an increased authorization for over $50 billion in new spending. So are they putting the fiscal house back in order by decreasing spending? No. Over $50 billion in new spending authorized by this new majority with the Blue Dogs supporting virtually every one of those bills.

So they must be then decreasing taxes, right, Mr. Speaker, in order to put the fiscal house back in order. Well, no, they are not doing that either. Because the budget that they adopted, this Democrat majority with I think the unanimous support of the Blue Dogs on the other side of the aisle, the budget that they adopted, over $400 billion in new taxes for the American people. It is the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation. I guess that they would argue that is putting this fiscal house back in order.

Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it has many folks at home asking me if the Blue Dogs are not just lap dogs and if they are not just kowtowing to the Democratic leadership and doing what they are told to do, as opposed to being fiscally responsible. Which is what so many of us on our side of the aisle are working so hard to do.

So things are a little curious, which is why I think it is important to bring some truth and facts to the debate and the discussion.

We had some curious things happen on the floor of the House today, Mr. Speaker. I know that you were as puzzled as I at some of the events that occurred yesterday. There was an indictment that was passed down in a court that indicted a Member of Congress, a Member of the House of Representatives. They indicted him I think on 16 counts. So the new majority party came to the floor of the House today, having known about the problem that this individual has had for years, literally. They came to the floor of the House today and they were stumbling over themselves to get to the microphone and to the floor as fast as they could to address this issue that could have been addressed long ago, and passed a resolution that said that anybody who had any criminal charge against them as a Member of Congress, a Member of the House, or any indictment would be referred to the Ethics Committee.

□ 2245

That may be appropriate. It passed by a wide margin. I was pleased to support it. I think the process was flawed. It didn't go through the regular committee process and, consequently, was a pretty poorly written bill, but it moves us in a little bit of the right direction.

In that whole process of talking about it on the floor of the House this afternoon and evening, the majority leader said something to the effect of anyone accused of wrongdoing needs to be investigated. Any Member of the House who is accused of wrongdoing needs to be investigated, which brings up, Mr. Speaker, the whole issue of earmarks, of special projects.

That's what I'd like to spend a little time talking about this evening, the whole issue of pork projects, special projects, earmarks, things that have inflated our budget to a huge degree and things that, frankly, ought not be included in the vast majority of bills, and if they are, they ought to have the greatest amount of scrutiny by both sides of the aisle, Members from both sides, and certainly greatest amount of scrutiny from our constituents, from people all across this Nation, and a great amount of scrutiny from the press.

That's what we call sunshine. That's what I call sunshine for earmarks, and it's an important thing. And the majority party made a huge deal as they ran for office last fall about the importance of spending restraint and getting the fiscal house in order, as it were, although we haven't seen a whole lot of that since they took over, but they made a huge point about controlling earmarks and putting a lid on earmarks and special projects.

And this past week, we've heard a lot about it, but what has happened is that things have actually gotten worse. Mr. Speaker, I know it's hard to believe, but they have actually gotten worse. And there are a number of people who believe that and a number of objective individuals. Again, facts will back up this case.

There was a letter written by the minority leader to the Speaker recently in which he said, We now have reached the point at which the congressional earmark process has become less transparent and less accountable than it was during the 109th Congress, directly violating pledges made last year by Democratic leaders.

That goes a long way. I tell you that's a major statement, less transparent, meaning not the kind of sunshine, and less accountable so that who knows where these projects are coming from. How are the people, how are the American citizens, supposed to hold their Member accountable if, in fact, they're doing what they don't believe they ought to do?

It has gotten so bad that a Member of even the Democrat majority has said, A lot of Democrats believe it's our turn at the trough. Quite a statement, Mr. Speaker. A lot of Democrats believe it's our turn at the trough. That's a fact that that was indeed said, and in fact, it's distressing because it appears to be that that's the fact of action on the part of this new majority.

Now, what did they do in fact? I have coined it Orwellian democracy because so often what has happened with this new majority is that they have said the right thing, they said they were going to do something, and then in fact either done exactly the opposite or ignored what they said they were going to do.

Well, what do I mean by that, Mr. Speaker? I have in my hand here the book of rules of the House of Representatives. It's a pretty dry read, but it's got some important points in it, and these are the rules by which the House operates and by which we supposedly make certain that individual Members of this House are held accountable for their actions.

One part of the rules talks about congressional earmarks. What's an earmark? How do you determine what an earmark is? How do you determine what a special project is? It's important to know that so you can say, yeah, that ought to be subject to a certain amount of scrutiny, hopefully more scrutiny, a certain amount of sunshine, that the individual Member of Congress ought to have to stand up and say that's my project, I support that project, I'm interested in having us spend Federal taxpayer money on that project.

So what's the definition of a congressional earmark? Well, in House rule XXI, subclause 9(d) it says, congressional earmark means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Member providing, authorizing or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority or other expenditure targeted to a specific State, locality, or congressional district other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process.

Now, what does that mean? That means that if an individual Member of Congress says I believe that certain Federal tax dollars, hard-earned taxpayer dollars ought to go for a specific project in my district for a specific purpose, and it's not part of any other authorization that the Federal Government has for another role or another aspect of its responsibility, it's something that a specific Member requests, that's a congressional earmark.

Now, how do you make certain that there's appropriate accountability for that? Well, Mr. Speaker, another portion of the rules it says that a list of those earmarks have to be in any bill that has an earmark, and the list has to include the Member's name who requested it. That's an important point because that allows for the sunshine. That makes it so that all Members of this body know who's requested that. It makes it so that the press know who's requested it and they can follow up on it and do investigations if they deem it to be appropriate. It's necessary so that constituents, people out across America, can know who's requesting these things.

And it goes on to say that if a list isn't included, the way that you can follow the rules as well is that a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks may suffice. So, if the bill actually contained no earmarks, then all that it took was the chairman of the committee to write a statement to the Speaker and to the Rules Committee that, in fact, the bill contained no earmarks, no special projects.

Now, one of the reasons that I've dubbed this the new Orwellian majority and Orwellian democracy is that what we've seen is that multiple bills, Mr. Speaker, multiple bills have come to the floor of the House with special project after special project after special project, millions and sometimes billions of dollars, and yet what is included in the report language from the committee is the sentence from the chairman that no congressional earmarks are in the bill, in spite of the fact that they're in the bill. That's why I call it Orwellian democracy because it just simply takes the chairman, an individual, to say, well, there aren't any earmarks in there, and so it satisfies the rule.

Now, I went to the parliamentarian on this because I couldn't believe it. I

said, Do you mean to tell me that if the chairman of the committee just says, regardless of its truth, just says there are no earmarks in this bill that that satisfies, that means there are no earmarks, even if there are? And the parliamentarian said absolutely correct, absolutely.

And so the only option that we have is to come to the floor and say, look, what they've said just isn't the truth. Remember, it's an opinion. It's not a fact. And the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that time after time this new majority has brought bill after bill to the floor with earmarks and special project after special project after special project and simply gotten around the rules because they say, oh, no, there's no earmarks here.

Let me give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker, because I know people would be interested in looking at that. Members of the House, if they're interested, H.R. 1100 was a bill that we voted on just a couple of weeks ago. The whole legislation really was one big earmark with a $7 million estimate cost by CBO over a number of years, and it specifically dealt with one congressional district, one specific project, and it did not have any other statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process. The whole thing was an earmark, but it had in the language of the report from the committee, no earmarks here, no earmarks here. Mr. Speaker, that emperor has no clothes I promise you.

H.J. Res. 20 was the continuing resolution to make certain that there was the money in place to continue the Federal Government's responsible activities. What did that have? Multiple earmarks, multiple. Millions and millions of dollars of earmarks, and in fact, got around the rule by just saying, oh, there are no earmarks here, there are no earmarks here. Orwellian democracy, Mr. Speaker.

And then most recently, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill had billions, billions of dollars in special projects, and in fact, all that was done in order to comply with the rules of the House was to have one of the chairmen of the committee say, oh, no, there are no earmarks here.

It reminds one of the Wizard of Oz, you know, where the wizard says, oh, don't pay any attention to that man behind that curtain. Well, that's kind of what the majority party is asking; don't pay attention to these earmarks even though we say there are none.

So what's the solution now? They have taken a lot of heat, this majority party has taken a lot of heat for trying to put these special projects, pork projects into bills. And so what's their solution? Well, they have come up with a solution.

Before we talk about that solution, it's important to remember what they promised. What did this new majority promise? And what they said was, We're going to adopt rules that make the system of legislation transparent so that we don't legislate in the dark of night and the public and other Members can see what's being done. We need to have earmarks subject to more debate. That's what debate and public awareness is all about. Democracy works if people know what's going on. That was Majority Leader HOYER last fall after the election. That's what he said about the earmark process.

And the now-Speaker said about a year ago, It's the special interest earmarks that are ones that go in there in the dark of night. They don't want anybody to see, and that nobody does see and then they're voted upon. So transparency, yes, by all means, let's subject them all to the scrutiny that they deserve and let them compete for the dollar. That's now-Speaker PELOSI. That's the statement that she made just a little over a year ago.

What's happened? What's the reality, Mr. Speaker? What's the facts, not the opinion, not the Orwellian democracy of, oh, there aren't any earmarks in that bill, don't bother looking because there aren't any earmarks in that bill? But what's the facts?

The fact is that after promising this unprecedented openness regarding Congress' pork barrel practices, what the majority party, the House Democrats, have done, they've moved in exactly the opposite direction. As they draw up spending bills, the new appropriations bills are coming on line for this new budget year, they're side-stepping the rules approved on the very first day that they took power in January where they said we need to identify earmarks. Remember those rules, Mr. Speaker, where you had to have a list of earmarks? You had to have the individual that requested them? Had to make certain that there was sunshine?

Rather than including specific pet projects or grants or contracts in the legislation as it's written, this is what's new, Mr. Speaker. Democrats are following an order by House Appropriations Committee Chairman to keep the bills free of such earmarks until it's too late in the process to challenge them. Too late in the process to challenge them. Phenomenal, absolutely phenomenal.

Associated Press writer Andrew Taylor said just 2 days ago, After promising unprecedented openness regarding Congress' pork barrel practices, House Democrats are moving in the opposite direction.

From an article by Andrew Taylor, the Associated Press of January 3, Representative DAVID OBEY, who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, says that those requests for dams, community grants and research contracts for favored universities or hospitals will be added spending measures in the fall. That's when the House and the Senate negotiators assemble their final bill. So, as a result, most lawmakers will not get the chance to oppose or even identify specific projects as wasteful or questionable when the spending bills for various agencies get their first vote in the full House this month.

So what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker, is that instead of this wonderful transparency, instead of the sunshine, all the accountability that this new majority talked about, in fact what they're doing is going way back, way back to an old time long, long ago when these special projects were put in late at night with nobody watching, no ability to gain accountability for it, no ability to see what's happening, no opportunity for average Members of this House of Representatives to see and appreciate what's happening in terms of spending in the appropriations bills as they go forward.

The House-Senate compromise bills due for final action in September cannot be amended, and it's extremely pivotal because you can't say, well, this is a project that we ought to have more discussion on, more debate on. So it can't be amended and they're only subject to 1 hour of debate.

□ 2300

It's not just those of us who believe in sunshine for earmarks, something that I have fought for a number of years. It's not just those of us in the House of Representatives who are concerned. Tom Shatz, the President of Citizens Against Government Waste says, ''Who appointed him judge and jury of earmarks? What that does is leave out the public's input.''

The article from Mr. TAYLOR goes on to say what Mr. OBEY is doing runs counter to new rules. The Democrats promised they would make such spending decisions more open. Those rules made it clear that projects earmarked for Federal dollars and their sponsors were to be made available to public scrutiny when appropriations bills are debated. The rules also require lawmakers requesting such projects to provide a written explanation describing their request in a letter certifying that they or their spouse wouldn't make any financial gain from them.

So it's important to appreciate what is happening with this new Orwellian democracy, Orwellian majority, is that what we are seeing is them saying one thing and then doing something exactly the opposite.

Again, it's not just those of us on this side of the aisle who believe that and have documented that. This is an article from the St. Petersburg Times that explains in an editorial, ''The new game that House Appropriations Chairman DAVID OBEY intends to play with budget earmarks this year is worse than the usual hide-and-seek. He's taken the whole thing underground, as though he is to be trusted as a one-man auditor for congressional pork. If this is to be the new ethic the Democrats promised, voters might want to get their ballots back.''

Something that I have talked about, the American people are paying attention, they are watching, and they are disappointed with what they see. This

new majority talked about taking the Nation in a new direction. They have taken it in a new direction, and it has been exactly backwards, backwards to a time, as documented or given the opinion by the St. Petersburg Times. It's worse than what has happened in the past.

The Las Vegas Review Journal notes that it didn't take long for Democrats to break their promise on earmark reform. ''When Democrats took control of Congress 4 months back, incoming House Speaker NANCY PELOSI bragged that it would take her party less than 100 hours to curb wasteful pork spending by requiring Members to attach their names to their earmarks, exposing such waste to the harsh light of public scrutiny. She failed to mention this reform would remain in effect for little more than the 100 days.''

Didn't even last that long, because, as we have documented already, what has taken place is this process of bypassing or skirting the rules by saying, oh, no, there is no earmarks there, when, in fact, there is a laundry list as long as your arm in there. That's the fact. That's the fact of the matter.

So while Democrats plot to hide their wasteful spending from the American people, our side, House Republicans, will continue to work to make the earmark process much more transparent and more accountable; and we will work to root out that wasteful spending and balance the budget without raising taxes, without raising taxes, which is so remarkably important.

I mentioned that I was home last week, many of us were home in our districts last week. That's what I heard, that individuals all across my district that I talked to have been concerned about spending. Over and over and over they said, we know that you can balance that budget without increasing spending and without increasing taxes.

So when our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about getting the fiscal House in order, yet they authorize more spending and they increase in their budget taxes by over $400 billion, the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation, my folks, the folks in my district at home say, well, that just doesn't wash. That's not the kind of leadership we want.

So that new direction, those ballots that that editorial talked about, folks getting back, may, in fact, need to occur. And it's a wonderful thing to be able to have accountability for Members of Congress every 2 years. I believe firmly that the American people are, indeed, watching; and they are already tired of what they see on the part of this new majority, especially in the area of earmark reform.

I have been joined by a very good friend from Arizona, who truly is the champion of earmark reform, a fellow who has worked tirelessly in his time in Congress to bring light and shed light on the egregious activity that occurs here in the special project. I am so pleased to have my good friend join me, Mr. FLAKE from Arizona. I look forward to your comments.

Mr. FLAKE. I appreciate you taking the time to bring this important issue to light.

I am the first to admit that our party didn't handle this issue very well. We went over about a decade or 12 years, depending on how you count them, from about 1,400 earmarks in all appropriation bills to more than 15,000. So the process exploded with Republicans in charge. That doesn't speak well for us as a party. We should not have let that happen.

I think right here near the end we woke up, and we passed some legislation in October of last year. Unfortunately, I think it was near the end of the appropriation process, when it was really too late to do any good.

The Democrats, to their credit, when they came into power in January of this year, passed a little stronger legislation than I think we did, and I think I and many of my colleagues gave them credit for that. It was a good thing to add more transparency to the earmark process.

The problem, as the gentleman from Georgia has so aptly pointed out, is that the rules that we set are only as good as our willingness to enforce them. So you can have pretty good rules with regard to earmark reform, with regard to transparency, but unless you are willing to enforce them, they are of little worth.

As the gentleman pointed out, when you have rules that allow the chairman of the committee to simply make a declaration that there are no earmarks in this bill, when there clearly are, we have no recourse. We have to accept that statement as if it were fact, when it clearly isn't.

The gentleman mentioned the war supplemental that came up. We actually had an example where there was a press release of one Member actually claiming credit for an earmark that had been received for that Members' district, put out a press release touting it. Yet, for that same bill, there was a statement in the RECORD saying there are no earmarks in this bill.

So, the gentleman mentioned, it was like a fairy tale. I think it's a lot like Alice in Wonderland, where you say a word has whatever meaning I give to it; and, in this case, you know, an earmark is whatever I pretend to call it. Unfortunately, that doesn't lend itself to transparency.

We have the situation now, which is far worse than anything we have heard before, that we won't have any earmarks in the House bills, but, rather, we will wait until the House bill is done, the Senate bill is done. Then the earmarks will be airdropped into the conference report.

Now, if that is the case, there is no way for any Member of this body to challenge any of those earmarks that come up. There is no way you can amend, because you can't do that to a conference report. You have to ask yourself, is that more transparency? Is that a better process?

The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee stated that more time was needed to actually scrub these earmarks, to make sure that they are proper, and that the committee was undertaking to do that.

I think, and I think those who have been watching this process will agree, that the best way to scrub the process is to let sunlight in to allow these earmarks to be made known, to allow the media, the blogging community out there, organizations that follow this and other Members of this body, to actually see these earmarks and to judge them and to determine who is it going to, who is going to benefit from this earmark?

If we are really concerned about scrubbing these earmarks, to make sure that they are proper, then let people know about them. Nobody is served well if they are kept secret.

So I commend the gentleman again for bringing this important issue to light. I would encourage him to keep up this battle and to make sure that earmarks get the sunlight that they deserve. If we want to really curb this practice that has gotten out of control, we need to ensure that we have more sunlight, not less.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much for your comments and for your good work on this matter. It's an issue that really strikes a chord, because it gets to the heart of irresponsible activity and irresponsible spending here in Washington.

So many of our friends back at home just are tired of it. They are tired of it. I think that's the message this they sent in November. I think that's the message that they sent. It wasn't some of the things that our good friends on the other side of the aisle, the message that they were sending. The message that they were sending is be responsible about your spending.

I will bet that if you had a referendum last November and you asked every single voter who went to the polls, would you think it would be a better idea to hide from the American people the special project spending that goes on in Congress to a greater degree than currently exists, yes or no, I bet you couldn't find a soul in this Nation that would support that.

Mr. FLAKE. Most certainly, I think across the country the taxpayers want to know what is going on. I think that they look at the process that we have now where Members will submit requests, earmark requests, but those requests are only made public if their earmark is actually part of a bill that comes to the House.

Now, under this new procedure that has been announced by the majority, those earmark letters, which indicate who the earmark is to go to, won't be made public at all until it's too late in the process to actually challenge that earmark.

So it means little to go through the process that we have set up if, by the

time it has any effect, it's too late in the process to change.

So the gentleman is correct, I think. Across the country, that's what I hear when I am out there. People want to know. They want open government.

When you think about it, every second that this Chamber is in session is captured on C–SPAN, this conversation and every other conversation, whenever this body is in session. When we are in committee, every word that is said is transcribed and is captured. So we have an open process.

Yet when it comes to spending money, we have a very secretive process in terms of earmarks, where, according to the majority this year, we won't know it all until it's too late to actually change it, until we have to just do one up and down, up or down vote on a bill.

There are several bills in the past, in fact, one bill, the highway bill a couple of years ago, that had 6,300 earmarks in the bill. You could conceivably have that again. At least, you know, virtually every appropriation bill is up somewhere approaching 1,000 or maybe 2,500. So, think of that, 2,500 earmarks in a single bill. The Members here won't even have the ability to challenge one of those, won't even know that they are there until you have to have to take one up or down vote on that legislation. I think every American knows that that simply is wrong.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That really brings to light the issue of accountability, what your constituents want. I know what my constituents want me to do is to make certain that I am paying attention to all of these items and that I raise questions about items that I believe they would not support.

Sometimes just a question of clarification, I have been so pleased to be able to support you in many of your efforts to shed light on so many earmarks that have been brought to the floor, and maybe you wouldn't mind sharing with our colleagues the process that that takes and how to get just one vote on a specific earmark and how this process would foil all of that and make it so that there would be no transparency at all.

Mr. FLAKE. Over the appropriation process last summer, I believe we brought 39 earmarks in several appropriation bills to the floor; and my effort was, in many cases, simply to see whose earmark this was and to have that Member actually justify the need for that earmark.

We simply didn't know who requested it. We saw it in the committee report. When the bill came to the floor, it would generally be a vague description of an earmark to a certain entity or a company. But you wouldn't know who actually sponsored the earmark until you challenged it on the floor. Then, typically, the author of that earmark would come to defend it, but not always.

I should mention that many of the earmarks that were challenged on the floor in the last appropriation cycle, the author of the earmark never even came to the floor to defend it. He or she simply knew that, through the process of log rolling, that other Members would know I won't challenge that earmark and the author of that earmark won't challenge mine.

So it was a very disheartening process to go through. But at least we could go through that process. At least we knew something about what was in the bill, because we had the reports come to the floor. Under the process that has been announced, we wouldn't even have that ability.

□ 2315

These bills would come to the floor, there would be no earmark, there would be no letters attached saying there are this many earmarks. There would be no lists listing the Members who had requested earmarks. Nothing. We would simply have to wait until it was too late in the process to actually challenge until the earmarks were air dropped into the conference report. So it's an important distinction.

I think the process has been far too secretive in the past. We would typically only get these lists in the committee reports hours before the bill actually came to the floor. But that's miles better than what is being discussed now because these earmarks would not be made known at all until it's too late. They would be kept secret from the body as a whole, and from the taxpayers across the country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank you again for your comments.

And I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, for our colleagues to appreciate that this is a proposed process that is being put in place by the majority party to correct what they have perceived as a lack of transparency and a lack of accountability. But their solution will result in less accountability and less transparency. And as I mentioned before, I don't think that's what the American people want. It certainly isn't what my constituents want, and it's not what you fought for for years and years to have greater transparency and greater accountability to the whole special project earmarking process.

Does the gentleman have any more comments?

Mr. FLAKE. Well, I just again thank the gentleman. And just to reiterate again, we have had a bad process. We recognize that. That was the reason for the reforms that we did in the fall of last year. And as I mentioned, I applauded the Democrats for the reforms that they put in place in January. The problem is we're running away from those reforms rather fast. And if we are really serious about bringing in sunlight and transparency, then we have to stop this proposed new rule, or this proposed process I should say, it's not a formal rule, to make sure that these earmarks get the sunlight that they deserve, that every member of this body and every taxpayer across the country has a chance to see what this body is doing. That's what open government is all about. And I, again, thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so very much. I appreciate you coming and joining us this evening.

So folks say well, what is it that you're asking for? Well I've talked about American values and American vision. And what we believe, what I believe Americans are asking for in this instance is open and honest leadership. It's what we oftentimes here in Washington give lip service to. But the fact of the matter is that the American people desire and I believe are demanding open and honest leadership. I believe, we believe that they have a right to transparent and fair legislative process. And the process that has been described for dealing with these earmarks, these special projects, these pork projects is neither transparent nor is it fair because it puts, it's not transparent because there's no light on it. There's no sunlight. There's no ability for, as my good friend from Arizona said, there's no ability for anybody to know who's asking for these earmarks during the process. And then there's no way for the House to work its will on an individual special project as to vote them up or down. Maybe thousands, literally thousands of them included in a particular bill. So that's not a transparent process. It's not a fair process because it concentrates power into the hands of too few individuals, the chairman of Appropriations or the subcommittee chairmen on Appropriations.

We believe that Americans have a right to sunshine on how taxpayer money is spent. That again gets to the transparency. You ought to shed light on it. How does this process work? Who's asking for the money? And so that they have to stand up and defend it in front of their constituents, in front of their colleagues and in front of the media, in front of the press.

And finally, that Americans have a right to merit based spending that's open to the public debate and open to public scrutiny.

Those are principles that I believe, we believe incorporate American values and an American vision that individuals all across this Nation have as the kind of vision for their government, how they believe their government ought to act.

Again, in November, if one had asked on everybody's ballot across this Nation, do you think that there ought to be less transparency, that there ought to be less accountability for special projects in Congress, Mr. Speaker, I'll bet you wouldn't have got 1 percent of the people across this Nation to vote in favor of that. Not one. So what we're asking for is accountability, is transparency.

I think it's also important, again, to appreciate that there are others across

this Nation who are concerned and dismayed by this process proposal that's been put forward by the new majority party. And I'd just like to highlight some of them, because I think it's important for folks to appreciate that this isn't just your usual political backbiting. This is serious business. This is how we're spending hard earned American taxpayer money. And the proposal is such that I believe, we believe, that it would be much less responsible, certainly much less transparent and much less accountable, and there are folks who believe that all across this Nation.

As I mentioned, the editorial in the St. Petersburg Times, one of the lines there said, ''The result then is that the earmark projects will receive almost no public scrutiny and no Congressional debate.'' Significant, major paper in an editorial today.

The Review Journal in Las Vegas, the Las Vegas Review Journal said, ''Democrat earmark reforms lasted 100 days. When Democrats took control of Congress just 4 months back, incoming House Speaker NANCY PELOSI of California bragged that it would take her party less than 100 hours to curb wasteful pork spending by requiring Members to attach their names to their earmarks exposing such waste to the harsh light of public scrutiny. She failed to mention that this reform would remain in effect for little more than 100 days. The anti-earmark reforms are just for show, mere window dressing.'' That's the Las Vegas Review and Journal from an editorial today.

There is a gentleman on CNN, Mr. Cafferty, Jack Cafferty, who has had a lot to say about Washington spending. Yesterday he said, ''Remember when the Democrats took control of the Congress back in January? On their very first day in power they approved rules to clearly identify so-called pet projects or earmarks in spending bills. You know, part of their promise to bring openness and transparency to government. Well, guess what? The Associated Press reports Democrats are not including the spending requests in legislation as it's being written. Instead they're following an order from the House Appropriations Committee Chairman David Obey to keep the bills free of these earmarks until the fall. Now, by doing this, nobody will know what the earmarks are when the bills are first voted on in June. And when they're finally announced in the fall, well, then it will be virtually too late to do anything about them. Clever, don't you think?'' That comes from CNN's Jack Cafferty, June 4, yesterday.

And so it's people all across this Nation who are concerned about the process that's been defined. The Toledo Blade, newspaper in Toledo, Ohio, in an editorial a little over a week ago, said, ''Backtracking on earmarks. Here's the outrage of the week from Washington. Democrats who took control of Congress by pledging reform and whacking Republicans over the issue of special interest earmarks already are perpetuating this odious waste of taxpayer money. Democrats promised to end such abuses. Now that they are in charge, they should live up to their rhetoric.'' That's an editorial in the Toledo Blade a little over a week ago.

From Montana, the Missoulian in Montana said, ''Congressional pork too tasty to leave alone. Congress is ignoring election promises and feasting on pork projects. What's on the menu on Capital Hill these days? Pork of course. Not that we're surprised, but we're scratching our heads given the promises and pronouncements of the last election season. In their first half year in office, the newly powerful House Democrats have seemingly lost their reformist zeal.'' Editorial from the Missoulian Montana this May 31 of this year.

How about Pennsylvania? Reading, Pennsylvania, the Reading Eagle in Pennsylvania said, ''Democratic vows remain unfulfilled. They can talk the talk but they seem to have difficulty walking the walk. As the approval ratings of Republicans plummeted prior to last November's general election, Democrats saw their chance to regain Congressional control. Representative NANCY PELOSI, who was soon to become Speaker of the House, said, 'We pledge to make this the most honest, ethical and open Congress in history.' That pledge,'' this is now from the Reading Eagle, from Reading, Pennsylvania. ''That pledge was broken in March when democratic leaders pushed through a $124 billion emergency supplemental bill to fund the military in Iraq and Afghanistan that was laden with $21 billion in pork barrel spending known as earmarks. A House rule instituted by Democrats that prohibits swapping earmarks for votes also seems to have fallen by the wayside.''

In fact, that brings up a specific point that is of grave concern to many of us. We highlighted on our side of the aisle a member of the Appropriations Committee who challenged and literally threatened a Member of the minority party, Republican Member, with saying that if he didn't support a certain bill, a certain provision, that his earmarks would be pulled from the appropriations bill. And it happened on the floor of the House. Many people witnessed it. And what did the new majority, when that was brought to light, what did they do with that complaint, with that concern, with that issue?

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know, and you remember, they moved to table the motion, the resolution that would have simply required an investigation of that process. And tabling, as you know, Mr. Speaker, means that it kills the issue. It's dead. So the majority party wielded their muscle and made certain that an individual who is in the majority, who is muscling another Member of the House of Representatives and threatening to withhold certain funds from a bill because he wouldn't support another provision, that will go uninvestigated. That will just be tossed under the rug, swept under the rug. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the kind of United States House of Representatives that Americans desire or that they deserve.

Further, a couple of others, Mr. Speaker, of objective individuals citing their concern about this new process for spending on the part of our new majority. CNN investigative reporter Drew Griffin said on May 25, ''The new open Democratic Party-controlled Congress promised the earmark process would no longer be secret. All earmark requests are made public with plenty of time for debate. But DAVID OBEY, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and one of those Democrats bragging about those changes, has decided that earmarks, those generous gifts of your money, will be inserted into bills only after the bill has cleared the House floor. In other words, earmarks will still be done in secret with no public debate. There was supposed to be some kind of change. In the next few months, in what Congressman OBEY says is the most open earmark process ever, the bills will be drafted, the earmarks added. But only then, just before those bills are passed, will the public learn where the treasure is buried.''

Mr. Speaker, that's not the kind of process that my constituents desire. That's not the kind of process that they voted for. It's not the kind of process that we've proposed. It's not the kind of process that is becoming of a House, especially when the majority party says that they are desirous of getting this fiscal house in order. It's more of that Orwellian democracy. Just because you say it doesn't make it so.

Associated Press on June 3 said, ''After promising unprecedented openness regarding Congress's pork barrel practices House Democrats are moving in the opposite direction as they draw up spending bills for the upcoming budget's year. Democrats are sidestepping rules approved their first day in power to clearly identify earmarks, lawmakers' requests for special projects, and contracts for their states in the documents that accompany spending bills.''

And finally, CNN's Drew Griffin said on May 31, ''Thousands of pages of earmarks in a bill time after time, and the Democrats promised reform and it's not happening.''

Mr. Speaker, what a shame. Truly what a shame. What a great opportunity we have to work together and fashion a system and a process that provides greater transparency, that provides greater openness, that answers the concerns of our constituents who say we want to make certain that there's sunshine on this process. We want to make certain that folks are held accountable. We want to make certain that our hard earned tax money that's going to Washington is

being spent in the most responsible fashion.

And so what is it that we desire? Open and honest leadership, Mr. Speaker. Americans have a right to transparent and fair legislative process. They have a right to sunshine on how taxpayer money is spent. They have a right to merit based spending that's open to public debate and to public scrutiny.

So I would ask my colleagues, I would challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to talk to their leadership, to implore them to urge them to move in the direction that they said they would move and that is greater transparency and greater openness and greater scrutiny of how these public monies are being spent.

□ 2330

So all is not lost. This is recoverable. I know that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said that it would be so, but this is a 435-Member body, and it ought to act in a majority fashion, and I am hopeful that at least some members of the majority party will see that that is not the kind of leadership and not the kind of process that their constituents desire.

Mr. Speaker, before I close this evening, I do want to touch on one other item very briefly, because I know that time is getting late, and that is the whole issue of taxes and spending.

As I mentioned, I was home this past week in the district over the Memorial Day break. And person after person, constituent after constituent kept coming up to me and talking about issue after issue, and one of the major issues was spending, spending in Washington, and taxes, making certain that tax money was being spent responsibly and that taxes didn't go up, which was why it was so concerning to them that this new majority has increased the authorization for spending already, in just 5 months, by over $50 billion; also why it was concerning to them that this new majority has passed a budget that incorporates $400 billion in new taxes. The largest tax increase in the history of the Nation, $400 billion. Phenomenal, absolutely phenomenal.

So when you think about how our economy has been relatively rolling along over the past number of months, over 16, 17, 18 quarters of growth in a row; more homeownership than ever before in the history of the Nation; the unemployment rate at its lowest continual rate in decades, lower than the average of the 1960s and the 1970s and the 1980s and the 1990s; remarkable success in terms of an economy that is performing extremely well, one would think that it would behoove the majority party to say, well, I wonder how that happened. I wonder how that economy got to be so strong.

There are issues and points in time that you can recognize and point to and say there were changes made then that resulted in a very strong economy, and one of them occurred in 2003. This graph highlights it. These are tax revenues coming into the Federal Government.

And, Mr. Speaker, as you know, between 2000 and 2003, Federal tax revenue was declining. We had been hit by some significant challenges, 9/11, a recession, the tech dot com boom burst, and so tax revenue was decreasing. So what happened in 2003, whatever this was, whatever happened on this vertical line here at that point in time, it resulted in significant increases to the Federal Government tax revenue because of a significant increase in the economy, a significant increase in productivity.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know, what happened at that time was that appropriate tax reductions were put in place. Fair tax cuts for the American people were put in place so that the marginal rates were decreased for everybody, so that there was a decrease in capital gains and dividends tax, a decrease over a period of time in the marriage penalty and the death penalty. All of those appropriate tax reductions were decreased.

Tax cuts result in more economic activity and more economic growth. It sounds counterintuitive, but, in fact, it happens every single time that you cut taxes. If you cut taxes, if you give the American people more of their hard-earned money, what they do is they determine when they save or they spend or they invest that money, and that results in a flourishing, increasing economic development and an increasing economic activity in our Nation, and it is undeniable what happened.

There is another graph that demonstrates it, that talks about jobs growth. Here you have a number of jobs created on the horizontal line from 2001 through 2007, and you see again, Mr. Speaker, before the appropriate tax reductions in 2003, what happened was a relative decrease in job growth, month after month after month after month. And what happened with the tax cuts on the American people, allowing people to keep more of their hard-earned tax money, what happens is an incredible increase in job growth, and that is why we have seen over 7 million new jobs created since August of 2003. Incredible economic activity.

So it astounds me that the majority party believes somehow that if they increase taxes, again by passing a budget that has the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation, nearly $400 billion in increased taxes to Americans, almost $2,700 for every single Georgian, a phenomenal increase in taxes, it is incomprehensible to try to understand why the majority party believes that that is the appropriate kind of policy to put in place if they want to continue this kind of activity.

If they wanted to continue this kind of activity, one would think that they would conclude appropriately, objectively, looking at the facts, that the appropriate tax reductions ought to continue. But what they have said is, no, they ought not continue, that those marginal rates ought to go up, that we ought to increase taxes on every single American who pays taxes, that we ought to increase the marriage penalty, that we ought to do away with the decreases in death tax, that we ought to have increases in taxes on capital gains and dividends and we ought to decrease the incentive for investment. It just doesn't make sense.

I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are responsible. I know that they desire to do the right thing. I know that they have heard from their constituents back home, and I suspect what they have heard is please make certain that we continue an economy that allows our Nation to grow, that allows our Nation to defend itself, that allows our Nation to create jobs, that allows our communities to thrive. And one way to do that, one of the most effective ways to do that, is the way that it has happened every single time that it has been tried in our Nation's history, and that is to decrease taxes on the American people. Allow Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money. Allow them to be the ones who determine when they spend or they save or they invest their money.

So I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a good look at what has happened. Take a good look at history. Take a good look at the remarkable economic growth and development that we have had across this Nation over the past 3 to 4 years. And I think what you will conclude, Mr. Speaker, is that those tax reductions ought to remain in place.

We live in an incredible Nation, a Nation that allows those of us who represent districts all across this Nation to come to the House of Representatives and to try our best as honestly and openly as we can to represent our constituents. It is a wonderful Nation. It is a beacon of hope and liberty for folks all around the world, and it is so because we are responsible when we act responsibly and we listen to our constituents and we decide issues based upon what their desires are and what is in the best interest of them and our Nation.

So I call on my colleagues to think seriously about the issues as they relate to taxes and economic development of our Nation. And I know that they will conclude what I have concluded; and that is decreasing taxes results in increasing economic development, increasing economic activity, and, amazingly enough, increasing revenue to the Federal Treasury.

GAS PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLSWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, schools will be letting out

soon, and American families will be hitting the road for their summer vacations. But how far will they get this year with sky-high prices at the pump?

The average price of regular gasoline is hovering near record highs, and this week stands at about $3.16 a gallon. This means American families are spending nearly $54 on average every time they fill up their tank, an astonishing $30 more per tank since President Bush took office.

According to the AAA, the typical American family is on course to spend over $3,600 this year just to fill up their cars if these prices persist. Gasoline prices set a new record of $3.22 a gallon on May 21, according to the AAA's fuel gauge report. Gasoline prices in 34 States broke record highs in the past month. Prices are expected to climb again as the summer driving season progresses.

Record high gas prices may not cause hardworking Americans to cancel vacation plans, but they are forcing families to cut back on other spending, putting our economic growth at risk.

Wherever I go Americans are asking, why are gas prices so high? Surprisingly, the answer is not because crude oil prices are higher than they were last year. According to the Department of Energy, the largest component of U.S. retail gasoline prices is the price of crude oil. What is unique about the current situation is that crude oil prices, the red line, are lower right now at the onset of the summer driving season than they were at this time last year. But, as we all know, gasoline prices, the blue line, are higher than they were this time last year.

The Department of Energy projects that crude oil prices will average $2 less per barrel this summer than last. But they also predict that gasoline will average about $2.95 a gallon this summer, up more than a dime from last summer's $2.84 a gallon on average. Analysts attribute this in large part to the fact that our refinery capacity has failed to keep pace with demand.

We haven't had a new refinery built in the United States in 30 years, pushing refineries to operate at capacity levels that are overtaxing the system. Refining costs account for about 22 percent of the retail price of gasoline, up from 15 percent in 2003.

With the increase in oil and gas prices over the last several years, refining margins are at historical highs. Refining profits in the first quarter of 2007 increased 36 percent over last year, and the U.S. refining margin increased to over $17 per barrel of refined oil.

High gas prices should be an incentive for expanding refining capacity, but instead of building new refineries the industry argues that it has focused on expanding and upgrading existing refineries to keep up with increased demand.

U.S. refining capacity has stayed relatively stable over the past few years, and that is the red bar here. But demand has steadily increased, and that is the blue bar. So capacity utilization has risen, regularly reaching levels above 90 to 95 percent of capacity throughout much of the 1990s and continuing into this decade.

The problems and risks associated with running near full capacity have become very apparent in recent months. As this chart shows, overtaxed refineries have required unplanned maintenance which has taken supply off line and caused short-term price spikes. Refiners typically perform planned maintenance during off-peak driving season, which impacts available stocks of gasoline when the demand is lower. But the increasing frequency of unplanned maintenance is cause for great concern. Unexpected refinery outages choke off supply and cause price spikes at the pump.

A recent spate of such unplanned outages in refineries across the country have made the price spikes a common occurrence and have kept gas prices in the headlines. BP, ConocoPhillips, and Valero Energy have all reported unexpected shutdowns at a number of U.S. refineries.

Oil companies certainly have the profits to invest in increased capacity, but they are not investing. With capacity as tight as it is, refiners can boost profits by taking capacity off line, particularly when there is a lack of competition at the refinery level. It is hard to prove that they are purposely limiting supply, but the risk of manipulating capacity to maximize profits is certainly greater with fewer players in the market.

□ 2345

Consumer advocates, such as the Consumer's Union Mark Cooper, argued that a lack of competition in the market has enabled oil companies to exploit the tight market they have created by purposefully uninvesting and mismanaging refinery maintenance.

With refining margins as high as they are, construction of a new refinery is not a losing proposition, particularly for profit-laden Big Oil companies. But ExxonMobil's CEO, Rex Tillerson, has indicated that he will not build a new refinery in the U.S., pointing to research that U.S. gasoline consumption will plateau in coming years as ethanol and energy efficiency measures become more prevalent.

The current runup in gas prices underscores the urgent need for a better national energy policy. But instead, we see stubborn inaction and complicity on the part of the administration. The Bush administration has turned a blind eye to oversight of the oil and gas industry in general, and especially with respect to mergers. Mergers in the gas and oil industry over the past decade have resulted in dangerously concentrated levels of ownership in the U.S. refining market, leaving us with only five major domestic oil companies controlling the majority of our domestic refining capacity.

The President has approved mergers at such a break-neck speed that by 2005, the top 10 refiners controlled 81 percent of the market, up from 56 percent since 1993. So it has jumped an astonishing amount. This concentration of refiners has restricted production capacity, causing American consumers to pay more at the pump than they would be with more market competition. The lack of competition is hurting consumers now and will hurt our economy in the future.

As a first step toward protecting consumers, the House passed the Energy Price Gouging Prevention Act just before the Memorial Day weekend. This legislation will provide relief to consumers by giving the Federal Trade Commission the authority to investigate and punish those who artificially inflate the price of energy. It would ensure the Federal Government has the tools it needs to adequately respond to energy emergencies and prohibit price gouging. With a priority on refineries and Big Oil companies, especially during a time of national crisis such as Hurricane Katrina, the Energy Price Gouging Prevention Act will provide the FTC with new authority to investigate and prosecute those that engage in predatory or unconscionable pricing from oil companies on down to local gas stations, with an emphasis on those who profit most. This includes the gouging of gasoline, home heating oil, propane or natural gas. It will enpower the Federal Government to impose tough civil penalties of up to triple damages of all excess profits from companies that have cheated consumers.

Until we have abundant renewable energy alternatives to benefit consumers, in the short term Congress must carefully look at the current market framework to see what can be done to improve competition in the marketplace. At the refinery level, Congress should look at strengthening antitrust laws, changing the way oil mergers are reviewed by U.S. antitrust agencies, cracking down on anticompetitive actions by oil companies, and/or improving price transparency at the wholesale level.

Mr. Speaker, high gas prices is an issue that has a supply side and a demand side, and we need to address both. Government leaders and businesses are recognizing the need to reduce our dependency on oil by making our vehicles more fuel efficient and investing in clean, renewable energy sources and technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I request additional time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker's policy of January 18, 2007 does not allow for an extension of the gentlewoman's time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection.

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last month, it was announced in my home district that New York City cabs are going green,

as the Mayor plans to replace the city's fleet with hybrid cars by 2012.

The Joint Economic Committee recently released a report entitled, "Money in the Bank, Not in the Tank", which argues that we have to take the issue of improving fuel efficiency seriously.

America's cars were more efficient two decades ago when our fleet-wide average was 26.2 miles per gallon. Now, our fleet-wide average for cars and trucks has slipped to 25.4 miles per gallon. Clearly, we're going in the wrong direction.

And it's hurting our competitiveness—our nation ranks at the bottom of the list of industrialized nations when it comes to fuel efficiency.

In Europe, fuel efficiency averages around 40 miles per gallon and they're looking to raise it to 51 miles per gallon by 2012. Japan is trying to get to 50 miles per gallon by 2010 across their fleet.

If we raised CAFE standards to 35 miles a gallon from 27.5 miles per gallon, the average American family would reduce their spending on gas by nearly one-quarter.

With families on course to spend more than $3,600 on average filling up their cars this year, this would be a savings of $900 a year.

Despite major technology gains, especially hybrid technologies, and record-breaking gas prices, we are decades behind when it comes to making our cars more efficient.

More efficient cars mean American families spend less at the pump, we're less dependent on foreign oil, and our environment benefits from lower emissions.

The President's priority has been to give tax breaks to oil and gas companies even as their profits have soared to new heights. The big five oil companies enjoyed eye-popping profits of $120 billion last year.

Instead of using those profits to expand refining capacity or make serious investments in renewable energy, the big oil companies are buying back their own stock to enhance prices for their shareholders.

Moreover, oil companies seem to be working hard to prevent gasoline alternatives, such as ethanol-based products, from being pumped at their branded gas stations.

In our first 100 hours of work in the majority, the House voted to roll back $14 billion in taxpayer subsidies for Big Oil companies and reinvest that money here at home in clean alternative fuels, renewable energy and energy efficiency.

We have also passed a bill that encourages research and development of markets for biofuels.

Speaker PELOSI has created a Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming to develop policy initiatives and assure that progress is made toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

Democrats in Congress are working on legislation to protect consumers and increase our energy independence by investing in renewable energy sources and reducing global warming emissions.

We need this new direction for energy policy that brings relief to American families and strengthens our economy.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for 11 minutes?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight for what time is left to us to talk a little bit about health care. I do try to do that every week because this is such an important issue that faces our country, and over the next 18 to 24 months we are going to see perhaps some significant changes proposed and some, in fact, enacted in the Nation's health care system.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to draw your attention, today there was an excellent piece written in today's Wall Street Journal. This piece was on the editorial page, it was written by Dr. Robert A. Swerlick. It is entitled, ''Our Soviet Health System.''

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Swerlick does such a good job of encapsulating a lot of the issues that I have been talking about here over the past several weeks and I just wanted to share a couple of quotes with you from his article as we get started. He is talking about the imbalance between supply and demand. He became aware of it when he found no trouble finding a veterinarian for his pet, but found difficulty finding a pediatric endocrinologist for a diabetic child. And the reason for the imbalance, Mr. Speaker, according to Dr. Swerlick, is because of some of the distortions of the marketplace and the inaccurate signals delivered to the marketplace because of our manipulation of those signals and of those market forces with the pricing structure we have in our Medicare system.

I am quoting from the article from today, and it says, ''The roots of the problem lie in the use of the administrative pricing structures in medicine. The way prices are set in health care already distorts the appropriate allocation of efforts and resources in health care. Unfortunately, many of the suggested reforms of our health care system, including the various plans for universal care or universal insurance or a single payer's system that various policy makers espouse, rest on the same unsound foundations and will produce more of the same.'' Going on and continuing to quote, ''The essential problem is this; the pricing of medical care in this country is either directly or indirectly dictated by Medicare. And Medicare uses an administrative formula which calculates appropriate prices based upon imperfect estimates and fudge factors rather than independently calculate prices, private insurers'', and Mr. Speaker, this is key, and many House Members don't realize this, let me slow down and say this again. ''Rather than independently calculate prices, private insurers in this country almost universally use Medicare prices as a framework to negotiate payments, generally setting payments for services as a percentage of the Medicare fee structure.''

Then further on into the article, again quoting, ''Unlike prices set on the market, errors in this system are not self-correcting.'' That is, we make a mistake in our policy meetings, in our committee hearings, we make a mistake in setting the actual value to a medical service, and that mistake never gets corrected by market forces. It is insulated, it is anesthetized from market forces, and the consequence is it gets worse over time. And then we compound the error when we try to fix things at the committee level or at the level of the Federal agency.

One last thing that I would like to point out that the article does state so succinctly. Markets may not get all the prices exactly correct all of the time, but they are capable of self-correction, a capacity that has yet to be demonstrated by administrative pricing.

Again, a very worthwhile article. And I commend it, Mr. Speaker, to you. And perhaps some of our colleagues will also be interested in that article as well because I think it very succinctly sums up a lot of the things that I have been pointing out over the past several weeks here.

Mr. Speaker, in the few remaining minutes that I have left, I wanted to talk just a little bit about the physician workforce of the future, because that is something we have to focus on as we have this health care debate. A lot of times I worry we are getting the cart before the horse. Here is a cover of the Texas Medical Association's professional magazine back in my home State of Texas. Texas Medicine last March devoted a lot of the issue to the concept of running out of doctors. As a consequence, I am introducing three physician workforce bills tomorrow that will deal with the person perhaps thinking about a career in medicine, the young physician just starting out in either medical school or residency, and then finally, a third bill to deal with the iniquities in the Medicare pricing system that I just referenced in the article of today's Wall Street Journal.

The physician workforce crisis has to be approached on several fronts. The issue of medical liability is one that we need to take on, and we need to be quite serious about that. But when we look at perhaps the largest group of doctors that we may not have in the very near future because of the things we are doing in our Medicare pricing schedule, these are the areas where we really need to concentrate. Baby boomers are going to retire, they are going to get older. Demand for services are going to go nowhere but up. If the physician workforce continues its downward trend, as it is doing year over year, we may not be talking any longer about funding a Medicare program, we may be talking about why there is no one there to take care of seniors.

Year after year reduction in reimbursement plans from the Center of Medicaid and Medicare Services to physicians for services they provide for

their Medicare patients. This is wrong. It is not a question of doctors wanting to make more money, it's about a stabilized repayment for services already rendered. And it isn't affecting just doctors, it is affecting patients every day. It becomes a real crisis of access. Not a week goes by that I don't get a letter or a fax from some physician who says, you know what? I've just had enough and I am going to retire early, or I am no longer going to see Medicare patients in my practice, or I am going to restrict the procedures that I offer to Medicare patients. Unfortunately, I know this is happening because I saw it in the hospital environment before I left practice to come to Congress a few years ago. And I hear it in virtually every town hall that I do back in my district. Congressman, how come on Medicare, you turn 65 and you've got to change doctors? The answer is because their doctor found it no longer economically viable to continue to see Medicare patients because they weren't able to cover the cost of delivering the care, they weren't able to cover the cost of providing the care.

Medicare payments to physicians are modified annually using a formula called the Sustainable Growth Rate. I won't bare you with the intricacies of that formula tonight, I may do that at some other time. But because of flaws in the process, physicians get a mandated fee cut every year, year over year for several years to come. If no long-term congressional action is implemented, the SGR will continue to mandate fee cuts. Unlike hospital reimbursement rates, unlike reimbursement rates to HMOs or drug companies, those closely follow the cost of living index, but the physician's formula does not. In fact, Medicare payments to physicians cover only about 65 percent of the actual cost of providing the services. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, any industry or company that would continue in business if they received only 65 percent of what it cost to cover the care? Currently, the SGR links physician payment updates to the gross domestic product, which has no bearing in reality as to what it costs to deliver those services.

The problem is repeal of the SGR is very costly. The Congressional Budget Office currently scores that at about $280 billion. There are ways to approach this. There are short term and long-term ways. And we need to have the political courage, we need to have the political will to do the things necessary to ensure that we do repeal the SGR and the formula and pay doctors on a more rational Medicare economic index such as hospitals are paid that recognizes the increase and cost of delivering care. All of this information is technicomplex and it is even boring to listen to, but it is an incredibly important story for our country. It is a story of how the most advanced, most innovative and most appreciated health care system in the world needs a little help.

The end of this story should read ''happily ever after,'' but I am not sure we can reach that conclusion given where we are today. The last chapter should read ''a privatized industry leads to a healthy ending.''

As I stated in the beginning, before I began this talk, we are in a debate that will forever change our health care system. We must understand what is working in our system and what is not. We cannot delay making changes and bringing health care into the 21st century. The only way that we can have this to work is to allow the private sector to lay the foundation for improvements. The pillars of this health care system we have must be rooted in the bedrock of a thriving public sector and not the shaky ground of a public system that has proven costly and inefficient in other countries and in fact in our own back yard. Again, I reference the article from today where the errors are self-perpetuating in the system and market forces are never allowed to correct those errors.

We must devote our work in Congress to building a stronger private sector in health care. History has proven this to be the tried and true method. We can bring down the number of insured, we can increase patient access, and we can stabilize the physician workforce, modernize our technology, and bring transparency to the system. All of these things are within our grasp if we have the foresight, the determination, the courage and the political will to get things done.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence. The day is concluded, and I will yield back the balance of my time.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, MAY 24, 2007, AT PAGE H5757

[Roll No. 420]

YEAS—382

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—37

Abercrombie
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Boehner
Boyd (FL)
Buyer

Clay
Cleaver
Costa
Cubin
Dingell
Flake
Gohmert
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Honda
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Mack
Meeks (NY)
Nunes
Pastor
Paul
Pickering
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Sessions
Shadegg
Tanner
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Watt
Whitfield
Wicker
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Berman
Campbell (CA)
Cardoza
Davis, Jo Ann
DeGette
Emerson
Engel
Jones (OH)
Lewis (GA)
McMorris Rodgers
Murphy (CT)
Oberstar
Radanovich

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and Wednesday.

Mr. WYNN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for May 24, on account of attending her son's graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SARBANES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. McCarthy of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and June 6, 7, 8, 11, and 12.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and June 6 and 7.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today and June 6.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today and June 6.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, on June 6.

Mr. MACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, on June 7.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, on June 11 and 12.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program at fiscal year 2006 levels through 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 398. An act to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act to identify and remove barriers to reducing child abuse, to provide for examinations of certain children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources 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.

S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution honoring the 50th anniversary of Stan Hywet Hall & Gardens; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 414. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 Calle McKinley, West in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the ''Miguel Angel García Méndez Post Office Building''.

H.R. 437. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 West Eisenhower Street in Rio Grande City, Texas, as the ''Lino Perez, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 625. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4230 Maine Avenue in Baldwin Park, California, as the ''Atanacio Haro-Marin Post Office''.

H.R. 1402. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South Lecanto Highway in Lecanto, Florida, as the ''Sergeant Dennis J. Flanagan Lecanto Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2080. An act to Amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to conform the District charter to revisions made by the Council of the District of Columbia relating to public education.

H.R. 2206. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 214. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys.

S. 1104. An act 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.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on May 24, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 988. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5757 Tilton Avenue in Riverside, California, as the ''Lieutenant Todd Jason Bryant Post Office''.

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on May 25, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2206. Making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. today, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable CRAIG THOMAS.

Thereupon (at midnight), pursuant to House Resolution 454, the House adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable CRAIG THOMAS until today, Wednesday, June 6, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the first quarter of 2007, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HAITI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 22 AND FEB. 24, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. David Price	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,090.20				1,550.20
Hon. Wayne Gilchrest	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Hon. Bobby Rush	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,586.20				2,046.20
John Lis	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Tommy Ross	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Rachael Leman	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Keenan Keller	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Eric Jacobstein	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Carol Peterson	2/22	2/24	Haiti		460.00		1,346.20				1,806.20
Delegation Expenses	2/22	2/24	Haiti						12,358.27		12,358.27
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAVID E. PRICE, Chairman, May 2, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ISRAEL, SYRIA, SAUDI ARABIA, PORTUGAL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 30 AND APR. 7, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Henry Waxman	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Nick Rahall	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. David Hobson	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	3/30	4/3	Israel		2,028.00		(3)				2,028.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Dr. John F. Eisold	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Michael Sheehy	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Reva Price	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Nadeam Elshami	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Robert King	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Kenny Kraft	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Dwight Comedy	3/30	4/3	Israel		1,948.00		(3)				1,948.00
Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Henry Waxman	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Nick Rahall	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. David Hobson	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	4/3	4/4	Syria		282.00		(3)				282.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Dr. John F. Eisold	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Michael Sheehy	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Reva Price	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Nadeam Elshami	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Robert King	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Kenny Kraft	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Dwight Comedy	4/3	4/4	Syria		250.00		(3)				250.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Henry Waxman	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Nick Rahall	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. David Hobson	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Dr. John F. Eisold	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Michael Sheehy	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Reva Price	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Nadeam Elshami	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Robert King	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Kenny Kraft	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Dwight Comedy	4/4	4/6	Saudi Arabia		527.00		(3)				527.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Henry Waxman	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Nick Rahall	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. David Hobson	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Dr. John F. Eisold	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Michael Sheehy	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Reva Price	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Nadeam Elshami	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Robert King	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Kenny Kraft	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Dwight Comedy	4/6	4/7	Portugal		336.00		(3)				336.00
Committee total											46,839.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, May 4, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Christopher Shays	1/26	1/28	Switzerland		390.00		(3)				390.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2007—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	1/28	1/29	Greece		186.00		(3)				186.00
Hon. Barney Frank	1/23	1/28	Switzerland		1,080.00		6,846.84				7,926.84
Joseph Pinder	3/16	3/19	Guatemala		738.00		595.20				1,333.20
Scott Morris	3/16	3/19	Guatemala		738.00		1,010.20				1,748.20
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BARNEY FRANK, Chairman, May 21, 2007.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1993. A letter from the Acting Deputy Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of the decision of a public-private competition of Department of Navy military space operations services, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2462; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1994. A letter from the Director, Pentagon Renovation Program, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's certification that the total cost for the planning, design, construction and installation of equipment for the renovation of wedges 2 through 5 of the Pentagon, cumulatively, will not exceed four times the total cost for the planning, design, construction, and installation of equipment for the renovation of wedge 1, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2674 Public Law 108–87, section 8055(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1995. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2007 annual report pursuant to Section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1998, Pub. L. 105-85, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 2367; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1996. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Vice Admiral Barry M. Costello, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1997. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report on the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for FY 2006, pursuant to Public Law 109-469, section 901(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1998. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's notification of payment-in-kind compensation negotiated with the United Kingdom for the return of U.S.-funded housing and improvements in Bentwaters, Bishop's Green, Blackbushe, Burtonwood, Caversfield, Chicksands, Clayhill, Greenham Common, Sculthorpe, Upper Hayford, Welford, and Woodbridge, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2921(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1999. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Franchising Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Business Opportunities — received May 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2000. 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. 07-29, concerning the Department of the Army'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.

2001. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) and U.S. participation in that organization for the period January 16, 2006, to January 15, 2007, pursuant to Public Law 97-132, section 6; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2002. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2003. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification for FY 2007 that no United Nations organization or United Nations affiliated agency grants and official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes, condones, or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 102(g); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2004. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determination that five countries are not cooperating fully with U.S. antiterrorism efforts: Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Syria, and Venezuela, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2781; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2005. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 012-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2006. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of defense articles to the Government of Israel (Transmittal No. DDTC 020-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2007. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed technical assistant agreement for the export of technical data, defense services and defense articles to the Government of the Netherlands (Transmittal No. DDTC 030-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2008. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a proposed removal from the United States Munitions List of the Category XV — Spacecraft Systems and Associated Equipment of radiation-hardened microelectronic circuits, pursuant to Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2009. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Annual Report of the Corporation, which includes the Corporation's operational and financial results as of September 30, 2006, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1308; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2010. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting a copy of the Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Company as of December 31, 2006, pursuant to D.C. Code section 43-513; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2011. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the six-month period ending March 31, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2012. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Parole Commission, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for the calendar year 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2013. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period ending March 31, 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2014. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual reports for FY 2006 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2015. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, transmitting a copy of the Office's Notification and Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act Annual Report, dated March 30, 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2016. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Long Term Care Insurance Program: Miscellaneous Changes,

Corrections, and Clarifications (RIN: 3206-AK99) received March 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2017. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Veterans' Preference (RIN: 3206-AL00) received March 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2018. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Employment in the Senior Executive Service, Restoration to Duty from Uniformed Service of Compensable Injury, Pay Administration (General), and Pay Administration under the Fair Labor Standards Act; Miscellaneous Changes to Pay and Leave Rules (RIN: 3206-AL21) received March 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2019. A letter from the Office of the Special Counsel, transmitting the Office's Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1218; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2020. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Labor Certification for the Permanent Employment of Aliens in the United States; Reducing the Incentives and Opportunities for Fraud and Abuse and Enhancing Program Integrity (RIN: 1205-AB42) received May 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2021. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Security Requirements for Unclassified Information Technology (IT) Resources (RIN: 2700-AD26) received May 21, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

2022. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Calculation of QPAI and W-2 wages by pass-thru entities under 199 (Rev. Proc. 2007-34) received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2023. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.105: Examinations of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability. (Also Part 1, 199; 1.199-1 through 1.99-9, 1.199-3T, 1.199-5T, 1.199-7T, 1.199-8T.) (Rev. Proc. 2007-35) received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2024. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.602: Tax forms and instructions. (Also: Part 1, 1, 223.) (Rev. Proc. 2007-36) received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2025. A letter from the Branch Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Credit for New Qualified Heavy-Duty Hybrid Motor Vehicles [Notice 2007-46] received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2026. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 482.—Allocation of Income and Deductions Among Taxpayers (Rev. Rul. 2007-35) received May 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2027. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 199.—Income Attributable to Domestic Production Activities (Rev. Rul. 2007-30) received May 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2028. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 118.—Contributions to the Capital of a Corporation (Rev. Rul. 2007-31) received May 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2029. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Deductability of Lodging Expenses [Notice 2007-47] received May 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2030. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Distributions from a Pension Plan upon Attainment of Normal Retirement Age [TD 9325] (RIN: 1545-BD23) received May 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2031. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 1221.—Capital Asset Defined (Rev. Rul. 2007-37) received May 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on May 24, 2007 the following report was filed on May 30, 2007]

Mr. LANTOS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2446. A bill to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on June 5, 2007]

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 632. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish monetary prizes for achievements in overcoming scientific and technical barriers associated with hydrogen energy; with an amendment (Rept. 110–171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 1467. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to award grants to institutions of higher education to develop and offer education and training programs (Rept. 110–172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 1716. A bill to authorize higher education curriculum development and graduate training in advanced energy and green building technologies; with an amendment (Rept. 110–173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of State of the Union.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 453. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–174). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 2557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and extend the alternative motor vehicle credit for certain flexible fuel hybrid vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 2558. A bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 2559. A bill to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SPACE, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 2560. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit human cloning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2561. A bill to protect the United States by targeting terrorists at the border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2562. A bill to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to limit casino expansion; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2563. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 309 East Linn Street in Marshalltown, Iowa, as the ''Major Scott Nisely Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. AKIN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 2564. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 2565. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to establish a grant program to ensure waterfront access for commercial fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2566. A bill to provide American consumers information about the broadcast television transition from an analog to a digital format; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 2567. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home infusion therapy under the Medicare Program; 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. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 2568. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to establish additional reporting requirements to enhance the detection of identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 2569. A bill to codify certain changes proposed by the Department of Agriculture to the rules governing eligibility for the rural broadband access program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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 Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2570. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 301 Boardwalk Drive in Fort Collins, Colorado, as the ''Dr. Karl E. Carson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2571. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Foreign Trade Zones Act to simplify the tax and eliminate the drawback fee on certain distilled spirits used in nonbeverage products manufactured in a United States foreign trade zone for domestic use and export; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2572. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a student loan forgiveness program for nurses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2573. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. DENT, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SHULER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WU, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. REGULA, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 2574. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Financial Services, the Judiciary, the Budget, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. LATHAM:

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Res. 451. A resolution directing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to respond to the indictment of, or the filing of charges of criminal conduct in a court of the United States or any State against, any Member of the House of Representatives by empaneling an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations not later than 30 days after the date the Member is indicted or the charges are filed; to the Committee on Rules. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 452. A resolution raising a question of the Privileges of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H. Res. 454. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BEAN (for herself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HILL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

H. Res. 455. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Internet Safety Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 456. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of an annual National Time Out Day to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H. Res. 457. A resolution calling on the Russian Federation to withdraw its military forces, armaments, and ammunition stockpiles from the sovereign territory of the Republic of Moldova; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PUTNAM:

H. Res. 458. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Fishing and Boating Week; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California introduced A bill (H.R. 2575) for the relief of Mikael Adrian Christopher Figueroa Alvarez; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 14: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 18: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 20: Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 21: Mr. STARK, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 89: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 96: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 154: Mr. GOODE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 171: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 172: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 174: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 180: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 260: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 364: Mr. WU, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 380: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 402: Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 473: Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 480: Mr. DUNCAN and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 491: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 507: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 532: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 566: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 579: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 592: Mr. HONDA and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 620: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 632: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 642: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 643: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 670: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 695: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 697: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 718: Mr. DOYLE Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 721: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 728: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 748: Mr. GOODE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 758: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 814: Mr. OLVER and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 821: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 829: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 849: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 850: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 864: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 869: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 871: Mr. NADLER and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 882: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 885: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 891: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 906: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 923: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 940: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 943: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 947: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 948: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 962: Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 969: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 971: Mr. BOREN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 980: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 983: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1014: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BOREN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1034: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1038: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1043: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1059: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1060: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1061: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 1065: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1073: Mr. RUSH, Mr. SPACE, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1078: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1088: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1104: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1107: Mr. SALI.
H.R. 1108: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BEAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 1110: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1115: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1125: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PORTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 1134: Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1152: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 1178: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1179: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1188: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1192: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1198: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1199: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1211: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. KANJORSKI.
H.R. 1216: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1222: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1223: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1226: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1229: Mr. MELANCON and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 1230: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1239: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1246: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1265: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1267: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1268: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 1273: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 1276: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1279: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1280: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 1308: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1310: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. KIND, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1328: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 1330: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 1333: Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1338: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 1343: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1344: Mr. WALSH of New York.
H.R. 1352: Mr. WATT and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1371: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 1380: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1381: Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 1391: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1394: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1398: Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 1400: Mr. KAGEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SPACE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1406: Mr. DONNELLY and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1439: Mr. HOLT and Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 1459: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1460: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1461: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1464: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1467: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1474: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1475: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1491: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1497: Mr. KIND, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1498: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1509: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1514: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 1532: Mr. REYES and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1542: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1551: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1559: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 1560: Mr. WAMP, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STARK, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1561: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1567: Mr. FILNER and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1582: Mr. BUCHANAN and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1589: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1608: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1614: Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1616: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1641: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1647: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WATT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1651: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1673: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1683: Mr. HELLER and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 1687: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 1688: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1693: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. CASTOR.
H.R. 1699: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1705: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1707: Mr. NADLER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1709: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 1712: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1713: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1716: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1733: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 1742: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1743: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1745: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1746: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1755: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1759: Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BACA, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1763: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1764: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1783: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1814: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1818: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 1830: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1845: Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1849: Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1869: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1880: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1889: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1890: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 1927: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1933: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1937: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1938: Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 1940: Mr. MICA, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1947: Mr. SIRES and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1959: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1965: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1971: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1975: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1977: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1983: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1985: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1992: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2017: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 2035: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 2045: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2053: Mr. DICKS, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2060: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2074: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2075: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2095: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2108: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2111: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2125: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. OBEY.
H.R. 2129: Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2134: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2135: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 2140: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
H.R. 2146: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2147: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 2159: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 2164: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2165: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2167: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2169: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2173: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2185: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2192: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2204: Mr. REGULA.
H.R. 2205: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 2210: Mr. BOREN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2212: Mr. NADLER and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2253: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2265: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2270: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2289: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2292: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2303: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2304: Mr. HONDA, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 2313: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2319: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 2327: Mr. CLAY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 2343: Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2353: Mr. SIRES, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2357: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2364: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2366: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2371: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 2395: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2407: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 2425: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2435: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2443: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2449: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2458: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2459: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2464: Mr. FORTUÑO and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2465: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2467: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 2481: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2490: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 2491: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2493: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2506: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2511: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2526: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.J. Res. 12: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. SAXTON.
H.J. Res. 37: Mr. HOLT.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Con. Res. 85: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KIND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ISSA.
H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mrs. BONO.
H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. RAHALL and Ms. SUTTON.
H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ORTIZ.
H. Con. Res. 131: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SALI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
H. Con. Res. 133: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H. Con. Res. 135: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. HENSARLING.
H. Con. Res. 138: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HILL.
H. Con. Res. 147: Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MACK.
H. Con. Res. 148: Mr. COHEN and Mr. BACA.
H. Con. Res. 152: Mr. WEINER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H. Res. 12: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 54: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. ISSA.
H. Res. 95: Mr. TOWNS and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H. Res. 111: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H. Res. 121: Mr. LYNCH.
H. Res. 154: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HODES, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H. Res. 169: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 231: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SALI.
H. Res. 268: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
H. Res. 281: Mr. POE and Ms. CARSON.
H. Res. 282: Mr. BERRY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. WOLF, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H. Res. 287: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 313: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 353; Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 356; Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 358: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 378: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BAIRD, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 395: Mr. ISSA.
H. Res. 401: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Res. 407: Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Res. 416: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H. Res. 417; Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H. Res. 421: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 422: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HARE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HOOLEY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FARR, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WATT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H. Res. 424: Mr. ISSA, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H. Res. 426: Mr. WOLF, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. RENZI.
H. Res. 430: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H. Res. 442: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
H. Res. 443: Mr. FORTUPO.
H. Res. 444: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. GRAVES.
H. Res. 446: Mr. AKIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 447: Mr. WOLF.

CONGERSSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative LANTOS of California or a designee to H.R. 2446, the Afghanistan Freedom Support 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.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 40: Mr. LATHAM.