



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 2007

No. 90

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, June 6, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL R. McNULTY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Zane Fishel, Temple Baptist Church, Mount Airy, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Our Great and Almighty Father, we thank You for the blessings of this day and the opportunity that we have to make a difference in our world.

I pray that Your all-knowing wisdom be granted to each person responsible for the decisions that govern this great Nation. May Your divine leadership be followed as they seek Your paths.

Give Your grace to these Representatives in the face of opposition and Your courage to enable them to stand for truth and right.

We know the issues that face this country are complex and some are seemingly unresolvable. But we look to You for wisdom, knowledge and guidance to assist the men and women with this awesome responsibility.

Make America a stronger Nation by using these individuals to make Godly decisions. God bless our President, our Representatives, and God bless our troops and pour out Your richest blessings on America.

We ask this in the name of our Eternal Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. 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 Texas (Mr. BRADY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BRADY of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution.

S. RES. 220

In the Senate of the United States, June 5, 2007.

Whereas, Senator Craig Thomas had a long and honorable history of public service, serving in the United States Marine Corps, the Wyoming State Legislature, the United States House of Representatives, and the United States Senate;

Whereas, Senator Craig Thomas represented the people of Wyoming with honor and distinction for over 20 years;

Whereas, Senator Craig Thomas was first elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1989;

Whereas, Senator Craig Thomas was subsequently elected 3 times to the United States Senate by record margins of more than 70 percent; and

Whereas, Senator Craig Thomas's life and career were marked by the best of his Western values: hard work, plain speaking, common sense, courage, and integrity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep re-

gret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming;

Resolved, That the Senate mourns the loss of one of its most esteemed members, Senator Craig Thomas, and expresses its condolences to the people of Wyoming and to his wife, Susan, and his 4 children;

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate shall communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of Senator Craig Thomas; and

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it shall stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of Senator Craig Thomas.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will rise and observe a moment of silence in memory of Senator Craig Thomas.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND ZANE FISHEL

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Reverend Zane Fishel, who is the House of Representatives' guest chaplain today.

Reverend Fishel comes to us from Pilot Mountain and Mount Airy, North Carolina, where he shepherds the flock at Temple Baptist Church. Reverend Fishel has faithfully served in the ministry of Temple Baptist since 1997 and he became the full-time youth minister in 1999 after sensing a call to serve God in the local church.

With the passing of Temple Baptist's pastor in 2003, Reverend Fishel took up his current role as the church's pastor, where he is devoted to spreading the good news to his congregation and community.

Under his leadership, the church body at Temple Baptist Church in

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H6011

Mount Airy has thrived. He has worked tirelessly to increase the outreach and effectiveness of Temple Baptist in the local community. He has shown a remarkable commitment to educating leaders in the local church so that many within the church can use their God-given gifts.

I am very pleased that Reverend Fishel joined us today to open the House of Representatives with such an inspiring prayer. He is a model of service to God, country and community; and he plays a vital spiritual role in Surry County, North Carolina. I am proud to welcome him to the people's house.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 1-minute speeches on each side.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of every working woman who faces pay discrimination in the workforce and call on the House to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. Last week, the Supreme Court ruled 5-4 to limit the ability of women and other employees to sue their employers for pay discrimination under title VII. The court decided that a victim of pay disparity should be able to document a discriminatory difference in pay within a mere 6 months, despite the typical office secrecy over income.

The Supreme Court is essentially rolling back efforts to ensure equal pay. When women still earn only 77 percent of what men earn, this ruling leaves these individuals with no recourse or remedy.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will help women confront discrimination in the workplace and give teeth to the Equal Pay Act by prohibiting employers from retaliating against employees who share salary information with their coworkers; allowing women to sue for punitive damages and recovery of back pay; and create a new program to help strengthen the negotiation skills of girls and women.

Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, we commemorate 44 years since John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act and still equal pay is not a fact of life for American women. It is time to value the work that women do in our society. Let's pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

HOUSTON'S PASSPORT CRISIS

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my message today is to our State Department in Houston. We have a prob-

lem, a serious passport problem that reached a crisis stage. We have families who applied in February for their passports that have not received them yet. We have wives that can't meet their soldier husbands on leave from Iraq. We have families who aren't able to go to experimental surgery out of this country, families leaving for the last time before college together who are simply denied the opportunity to travel.

Our passport offices are overwhelmed. Our people wait in line for hours, if not days, getting there at 4 o'clock in the morning. We appreciate the 20 additional staff the State Department sent. They are overwhelmed. We appreciate the 1-800 number. It is a middle man and causing more problems.

We need more staff. We need more information call lines manned 24/7. We need more resources. It is wrong. As our constituents tell us, they feel like they are in a third-world country. We think they deserve better treatment than that; and this deserves immediate attention, immediate, absolute action by the State Department.

PAY DISCRIMINATION

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Supreme Court dealt a serious blow to women pursuing pay discrimination claims.

For the majority of her 20-year career, Lilly Ledbetter was paid less than her male counterparts, including those with less seniority for doing the exact same work. By her own calculations, she was now being shortchanged by about \$15,000 annually.

Her experience is, unfortunately, a common one. In the Supreme Court decision, Ledbetter versus Goodyear Tire, the Court ruled that she had missed her window of opportunity to file a claim covering the many years of discrimination she faced.

We need to close this loophole by making every pay period a new infraction. This way, employees can challenge unfair practices that persist over time but don't come to light for years later.

Inequality still exists. It is our job to fix it.

□ 1010

FIX THE LEAK OR BUY MORE BUCKETS

(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, when Hurricane Rita hit southeast Texas, a pine tree fell on our house and caused a leak in the roof. The water came into the house, and I couldn't put enough buckets under the leak to catch all that

water. I didn't really know what to do. Eventually it dawned on me, I had to go up on the roof and fix the leak or water would have continued to fill all those buckets and more. The "grand bargain" immigration plan is really a plan to buy more buckets for the big leak on our border.

The government is missing the obvious. Until we fix the leak, we can never deal with all of the water from the leak. Until Uncle Sam enforces border security, we cannot solve the problem with the illegals already here.

The so-called immigration reform bill deals with the wrong issue first. It legalizes the illegals while inadequately securing the border. Secure the border and then come up with a plan that is not amnesty in dealing with the people here illegally. Otherwise, we will keep buying more buckets and the real problem will never be solved.

And that's just the way it is.

FOOD AND FARM BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is in the process of updating the Nation's agricultural policy for the first time since 2002 to see if it can serve the interests of all America's farmers and ranchers. This is more than a farm bill, it is a food bill as well. Everyone who eats is affected by our food and farm policy.

Michael Pollan explained how the farm bill is the reason that a package of Twinkies, which contains 39 complex ingredients, costs less than a bunch of carrots straight from the farm. The farm bill should serve all Americans, not just a few special interests.

Today, 70 percent of the payments go to the richest 10 percent of the farmers, while 60 percent of America's farmers and ranchers get no support whatsoever.

It is time for a food and farm bill of rights that provides a comprehensive guide to reform the farm bill. We must move beyond the policies that were written for the Depression or the 1950s to one designed for the world we live in today; and, more important, the world we want to live in tomorrow.

RIISING ENERGY COSTS

(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 to speak about the need for this Congress to address the rising energy costs across America. Gas prices are continuing to rise, and our energy needs across our country continue to increase. The American people expect us to do something about this, to solve the problem.

Yet the liberal leadership of this Congress is missing in action. Instead of

coming forward with a real plan to solve our energy problems, they are preparing to recreate the energy crisis of the late 1970s. Are the American people really ready for long lines, rationing, and higher prices?

The policies of the 1970s should have been a wake-up call for us. But instead of instituting a plan for American energy independence back then, we just kicked that can a little further down the road.

So today, my GOP colleagues and I will unveil a multi-tiered plan that focuses on innovative ways to create new American sources of power through conservation exploration and cutting-edge technologies. We will act to fill the need.

PASS EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, there are many issues that face America that are of great importance, from the Iraq War to global warming. These global issues must be dealt with, but we have lacked the leadership in this administration to make the world proud of America and see us as a leader on such issues.

On Wednesday, this House will vote on an embryonic stem cell research bill sent from the Senate which the President has threatened to veto. I don't think there is a more important bill that this House could pass and send to the President and for the President to sign than embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, if you or anybody in your family has Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, spinal cord injury, cancer, stroke, burns, heart disease, diabetes, osteoarthritis or rheumatoid arthritis, you could have relief and possibly a cure for that illness because of embryonic stem cell research. America could reestablish itself as a country that has the best scientific research and provides the world with hope for cures for these catastrophic illnesses.

Last night in the Republican debate, one of the candidates said we need to find a cure for cancer. He's right, and the way to do it is through embryonic stem cell research. I urge this House to pass the bill, and I urge the President to have the courage to do the right thing and be pro-life and extend life for people on this planet.

BODY ARMOR FOR TROOPS

(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, today the House Armed Services Committee will examine the issue of body armor for our troops in combat. Fortunately, before going into recess for Memorial Day, Congress passed

a critical war funding bill that will allow the military to purchase body armor and other equipment for our men and women in uniform.

I was grateful to visit with our troops during the break in Iraq and Afghanistan. Everywhere we went, the troops thanked us for passing the legislation to provide for their being fully equipped.

Our soldiers are fighting the terrorists overseas so we do not have to face them again in the streets of America. We are protecting American families in stopping al Qaeda's threat to our Nation.

On the 63rd anniversary of D-day, we appreciate the new greatest generation. I am pleased Congress passed and President Bush signed a bill that will provide our military with the tools it needs without handcuffing our commanders on the battlefield.

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

PAY DISCRIMINATION MUST BE CORRECTED

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I voice my deep disappointment with the recent Supreme Court decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tires*.

Women, on average, are paid less than their male counterparts. For women of color, the pay is much less. Unless you can look me in the eye and say that women are less intelligent, less capable than their male counterparts in the same fields, the most glaring explanation for this discrepancy is discrimination.

We have made great strides in working to equalize wages for all Americans regardless of gender, race or age. But the decision last week to limit a worker's available recourse in the face of discrimination is a setback to all of our civil rights, and reminds us of how far we still have to go.

Now we must mobilize. To fix this disparity, we must move forward and correct the law so this misinterpretation will never occur again. I urge my colleagues to support a legislative remedy to preserve a worker's right to be compensated for discrimination.

ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, during my career as a heart surgeon, I saw too many patients who were trapped in a paper-based system that leads to duplicate tests and avoidable medical errors.

Despite the advancement of innovative health information technology, America's health care system remains trapped in the 20th century. The need

for health IT became even more apparent during Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, when I saw displaced patients present themselves in makeshift clinics with little or no medical history to guide their health providers.

To date, only 24 percent of Louisiana physicians have converted their offices to electronic health records because many are unwilling or unable to handle the cost.

I will soon introduce a bill to create a demonstration project through the Department of Health and Human Services to provide financial incentives to providers and health information exchange networks to encourage the adoption and use of interactive personal health records.

Health IT will greatly improve the quality of information and care that patients receive, but Congress should do more to encourage physicians to transfer to a paperless system.

PAY EQUALITY

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to voice my strong disapproval of the Supreme Court's decision last week that effectively endorsed pay discrimination against women.

Pay equity is a problem for women around the country, but especially for women of color, women who look like me. On average, African American women earn only 64 cents for every dollar and Latinas earn only 52 cents on the dollar compared to their white male counterparts.

We need to protect the rights of workers, to remedy wage discrimination, and do more to close the pay gap between men and women. That is why I cosponsored the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would give teeth to the Equal Pay Act. The Paycheck Fairness Act would entitle the plaintiffs to backpay, compensatory, and punitive damages for "intentional" wage discrimination.

Without serious penalties for wage discrimination, violations will continue and working men and women and their families will suffer.

We can and must fix the Equal Pay Act so workers all around can be fairly compensated for wage discrimination, and we must pass the Paycheck Fairness Act to close the wage gap.

□ 1020

SAMEH KHOUZAM

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Mr. Sameh Khouzam. In 1998, Mr. Khouzam fled Egypt to the United States to escape persecution and torture at the hands of the Egyptian officials. Mr. Khouzam currently

works in my district and by all accounts is an upstanding, contributing member of the community.

In 2004, our courts gave him protection because they believed, "it is more likely than not" that he would be tortured should he return to Egypt. Even our State Department reports outline extensive torture in Egypt. Having personally heard stories of individuals who have suffered torture by Egyptian authorities, I firmly believe that the court has been right to prevent his deportation.

U.S. officials are now prepared to ignore the court's decision and deport Khouzam based on nothing more than "assurances" of no torture from known torturers.

Mr. Speaker, a former CIA officer stated this week on an Australian news program that sending someone like Khouzam back to Egypt is "tantamount to condemning them to death."

Our government has the ability to prevent his torture. Do not deport Mr. Khouzam.

CAPITOL HILL OCEANS WEEK

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Capitol Hill Oceans Week. The President has declared June as Oceans Month, and this Friday will be an international celebration of Oceans Day.

Why do we need to pay attention to the oceans? Well, the oceans are dying, and the earth is dependent upon them. We are dumping everything we don't want into the ocean and extracting every living thing we can to eat.

We've created commissions by Congress and by private trust of the best talent in America to advise Congress on what we should do, and they recommended national ocean governance policies, new policies that can be adopted by this Congress.

I've introduced that bill, H.R. 21, and as National Oceans Week, Day and Month, I'd like to ask all my colleagues to seriously consider cosponsoring H.R. 21. It provides solutions to the problems of the earth.

MARKING THE ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, today, June 6, marks the anniversary of D-day, the invasion of Normandy. It marks one of the most selfless acts of humanitarian love known in the history of mankind. It exemplifies a Nation's willingness to lay down our lives and to expend our treasure to free a people from brutal oppressors.

Today, Mr. Speaker, America remains the greatest Nation on earth,

and we have our American soldiers to thank for securing our safety, for securing our freedom.

To those who marched to a near certain death that morning on a French sandy shoreline, we pay you tribute. We can never repay the price that you paid for our freedom, but we will never forget that cost that you paid.

There is no greater love than this but that we lay down our lives for our friends.

GITMO

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, military judges dismissed the cases against the only two men to have been charged with a crime still being held at Guantanamo Bay. This legal impasse creates an imperative for Congress to address the legal black hole that we have created at Guantanamo.

There have been almost 800 people sent to Guantanamo. There are 385 left; and, of those 385, only 80 will be charged and tried with a crime. Now, that means that 90 percent will not even be charged and tried, but it will take more than a decade even to try those 80 people, given the island's remote location. In fact, there's only one courtroom there.

Mr. Speaker, every day that we keep Guantanamo open, we damage our credibility and we lose ground in the global war on terror. Congress has an opportunity to change this wrong-headed policy, and we can do so by shutting the facility down and transferring the detainees to the U.S. military brig system. There they will still be under lock and key but also have the right to a fair and speedy trial.

The United States is a country that should stand for justice and be governed by the rule of law. Our policy should reflect our values. Guantanamo does not.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007.

Stem cell research has the capability to cure our most common and pervasive diseases and conditions. From Alzheimer's to Parkinson's disease, cancer to juvenile diabetes, the potential of stem cell research presents one of humanity's greatest leaps toward the ultimate goal of preserving, prolonging and improving life.

As a member of the Florida State Senate for 10 years, leading efforts to utilize and fund embryonic stem cell research was not just a priority of mine, it was a mission.

A large part of my passion and drive toward funding stem cell research is driven by people like Adam Susser, a young boy from the town I reside in, Boca Raton. Adam was asphyxiated at birth and, as a result, is cortically blind with quadriplegic cerebral palsy.

It is driven by Matthew Romer, a young boy in south Florida who died from a fatal genetic disease, despite both parents being told they did not carry the gene.

Both Adam and Matthew suffer from illnesses that stem cell research could find cures for.

Today, I encourage my friends in Congress to support the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. The passage of this Act is vitally important to the millions of Americans who suffer today from incurable disease and to the millions of Americans who will suffer from incurable diseases in the future.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, according to the National Committee on Pay Equity, working women stand to lose \$250,000 over the course of their careers because of unequal pay practices. While women's wages and educational achievements have been rising, there's still a sizeable gender wage gap. This is a national disgrace.

Unfortunately, last week's Supreme Court decision, Ledbetter v. Goodyear, does little to achieve fairness for American workers. In a narrow 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court threw out the case, not just because she wasn't being discriminated against but because she filed her claim too late.

This interpretation, which has been rejected by eight Federal appeals courts and the EEOC, fails to realize that employees are discriminated against every time they receive a discriminatory paycheck.

Congress needs to step in and stand up for ordinary people without delay. We should move quickly to pass Congresswoman DELAURO's Paycheck Protection Act that would provide remedies to women facing pay discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to live in an America where my daughter earns less than my son for doing the same job.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court, the judicial branch of our government, has ruled that the President of the United States is not above the law, even during time of war.

The Attorney General's office within the executive branch of government is undermining the entire judicial system. Over 400 U.S. attorneys have been

confirmed over the last 20 years. Three have been fired for political partisanship during that time.

However, in the last 9 months, nine have been fired because they didn't bow to the partisan pressures of the executive branch of government. The Attorney General has allowed these nine U.S. attorneys names to be trashed in the public.

This is worse than Watergate. There is reason to believe that a cover-up occurred, and that will be worse than the dirty deed. How did each of these get on the list in the first place? And out of the original 30, how did you get off the list? What did you have to do to be removed from that list, Mr. Attorney General?

This is not the moral high ground. No one is above the law.

□ 1030

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE HOUSE IS IN SESSION

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 460) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 460

Resolved, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING TRANSFERS FROM SENATE GIFT SHOP REVOLVING FUND

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1537) to authorize the transfer of certain funds from the Senate Gift Shop Revolving Fund to the Senate Employee Child Care Center, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1537

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

SECTION 1. TRANSFERS FROM SENATE GIFT SHOP REVOLVING FUND.

Section 2(c) of Public Law 102-392 (2 U.S.C. 121d(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The Secretary of the Senate may transfer from the fund to the Senate Employee Child Care Center proceeds from the sale of holiday ornaments by the Senate Gift Shop for the purpose of funding necessary activities and expenses of the Center, including scholarships, educational supplies, and equipment.”.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 459, DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM 21ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-175) on the resolution (H. Res. 459) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-first Congressional District of Florida, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 461, DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM 24TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-176) on the resolution (H. Res. 461) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of Florida, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 462, DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-177) on the resolution (H. Res. 462) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 463, DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-178) on the resolution (H. Res. 463) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Florida, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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.

NATIONAL STEM SCHOLARSHIP DATABASE ACT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1051) to direct the Secretary of Education to establish and maintain a public website through which individuals may find a complete database of available scholarships, fellowships, and other programs of financial assistance in the study of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1051

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 “National STEM Scholarship Database Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL DATABASE ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDY OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASE.—

(1) DATABASE.—The Secretary of Education shall establish and maintain, on the public website of the Department of Education, a database consisting of information on scholarships, fellowships, and other programs of financial assistance available from public and private sources for the study of science, technology, engineering, or mathematics at the post-secondary and post-baccalaureate levels.

(2) PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION.—The information maintained on the database established under this section shall be displayed on the website in the following manner:

(A) Separate information shall be provided for each of the fields of study referred to in paragraph (1) and for post-secondary and post-baccalaureate programs of financial assistance.

(B) The database shall provide specific information on any programs of financial assistance which are targeted to individuals of

a particular gender, ethnicity, or other demographic group.

(C) If the sponsor of any program of financial assistance included on the database maintains a public website, the database shall provide hyperlinks to the website.

(D) In addition to providing the hyperlink to the website of a sponsor of a program of financial assistance as required under subparagraph (C), the database shall provide general information that an interested person may use to contact the sponsor, including the sponsor's electronic mail address.

(E) The database shall have a search capability which permits an individual to search for information on the basis of each category of the information provided and on the basis of combinations of categories of the information provided, including whether the scholarship is need- or merit-based and by relevant academic majors.

(F) The database shall include a recommendation that students and families should carefully review all of the application requirements prior to applying for aid, and a disclaimer that the scholarships presented in the database are not provided or endorsed by the Department of Education or the Federal Government.

(b) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON DATABASE.—The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary on an ongoing basis, including sending notices to secondary schools and institutions of higher education, to disseminate information on the database established and maintained under this Act and to encourage its use by interested parties.

(c) USE OF VENDOR TO OBTAIN INFORMATION.—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary of Education shall enter into a contract with a private entity under which the entity shall furnish and regularly update all of the information required to be maintained on the database established under this section.

(d) ENCOURAGING THE PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary of Education and the contracted entity shall consult with public and private sources of scholarships and make easily available a process for such entities to provide regular and updated information.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I request that there be 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H.R. 1050 into the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that Members be allowed to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. This is an important piece of all of the work that we have to do to improve our science, engineering, technology and mathematics capability here in the United States. Specifically, this bill es-

tablishes a complete database of all available scholarships from public and private sources, fellowships, and other programs of financial assistance for the study of science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

The Act, specifically known as the National STEM Scholarship Database Act, directs the Secretary of Education to establish and maintain a public Web site through which individuals may find a complete database of available scholarships, fellowships and financial assistance.

The Secretary of Education will also, under this legislation, disseminate information about the database to secondary schools and to colleges and universities, institutions of higher education. It will serve as a one-stop shop for financial aid information for those who want to study in the STEM fields.

Now, it may be surprising to my colleagues that this doesn't already exist. But it does not. Although there are many things that we need to do to improve science and math teaching in elementary and secondary schools and in higher education, and encourage students toward science and technology fields, this is one important thing we can accomplish today.

We all know that higher education is expensive. In fact, many students are deterred from studying these important fields because of the cost.

Yet, at the same time, some of the opportunities for financial assistance go unused, and, students, however motivated they may be, often don't know where to start to look for financial assistance. Certainly in high school, school counselors are overloaded with typically 400 students each, and as a college student is trying to decide on a major and a specific field of engineering, for example, it's hard to know where to turn for financial assistance.

This simple straightforward database available through a Web site will greatly, I think, facilitate the student's ability to go into these STEM fields. It will serve all students at all levels as they are thinking about going into college, as they are thinking about choosing a major in college, as they are thinking about going to graduate school, as they are thinking about whether or not to teach in a science or engineering or mathematics area.

This is an important and straightforward piece of legislation that will assist our nation's students in studying science and math, and will assist our country in our efforts to be more competitive internationally.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1051, which is a bill to establish a public Web site through which individuals may find a database of available scholarships and fellowships and other programs of financial assistance for the study of science and technology and engineering and math.

Before I begin, I just want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for introducing this piece of legislation and for his leadership in this area. I also want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for his leadership, as well as Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. BIGGERT and others for their support of this bill itself.

I am a strong proponent, strong proponent of STEM education programs. Anything that Congress can do to strengthen interest in these fields is wholeheartedly welcome.

As a physician, I understand and appreciate the challenge that our Nation has in maintaining its preeminence in these fields. Encouraging our best and brightest and interested young people to choose this field of study is a positive step, and I believe this bill is a step in that direction.

As we continue to discuss new ideas for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, it's important that we develop proposals that will ensure students are informed about their options for financial aid, both from the Federal Government and from the private sector. In fact, the House has already taken one step in that direction, included in H.R. 890, the Student Loan Sunshine Act, which passed last month, was a proposal that was offered by Representative KELLER, that would make it easier for students to get information on their options for Federal financial aid.

This proposal would launch a single Web site for opportunities for financial aid in fellowships and scholarships being offered by any agency within the Federal Government.

This bill simply takes this idea one step further by making sure that information about scholarships and fellowships and other forms of private financial aid is readily available to students interested in pursuing their opportunities in education and science, technology, engineering and math. As we continue to examine proposals to increase America's competitiveness, it's helpful for us to equip students interested in pursuing careers in these fields with the information that they need that might assist them in financing their education.

For these reasons and others, I respectfully ask my colleagues to support H.R. 1051.

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

□ 1040

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PRICE, who is an original cosponsor of this legislation, along with many others from the Education Committee, from the Science Committee, and from elsewhere here in Congress.

And, with that, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, my colleague on the committee on Education and Labor, Mr. HINOJOSA.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1051, the National STEM Scholarship Database

Act. I would like to commend the work of my good friend and colleague from New Jersey, Congressman RUSH Holt, for bringing this bill forward and for all of his efforts to ensure that our Nation stays at the forefront of the STEM fields. I share his commitment to mobilizing our resources at all levels to expand the pool of opportunities in these career fields that are critical to our future security and prosperity.

It is no secret that we are losing our competitive edge in producing experts in science, technology, math and engineering. Of the 42 countries that granted more than 20,000 university degrees in 2002, the United States is in the bottom quartile in the ratio of STEM college degrees awarded.

Our pool of future STEM professionals can be found in our public schools in America. The 2007 "Condition of Education" reminds us that a growing percentage of these students are minorities, with a growing percentage from low-income families. These are the students that will rely on college scholarships and college financial aid to achieve the dream of a college education.

The National STEM Scholarship Database will be an invaluable tool to help our young people to find the resources they need to finance college education in the STEM fields.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education, I believe this legislation will also underscore that a STEM career is possible, an essential message for our young people to hear.

This is a real service to our young people and to our Nation. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his efforts, and urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, who has been pivotal in this area, in this field, Mr. EHLERS.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National STEM Scholarship Database Act, H.R. 1051. I thank my friend and fellow physicist, Congressman RUSH HOLT, for introducing this important legislation; and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this excellent bill.

For several years, Congressman HOLT and I have worked tirelessly to improve our Nation's math and science education. It has been wonderful to have a Member from the other party sharing my concern about the quality of math and science education in this country and the limited number of young people who are pursuing math and science-related degrees. In fact, I'm very pleased that Representative HOLT and 115 other Members have joined the STEM Education Caucus that I founded in 2004.

Of course, I'm sure by now everyone knows that STEM stands for science, technology, engineering and mathematics. It's very important to make that clear, because tomorrow we'll be

debating a few stem-cell issue bills on the floor, and this bill has nothing to do with that.

This year, an estimated 111,000 students in Michigan will graduate from high school and may face the pricey but critical investment in their future known as paying college tuition and fees. In Michigan, the average cost of tuition fees is about \$6,200 per year at a 4-year public university and \$13,250 at a 4-year private university, according to the *Chronicles of Higher Education*.

Unfortunately, data have shown that some students do not attend college or graduate school because they think they cannot afford it. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, science and engineering students who had taken out loans as undergraduates were more likely to indicate a cost-related reason for not applying to graduate school, compared to students who had never borrowed funds.

Unbeknownst to some students, significant financial aid resources are available. The Federal Government alone provided about \$80 billion in student financial aid this fiscal year, with States providing almost \$8 billion in additional financial aid. Also, the private sector provides significant financial aid resources.

The National STEM Scholarship Database Act will provide students with better information about available financial aid resources related to the STEM fields. It simply establishes a database to be accessed on the U.S. Department of Education's Website. I am very hopeful that this database will link students with available financial aid resources, and I particularly hope this will encourage more students to enter STEM-related careers by entering graduate schools related to the STEM fields.

This is an excellent bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I again thank Congressman HOLT for his work on improving STEM education and urge all of our colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his support and also for pointing out that this has nothing to do with pleuropotent stem cells but has to do with what is generally known as STEM education, science, technology, engineering and mathematics education.

Mr. Speaker, I'm now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague on the Education Committee, Mr. HARE, who understands that financial assistance is necessary for nearly two-thirds of undergraduates and most graduate students, and anything we can do to help them take advantage of available financial aid will improve their lives and our society. Mr. HARE.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today as a cosponsor and a very strong supporter of H.R. 1051, the National STEM Scholarship Database Act. I want to commend my friend, Congressman RUSH Holt, with whom I

serve on the Education and Labor Committee, for introducing this vital piece of legislation.

America's global competitiveness will increasingly depend on our ability to attract more of our best and brightest students into technological careers.

Sadly, the U.S. is growing reliant on foreign talents to fulfill its science and engineering workforce needs. According to the National Science Foundation, 25 percent of all college-educated professionals in science and engineering occupations in the United States are foreign born.

The National STEM Scholarship Database addresses this problem by directing the Secretary of Education to establish a database on the Department's Web site with information on financial assistance for postsecondary and graduate programs in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. This important database will help capable students who are interested in STEM careers find scholarships to support their studies.

We all know the cost of higher education is very expensive. In fact, two-thirds of undergraduate students are on some form of financial aid. Therefore, identifying funding opportunities is critical to the recruitment of aspiring STEM students.

H.R. 1051 is endorsed by all sectors of the technological workforce, and I urge my colleagues to help the U.S. stay globally competitive by voting for this bill.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm now pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) who's been a leader in this field as well.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, the science and technology and math education fields, they are inseparable, tremendous assets to our economic strength and national security. These disciplines are critical to ensuring our global competitiveness, and the demand for knowledge-based jobs is growing.

From 1994 to 2003, the proportion of the work force working in STEM fields jumped from 17 percent to 23 percent. Furthermore, if trends in manufacturing continue, over 40 percent of factory jobs will require postsecondary education by 2012.

□ 1050

I spend at least half of my time in Congress working on manufacturing issues, one of the founders of the manufacturing caucus, and serve as co-chairman, along with Congressman TIM RYAN from the State of Ohio, and this is obviously a bipartisan effort in order to encourage more education of people who will be qualified to play a more meaningful role in the field of manufacturing.

The skyrocketing cost of college education have made access to this type of education more and more difficult for many of our brightest students. This bill seeks to correct the problem. It

creates a web portal of public and private science, technology, math education scholarships, loans, and grants that are available. And the database would be searchable by field of study, demographics, and level of study. By placing all of these scholarships in one easily accessible location, H.R. 1051 greatly increases the chances that our students will be able to pursue these valuable opportunities.

It is not without coincidence this bill comes up 3 to 4 weeks after the missed reauthorization wherein we set aside a certain amount of money to complete the huge web portal that would replace what agencies are doing in manufacturing and what programs are available. So this fits very tidily into that program, and I would encourage that the House adopt it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, my colleague on the Committee on Education and Labor (Mrs. MCCARTHY), who also understands the importance of this legislation to individual students as well as to our economy at large.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to thank my colleague from the Education Committee, Congressman HOLT, for bringing this measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1051, the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Scholarship Database Act. This legislation will help students become more competitive in science and math and allow them to find the scholarship that is right for them.

Mr. Speaker, in the audience today we have many young students. This is the future of this country. And we have to do everything that we can to encourage our young people to go into the sciences, math, and engineering. Last year the Education Committee went to China and we spoke with many students there and the minister of education. And their effort, and certainly on what they are pushing their young people to do, is to go into the math and sciences.

This country has an obligation to give our young people the ability to compete in the future. This kind of legislation is going to help in so many ways as far as our country on our economy. But more than that, our young people deserve this opportunity.

When you think back to the 1960s when we were looking at the moon and having programs that were putting us into space, those were kids' dreams. We need to reunite that dream, to have people understand that engineering and math is exciting. The last several years Mr. HOLT and Mr. EHLERS have been talking about science and math in our committee; so it is right that at this time we are pushing to encourage our young people, saying if these are the careers that you want to go into, we are going to help you between a private partnership and certainly with the gov-

ernment's helping. This is a great piece of legislation. We should be seeing more and more of this. This is only the beginning.

And I have to say last week I had a field hearing back in my district, and the issue had to do with gangs. And we had testimony from all the experts. But even those young people that had gotten into gangs, all they were asking for were opportunities to better themselves. This young fellow did go back to college. He did start studying science and math, and now he is reaching out. Education is the most important thing that we can do for our young people and for this country.

So, again, I thank my colleague Mr. HOLT for bringing this, and I encourage certainly all of my colleagues to support this legislation H.R. 1051. This is only the beginning. We must do more things like this.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from references to persons in the gallery.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to close and commend once again my good friend Mr. HOLT for introducing this legislation and for moving this forward.

I think the discussion that we have had has been good. I think that the breadth of individuals that have signed on as cosponsors to this legislation, as well as the diversity of the background of those Members who have come to the floor today to speak on behalf of this legislation, give testimony to the importance of moving forward and having this kind of information available.

So I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1051.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I said earlier, it may come as a surprise to my colleagues that this single database where any student who might be interested in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics could go might, they might be surprised that it doesn't already exist. In fact, it doesn't.

This is straightforward legislation that will make it easier for students to pursue a line of study or one of a number of lines of study that are critically important not only for their personal development, but for our economy and our society, our international competitiveness, indeed, the future of our country.

This is only one piece of the many things that we need to do that you have heard from other speakers about this morning. It is a straightforward, simple thing that we can do, that is not expensive. If we could, through this inexpensive method, encourage eight or ten or twelve more students to go into science, that would be wonderful. Instead, I expect we will get hundreds, if not thousands, who will find their way into these critical fields because of

the existence of a database that gives them a place to start as they look to their future.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 1051, as amended.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the National STEM Scholarship Database Act. In a time of global economic and scientific competition, we must ensure that our brightest young people have the resources to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and math.

When students graduate from American universities with undergraduate degrees, they graduate with on average, \$20,000 in debt. This undergraduate debt is a significant factor in a student's decision to pursue graduate school. And among science and engineering students, those who had debt from their undergraduate education were more likely to say they could not afford graduate school.

We cannot afford to limit the potential of these students, or those who find the cost of even an undergraduate education prohibitive. We cannot afford to have ambitious students with interest and aptitude in science or math or engineering shut out of our colleges. We need Americans with advanced degrees in the STEM fields to propel our Nation forward in discovery and innovation.

This bill makes it easier for students to find scholarships and grants to finance their educations. It does not require a significant investment from the Federal Government—although I believe we should make the investment in more Federal loans in the future. It simply creates a central location where students can learn about their options.

This is a common sense way to help students pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and math. It is a simple, low-cost part of our competitiveness agenda, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it today.

Mr. HOLT. 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 New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1051, 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.

FIRST HIGHER EDUCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2007

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2559) to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2559

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 "First Higher Education Extension Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.

Section 2(a) of the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-81; 20 U.S.C. 1001

note) is amended by striking "June 30, 2007" and inserting "October 31, 2007".

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or in the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 as amended by this Act, shall be construed to limit or otherwise alter the authorizations of appropriations for, or the durations of, programs contained in the amendments made by the Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-171) to the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Taxpayer-Teacher Protection Act of 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H.R. 2559 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1100

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong report of H.R. 2559, a bill to extend the Higher Education Act through October 31, 2007.

This bill is very straightforward. It simply extends the current programs authorized under the Higher Education Act until October 31, 2007, giving us the time to fully consider and complete the reauthorization act.

I would like to thank Congressman MCKEON, the ranking member of the full committee, and Congressman RIC KELLER, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning and Competitiveness, for joining Chairman GEORGE MILLER and me in bringing this non-controversial extension to the floor in a bipartisan manner.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2559, which is a measure to extend programs under the Higher Education Act that are set to expire at the end of this month.

I want to thank my committee colleagues, Chairman MILLER, Chairman HINOJOSA, Mr. MCKEON and Mr. KELLER for their work on this bill, as well as their consistent efforts on behalf of our Nation's college students and their families.

Bolstering our higher education and student aid programs has long been a priority for Congress, regardless of

which party was in the majority. In the last Congress, for example, under Republican leadership, we passed a measure that reduced lender subsidies, increased loan limits for students, and provided additional resources for students studying math, science and critical foreign languages in college.

Unfortunately, the Senate didn't act on the higher education reauthorization in the last Congress, so we were forced to extend programs under the law last September. In that extension, we included a number of important benefits for college students and institutions of higher education as well. For example, we reduced red tape and provided loan forgiveness to spouses and parents of those who died or became disabled on September 11.

Mr. Speaker, just last month, the House continued our work to strengthen the student aid system by passing the Student Loan Sunshine Act, bipartisan legislation that will restore confidence in the relationships between student lenders and colleges and universities.

Now, as we prepare anew to reauthorize programs under the Higher Education Act, we are again faced with the need to pass an extension of these programs to bridge this gap. Now, make no mistake, the measure before us today is worthy of our support, but, at the same time, I am hopeful that our friends on the other side of the Capitol will renew their commitment to a full reauthorization. These extensions, now five of which we've had in the last Congress alone, ought to become a thing of the past.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol in completing our reauthorization work in the 110th Congress. Just as importantly, I also look forward to working toward reforms that recognize the contributions of market-based programs that have been made on behalf of millions of students for the last several decades. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong commitment, as chairman of the Higher Education Subcommittee, that I will work very closely with Congressman PRICE from Georgia and all of the members of our committee to be able to finish the work necessary to reauthorize the Higher Education Act sometime before the end of this year, hopefully in October.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield to my good friend and fellow physician, a gentleman from Louisiana who has been a strong proponent of higher education in his work on the committee. I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we actually get the work done on this. We really need to get this done permanently, but I rise in support of this extension so that we can continue to move the ball forward. It is my hope that the other body across the Capitol will move this time around. I know we are going to do it here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House has agreed to include a provision I offered with subcommittee Chairman ROB ANDREWS that would limit projected physician shortages. This was an amendment to the bill that we had in the 109th Congress, and it is my understanding that it will be included in the base bill, and I am very pleased.

I hope, also, that Congress will add a provision that I introduced with Congresswoman MCCARTHY to meet the future need of qualified nurses, which is an area where we have critical shortages throughout the country. And so it is my hope that as we go forward with this bill on the House side we can introduce this language into the bill or perhaps amend the bill, if necessary.

Once again, I think it is critical that we get the job done on this. We did our work in the 109th Congress. The other body needs to move forward. We need to complete our work here so we can get a good, solid reauthorization bill that will do justice to our higher education system.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman once again for moving this issue forward. Again, I look forward to working with him as we move forward with the Higher Education Reauthorization Act. I am confident that we will be able to get it done in this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. I thank Congressman PRICE for those closing remarks. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to pass H.R. 2559.

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 Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2559.

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.

HONORING THE MERCURY 13 WOMEN

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 421) honoring the trailblazing accomplishments of the "Mercury 13" women, whose efforts in the early 1960s demonstrated the capabilities of American women to undertake the human exploration of space.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 421

Honoring the trailblazing accomplishments of the "Mercury 13" women, whose efforts in the early 1960s demonstrated the capabilities of American women to undertake the human exploration of space.

Whereas all of the Mercury 13 women were accomplished pilots with commercial ratings or better and at least 2,000 hours of flying time;

Whereas the Mercury 13 women passed the same rigorous physical and psychological tests that the original Mercury 7 astronauts had to undergo;

Whereas the Mercury 13 women successfully completed their testing at the Lovelace Clinic, in Albuquerque, New Mexico by the end of 1961;

Whereas the Mercury 13 women were prepared to continue their contributions to America's space program at the Naval School of Aviation Medicine in Pensacola, Florida, by undergoing advanced aeromedical examinations using jet aircraft and military equipment, until they were informed that their testing program was canceled;

Whereas the Soviet Union flew the first woman in space in 1963;

Whereas the United States flew the first American woman in space, Dr. Sally Ride, in 1983;

Whereas the United States flew the first woman to pilot the Space Shuttle, Lt. Col. Eileen Collins, in 1995;

Whereas the Mercury 13 women served as pathfinders for NASA's female astronauts; and

Whereas the careers of accomplishment of the Mercury 13 women can serve as an inspiration for other young women who are considering pursuing a career in aviation, astronautics, science, or engineering: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and honors the contributions of Myrtle Cagle, Geraldyn "Jerrie" Cobb, Jan Dietrich, Marion Dietrich, Mary Wallace "Wally" Funk, Jane Briggs Hart, Jean Hixson, Gene Nora Stumbough Jessen, Irene Leverton, Sarah Lee Gorelick Ratley, Bernice Trimble Steadman, Geraldine "Jerri" Sloan Truhill, and Rhea Hurrle Allison Woltman; and

(2) encourages young women to follow in the footsteps of the Mercury 13 women and pursue careers of excellence in aviation and astronautics, as well as in engineering and science.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 421.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the trailblazing accomplishments of the Mercury 13 women, whose efforts in

the early 1960s demonstrated the capabilities of American women to undertake the human exploration of space. The Mercury 13 women were Myrtle Cagle, Geraldyn "Jerrie" Cobb, Jan Dietrich, Marion Dietrich, Mary Wallace "Wally" Funk, Jane Briggs Hart, Jean Hixson, Gene Nora Stumbough Jessen, Irene Leverton, Sarah Lee Gorelick Ratley, Bernice "Bea" Trimble Steadman, Geraldine "Jerri" Sloan Truhill, and Rhea Hurrle Allison Woltman.

All of these Mercury 13 women were accomplished pilots with commercial ratings or better and at least 2,000 hours of flying time, and they passed the same rigorous physical and psychological tests that the original Mercury 7 astronauts underwent. The Mercury 13 women were prepared to continue their service to America's space program, until they were informed that their testing program was cancelled.

While the former Soviet Union flew the first woman in space in 1963, it was another 20 years before the United States flew Dr. Sally Ride as the first American woman in space in 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I seek support for H. Res. 421 to honor the Mercury 13 women pioneers and to encourage young women to follow in the footsteps of the Mercury 13 women in pursuing careers of excellence in aviation and astronautics as well as in engineering and science.

Times do change. I spent a chunk of my time last week at home during recess handing out space camp scholarships. At every stop, it wasn't clear whether the winner was going to be a boy or a girl; and the enthusiasm for space seemed to be relatively equal between the boys and the girls in the classes where we made such awards.

□ 1110

In an aside, I would like to welcome China as a new nation among space-faring nations. There is an old Chinese saying, as there always is, that women hold up half the sky, and this recognition that American women have been participating in space long before 1983 is very, very appropriate at this point in time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Oregon for his resolution. I want to rise today in support of House Resolution 421, which honors the accomplishments of the so-called Mercury 13 women whose efforts in the early 1960s demonstrated the capabilities of American women to undertake human space exploration.

At a time when there were many prejudices against women, the Lovelace Clinic in Albuquerque, New Mexico, began testing female pilots to undertake human exploration of space under the same rigorous, physical and psychological standards as NASA's male astronauts.

In 1960, the first of the Mercury 13, Geraldyn "Jerrie" Cobb went to Lovelace Clinic, and by the end of 1961, 13 women had successfully completed this rigorous training. Following their testing program, the 13 women were prepared to continue their contributions to America's space program at the Naval School of Aviation Medicine in Pensacola, Florida and undergo advanced aeromedical examinations using jet aircraft and military equipment, but their program was canceled.

The careers and accomplishments of these great American women served as an inspiration for many other young women that followed in their careers in aviation, astronautics, science and engineering.

This resolution recognizes the accomplishments of Myrtle Cagle, Geraldyn "Jerrie" Cobb, Jan Dietrich, Marion Dietrich, Mary Wallace "Wally" Funk, Jane Briggs Hart, Jean Hixson, Gene Nora, Stumbough Jessen, Irene Leverton, Sarah Lee, Gorelick Ratley, Bernice Trimble Steadman, Geraldine "Jerri" Sloan Truhill, and Rhea Hurrle Allison Woltman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 421 and again thank the gentleman from Oregon.

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, Dr. KAGEN, and thank him for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues from Oregon and Florida. I appreciate their support on this important resolution.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 421, to honor the first American women to participate in the United States space program. Known as the Mercury 13, they were extremely accomplished pilots and aviators and were selected from a pool of women to become astronauts. Conducted in secret at the Lovelace Clinic in Albuquerque, New Mexico, they excelled in the same physical and psychological tests as the male candidates for astronaut school did, the Mercury 7.

Although many of these women outshined and outperformed their male counterparts, they were never allowed to fly into space. The prejudice of the day grounded their mission before they could reach the stars, but it did not ground their dreams.

In 1961, just before their final phase of training at the Naval Aviation Center in Pensacola, Florida, the Mercury 13 women received notice that the program had been canceled. Twenty-two years later, NASA sent our first American woman into space, Sally Ride.

In these past decades, the groundbreaking achievements of the Mercury 13 women have often been overlooked. Author Martha Ackmann wrote this about the Mercury 13 and their quest for flying into space:

"While the Mercury 13 did not get their shot at space—at least not yet—

they refused to let someone else trim their dreams. They fought for what they wanted, what they believed in, and spoke out against discrimination.”

The Mercury 13 women, as already stated, were Jerrie Cobb, Gene Nora Jessen, Wally Funk, Irene Leverton, Myrtle “K” Cagle, Jane Hart, Jerri Truhill, Rhea Hurrle Woltman, Sarah Ratley, Bernice “B” Steadman, Jean Hixson, Jan Dietrich, and Marion Dietrich.

I had the honor of meeting several of these very tough and spirited women at the University of Wisconsin in Oshkosh in a commencement ceremony, and I was privileged and honored to present to the Mercury 13 women an honorary degree, an honorary doctorate. Today, I have the extreme privilege to honor these phenomenal and extraordinary women on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and their pioneering spirit that has advanced the rights of women everywhere. As these Mercury 13 women have demonstrated, the sky is not the limit.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my friend from Oregon that I have no further speakers and am prepared to reserve my time until it is appropriate to close.

Mr. WU. There are no further speakers on this side, either, if the gentleman would care to close.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank my colleagues for their support for the great history of the Mercury 13. I should say since that Mercury 13 program, there have been 34 women that have flown aboard the space shuttle, including four who made the ultimate sacrifice in the *Challenger* and *Columbia* accidents.

In order to honor such dedication after the *Columbia* accident, America committed to a vision for space exploration that will return Americans to the Moon. Undoubtedly, several women will make that journey. I look forward to that moment when the first American woman steps on the Moon and shares her experience with the rest of the world.

This resolution by the gentleman from Oregon and others recognizes the first 13 women that helped propel an entire gender and an entire nation into space.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to recognize the good work of my colleague from Wisconsin, Dr. KAGEN, for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is timely and it is timely recognition of a space program that includes everyone from America and now, because of the international space station and international space efforts, includes many people from around the world.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer strong support for House Resolution 421, honoring the extraordinary accomplishments and

courageous journey of the Mercury 13 women. Though largely unrecognized in history, these 13 female pilots displayed determination, bravery and strength in their quest for space exploration.

Selected from a large group of women, the Mercury 13 pilots endured and passed the same grueling physical and psychological tests as the Mercury 7 male astronauts. These women however, were tested not only on their ability to withstand the toils of space exploration but also on their capacity to overcome extensive discrimination in both their careers and personal lives. When championing their cause, the women were repeatedly told by government officials that any effort to put a woman in space was a waste of time and money. Given this lack of U.S. support, Valentina Tereshkova, a Russian engineer, became the first woman in space on June 16, 1963. It would be many years later, in 1983, that Dr. Sally Ride would become the first American woman in space.

Although the women of Mercury 13 were barred from space travel, disappointment did not lessen their pioneering spirit and quest for equality. We must follow their lead. Given our country's shortcomings in 1963, it is our responsibility today to ensure that future generations of women are granted equal opportunities to follow their dreams.

These courageous women demonstrate that the sky is not the limit and that as a Nation we must ensure that all individuals, regardless of gender, race or ethnicity, are encouraged to venture into the fields of math, science, technology and engineering. I believe we must instill the spirit of the Mercury 13 into our children today, by supporting innovative programs such as the National Science Foundation that promote technology in the classroom. By creating an environment in this country that fosters innovation and growth, we will ensure our businesses and workforce can stay competitive in the global economy of the 21st century. From new education technology and better math and science teachers to train the next generation of innovators, to the promotion of new sources of energy and the expansion of markets for our products, this comprehensive agenda will create a strong foundation to build the economy of the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to capitalize on this opportunity to extend an honor to the women of Mercury 13 and to ensure we never again allow gender inequality to restrict our citizens' ambition and potential.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 421.

This resolution recognizes the brave “Mercury 13” women who in the early 1960s undertook the human exploration of space.

The members of the “Mercury 13” include Myrtle Cagle, Geraldyn “Jerrie” Cobb, Jan Dietrich, Marion Dietrich, Mary Wallace “Wally” Funk, Jane Briggs Hart, Jean Hixson, Gene Nora Stumbough Jessen, Irene Leverton, Sarah Lee Gorelick Ratley, Bernice Trimble Steadman, Geraldine “Jerri” Sloan Truhill, and Rhea Hurrle Allison Woltman.

The “Mercury 13” women successfully passed the same physical and psychological tests as those of their male counterparts, the “Mercury 7.”

Just before leaving for the next phase of training at the Naval Aviation Center in Pensacola, Florida, they were told not to come.

In 1961, their efforts marked a milestone in American history and these women paved the way for those who would follow in their footsteps.

The Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas has been the leading NASA center for more than 40 years and continues to encourage women to participate in the area of space exploration.

H. Res. 421 is an important way to help young women understand the importance of space and science.

As of today, there have been 34 women in space, and although this is a great accomplishment, there should be more.

It is my hope that this resolution encourages girls to pursue what they may feel is impossible.

The “Mercury 13” continue to inspire women of all ages to go above and beyond, so that they can fulfill their dreams. The sacrifices of these women deserve to be honored.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 421, a resolution to honor the achievements of women in space exploration.

In the 1960s, a courageous group of women challenged themselves, and the stereotypes of our Nation, to become the First Lady Astronaut Trainees.

These women were all accomplished pilots with a dream to explore the unknown.

Thirteen of these women—“the Mercury 13”—were chosen to be part of America's space team, breaking boundaries with their passion and determination.

Though the program was discontinued before these women could actually fly in space, they paved the way for future female astronauts through their hard work and relentless efforts.

Finally, NASA got the message and began recruiting women again, starting with the class of 1978 astronauts and culminating in the first American woman in space in 1983.

Without the efforts of the Mercury 13, women with skills and interest in science and exploration would have had a much tougher time breaking through gender barriers.

The Mercury 13 women saw roadblocks as challenges to overcome.

I hope that all of the young women in my district and across America may be inspired to make change by their example.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. WU. 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 Oregon (Mr. WU) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 421.

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.

HONORING ASTRONAUT WALTER MARTY SCHIRRA AND EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES ON HIS PASSING

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 446) honoring the life and

accomplishments of Astronaut Walter Marty Schirra and expressing condolences on his passing.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 446

Whereas Walter Schirra was born on March 12, 1923, in Hackensack, New Jersey;

Whereas as an exchange pilot with the 154th Fighter Bomber Squadron during the Korean War, he flew 90 combat missions in F-84E jets and was credited with downing at least one MIG fighter;

Whereas on October 3, 1962, Walter Schirra became the fifth person to fly in space when he piloted Mercury 8 (Sigma 7) on a six-orbit mission lasting 9 hours, 13 minutes and 11 seconds;

Whereas on December 15, 1965, Walter Schirra piloted Gemini 6A in what was the first attempted rendezvous by two manned spacecraft in earth orbit;

Whereas on October 11, 1968, he concluded his third and final mission when he was launched as commander of Apollo 7, the first manned Apollo mission, making Commander Schirra the only astronaut to fly aboard Mercury, Gemini and Apollo spacecrafts;

Whereas Commander Schirra was the recipient of many distinguished awards, including three distinguished flying crosses, two air medals, two NASA Distinguished Services Medals and induction into the National Aviation Hall of Fame;

Whereas after he retired to San Diego in 1984, Wally dedicated much of his later years to working with children on connecting them to the amazing possibilities that a career on space exploration could provide, and as a tireless advocate for discovery, Wally was an inspirational figure for countless San Diegans; and

Whereas Commander Schirra was an exemplary resident of the State of California where he resided in La Jolla until the time of his death on May 2, 2007: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the life and accomplishments of Astronaut Walter Marty Schirra and expresses condolences on his passing; and

(2) recognizes the profound importance of Astronaut Schirra's record as a pioneer in space exploration and long-time contributor to NASA's mission as a catalyst to space exploration and scientific advancement in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 446, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of one of our heroes of the American space pro-

gram, astronaut Walter Schirra, known as Wally Schirra. In his 84 years, spanning 1923 to 2007, Captain Schirra took great risks on behalf of his country, including while serving in the Pacific during World War II.

□ 1120

During the Korean War, Captain Schirra served our country as an exchange pilot with the 154th Fighter Bomber Squadron and flew 90 combat missions and downed at least one MIG fighter.

In April of 1959, Wally Schirra was selected by NASA as one of the original Mercury 7 astronauts. On October 3, 1962, he became the third American to orbit the Earth when he piloted his Sigma 7 spacecraft on a six-orbit mission that lasted 9 hours 13 minutes and 11 seconds.

As a brand new American who had just been in this country for a year and about 8 years old, I remember that, and I just remember that as one of the signal moments that I indeed had come to a country where anything and everything was possible, and Wally Schirra and others of the Mercury 7 group demonstrated that to America and to the world.

Wally Schirra went on to pilot the Gemini 6A mission in 1965, which involved the first attempted rendezvous by two manned spacecraft in Earth orbit, and he made his third and final mission in October, 1968, as commander of the first manned Apollo mission, Apollo 7.

During his career as an astronaut, Wally Schirra was the only astronaut to fly aboard all three generations of our late sixties-early seventies spacecraft, the Mercury, the Gemini and Apollo spacecraft. His outstanding service to the U.S. space program is marked by several awards, including the Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Force Medal, NASA Distinguished Service Medal, and induction into the National Aviation Hall of Fame.

Wally Schirra was a tireless advocate for discovery and spent his later years helping to connect children with the amazing possibilities that a career in space exploration can offer.

Mr. Speaker, today, I seek the support of this Chamber to honor the life and accomplishments of astronaut Wally Schirra, to express condolences on his passing, and to recognize the profound importance of astronaut Schirra's record as a space pioneer and a long-time contributor to NASA's mission of space exploration, scientific advancement and education in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that this Chamber honor Wally Schirra's achievements, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Mr. WU, my friend from Oregon, for

this resolution and want to speak in favor of H. Res. 446, which honors the life and accomplishments of an extraordinary man, astronaut Walter Marty Schirra. Wally Schirra, as he was known to nearly everyone, was truly a great American and a terrific human being.

Wally Schirra was born in Hackensack, New Jersey, on March 12, 1923, and was perhaps best known as an accomplished NASA astronaut and human spaceflight pioneer, with the distinction of being the only astronaut to fly aboard the Mercury, Gemini and Apollo spacecrafts. He was named one of NASA's original Mercury 7 astronauts in April of 1959 and became the fifth American to fly into space. Then, as the commander of the Gemini 6A spacecraft, he completed a dramatic rendezvous in space with the Gemini 7 spacecraft.

Schirra then served as commander of the Apollo 7 mission, which was the first Apollo flight after the catastrophic 1967 launch pad fire that killed the original Apollo 1 crew. At the conclusion of the Apollo 7 mission, Schirra had logged 295 hours and 15 minutes in space.

Before his service with NASA, Wally Schirra had already served his country with honor as a pilot in the 154th Fighter Bomber Squadron during the Korean War. Schirra flew over 90 combat missions in F-84E jets and was credited with downing at least one enemy MIG fighter.

What is perhaps less well-known about Wally Schirra is his personal warmth, his contagious sense of humor and his tireless dedication as an advocate for discovery. After his retirement in 1984, he spent many years working to inspire children to pursue their dreams by connecting them to the amazing possibilities of space exploration.

Schirra captured the pride of our entire Nation when he wrote, "We shared a common dream to test the limits of man's imagination and daring. Those early pioneering flights of Mercury, the performances of Gemini and the trips to the moon established us, once and for, all as what I like to call a spacefaring nation. Like England, Spain and Portugal crossing the seas in search of their nations' greatness, so we reached for the skies and emboldened our Nation."

I am deeply saddened by Wally Schirra's passing on May 2, 2007. He was truly an American hero. I am proud to support this resolution honoring such a prominent American citizen, military veteran and astronaut.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 446.

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

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to, first of all, thank the chairman from Oregon and the ranking member for

supporting my bill, H. Res. 446, in recognition of the life of Wally Schirra. I would just have to say that when we go through the record of the life of Wally, he was a San Diegan for a long time; and we celebrated Wally as a neighbor and as a friend and as a national and international hero.

The fact is that he did serve extensively, like many San Diegans, in the military, with three Distinguished Flying Crosses, two Air Medals, more than a MIG or two on the side. He obviously went into the space race with a lot of accomplishments.

Being the only individual to fly in all three of the first stages of manned space flight for America was unique, but I think, as was pointed out before, Wally is a man that filled in so often when others might have hesitated.

After the terrible disaster of losing astronauts in a major fire, he did not hesitate to look forward to being the first to step back into those capsules and move on and move up with our space race. That kind of bravery we didn't really take into consideration at the time. What a huge challenge it must have been to explain to your wife, "Honey, I am going to get in this capsule. Somebody has to do it, and I will be the one." We don't think about that family, that personal aspect of being a hero and moving forward with those kinds of accomplishments.

I also would like to say that we forget that, without the docking procedure that Wally was able to master, there was not going to be any trip to the moon. It was an essential component, as important as any missile, any rocket, any control system. The ability for man to dock with another spaceship was an essential part, and Wally was a major part of that.

But I want to thank all my colleagues for supporting this bill. Wally was our neighbor, he was our friend, and he really did live a life that San Diegans are proud of in public service. He spent his later years working with the local museums for flight history, and he also spent a lot of time on his sailboat in San Diego.

But I want to thank all of you, because Wally was not just a hero to the world and to America; he was a neighbor and a friend to those of us in San Diego.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, this is a terrific resolution. Mr. BILBRAY is rightfully proud to call Wally Schirra a neighbor and a friend. I think America can call him a neighbor and a friend as well.

I expect to be proudly this Friday evening down at Cape Canaveral where we will hopefully send the next shuttle flight into space with some good luck and good fortune. And as I am down there I will join many Americans in thinking about Wally Schirra and the other great heroes that have come forward and made these great feats today

possible and the many more opportunities in space that would not have happened without heroes like Wally Schirra.

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and accomplishments of Astronaut Walter Marty Schirra, one of our heroes of the American space program.

In his 84 years of life spanning from 1923–2007, Captain Schirra took great risks on behalf of his country.

During the Korean War, Captain Schirra served the country as an exchange pilot with the 154th Fighter Bomber Squadron and flew 90 combat missions and downed at least one MIG fighter.

In April of 1959, "Wally" Schirra was selected by NASA as one of the original Mercury 7 astronauts.

On October 3, 1962, he became the third American to orbit the Earth when he piloted his Sigma 7 spacecraft on a six-orbit mission that lasted 9 hours, 13 minutes, and 11 seconds.

He went on to pilot the Gemini 6A mission in 1965, which involved the first attempted rendezvous by two manned spacecraft in Earth orbit, and he made his third and final mission in October 1968 as commander of the first manned Apollo mission, Apollo 7.

During his career as an astronaut, Wally Schirra was the only astronaut to fly aboard the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo spacecrafts, and his outstanding service to the U.S. space program is marked by several awards, including Distinguished Flying Crosses, Air Medals, NASA Distinguished Service Medals, and induction into the National Aviation Hall of Fame.

Wally Schirra was a tireless advocate for discovery and spent the later years of his life helping to connect children with the amazing possibilities that a career in space exploration can offer.

Mr. Speaker, today I seek support to: honor the life and accomplishments of astronaut Walter "Wally" Schirra; to express condolences on his passing; and to recognize the profound importance of Astronaut Schirra's record as a space pioneer and a long-time contributor to NASA's mission as a catalyst to space exploration and scientific advancement in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that this House honor Wally Schirra's achievements, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 446, honoring the life and accomplishments of Astronaut Walter Marty Schirra and expressing condolences on his passing.

Astronaut Walter Marty Schirra was a member of the Mercury 7, who were named by NASA in April of 1959.

He piloted the six orbit *Sigma 7* Mercury flight, the *Gemini 6* flight and was Command Pilot on the *Apollo VII*.

Walter Schirra became the first man to fly in space three times after being pilot of the *Apollo VII*. Schirra received numerous awards and honors while being a member of NASA. Schirra logged more than 295 hours in space.

After he left NASA in 1969, he worked as a television commentator during the Apollo moon landings, was an engineering consultant and worked on corporate boards.

Not only was Walter Schirra an astronaut, but he was an advocate for students who want to pursue careers in science and engineering.

He helped to found the Mercury Seven Foundation, which creates college scholarships for engineering and science students.

The passing of Walter Schirra has been a huge loss to the space community and America as a whole.

His contributions will never be forgotten, and he leaves a strong legacy of bravery and service. I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the life of one of our great space pioneers, Walter M. "Wally" Schirra and to speak in support of H. Res. 446, a resolution to recognize his many accomplishments and honor his memory.

Wally Schirra was one of the original seven Mercury Astronauts and the only astronaut to fly in all three of the earliest manned space programs: Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo.

He was known for being an exact and precise pilot, and this aviation excellence speaks for itself as Capt. Schirra flew 90 combat missions while serving in the Navy during the Korean War. Later, during his Gemini 6 mission as a NASA astronaut, Schirra conducted the first rendezvous of manned spacecraft in orbit, considered one of the most challenging tasks in space flight at the time.

Capt. Schirra was a great astronaut and a great American. What many of my colleagues may not realize is that Wally Schirra became an active businessman and citizen in Colorado after retiring from the space program.

In the decade after he retired from NASA's Astronaut Corps, he moved to Denver where he lived a life as a successful businessman and an active environmentalist. When he first came to Colorado, he became the president of an investment company. Several years after that, he started an environmental management firm that concentrated their efforts towards developing solutions for environmental problems faced by the government and private industry.

In addition to being an advisor to Colorado State University, Capt. Schirra was also an avid outdoors man, as evidenced by his tenure as a trustee of the Colorado Outward Bound School.

Later in his life, while he continued to be busy in civic life, he played an active role in Colorado politics and served as Colorado's honorary chairman for Ronald Reagan's presidential campaign.

I and my fellow Coloradans will miss him, and I urge my colleagues to honor his memory by passing H. Res. 446.

□ 1130

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 446.

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.

PERMISSION TO RE-REFER EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION 1370 TO COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Executive Communication 1370, the Department of Transportation's final rule, Human Space Flight Requirements for Crew and Space Flight Participants, be referred to the Committee on Science and Technology.

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

There was no objection.

10,000 TRAINED BY 2010 ACT

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1467) to authorize the National Science Foundation to award grants to institutions of higher education to develop and offer education and training programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1467

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 "10,000 Trained by 2010 Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the National Science Foundation has long been a government leader in strengthening our Nation's information infrastructure;

(2) as automation and digitization reach the healthcare industry, that industry will need to draw heavily on the expertise of researchers funded by the National Science Foundation for the collection, processing, and utilization of information;

(3) the National Science Foundation's basic research, demonstrations, and curriculum development assistance are all required to help make sure the industry has the knowledge, procedures, and workforce necessary to take full advantage of advanced communications and information technology;

(4) the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that 136,000 Americans were employed in 2000 as information management professionals in the healthcare industry alone, with projected growth of 49 percent by 2010; and

(5) no systematic plan exists for designing and implementing systems and information tools and for ensuring that the healthcare workforce can make the transition to the information age.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **DIRECTOR.**—The term "Director" means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(2) **INFORMATION.**—The term "information" means healthcare information.

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

SEC. 4. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION RESEARCH.

(a) **GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies

as appropriate, shall award grants for basic research on innovative approaches to improve information systems. Research areas may include—

- (A) information studies;
- (B) population informatics;
- (C) translational informatics; and
- (D) data security, integrity, and confidentiality.

(2) **MERIT REVIEW; COMPETITION.**—Grants shall be awarded under this section on a merit-reviewed, competitive basis.

(3) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection—

- (A) \$3,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;
- (B) \$3,600,000 for fiscal year 2009;
- (C) \$3,700,000 for fiscal year 2010; and
- (D) \$3,800,000 for fiscal year 2011.

(b) **INFORMATICS RESEARCH CENTERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies as appropriate, shall award multiyear grants, subject to the availability of appropriations, to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) to establish multidisciplinary Centers for Informatics Research. Institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) receiving such grants may partner with one or more government laboratories, for-profit institutions, or non-profit institutions.

(2) **MERIT REVIEW; COMPETITION.**—Grants shall be awarded under this subsection on a merit-reviewed, competitive basis.

(3) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Centers shall be to generate innovative approaches in information by conducting cutting-edge, multidisciplinary research, including in the research areas described in subsection (a)(1).

(4) **APPLICATIONS.**—An institution of higher education (or a consortium thereof) seeking funding under this subsection shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(A) the research projects that will be undertaken by the Center and the contributions of each of the participating entities;

(B) how the Center will promote active collaboration among professionals from different disciplines, such as information technology specialists, health professionals, administrators, and social science researchers; and

(C) how the Center will contribute to increasing the number of information researchers and other professionals.

(5) **CRITERIA.**—In evaluating the applications submitted under paragraph (4), the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(A) the ability of the applicant to generate innovative approaches to information and effectively carry out the research program;

(B) the experience of the applicant in conducting research in the information field, and the capacity of the applicant to foster new multidisciplinary collaborations;

(C) the capacity of the applicant to attract and provide adequate support for undergraduate and graduate students to pursue information research; and

(D) the extent to which the applicant will partner with government laboratories or for-profit or non-profit entities, and the role the government laboratories or for-profit or non-profit entities will play in the research undertaken by the Center.

(6) **ANNUAL MEETING.**—The Director shall convene an annual meeting of the Centers in order to foster collaboration and communication between Center participants.

(7) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for

the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection—

- (A) \$4,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;
- (B) \$4,600,000 for fiscal year 2009;
- (C) \$4,700,000 for fiscal year 2010; and
- (D) \$4,800,000 for fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION INFORMATION PROGRAMS.

(a) **CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies as appropriate, shall establish a program to award grants to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) to establish or improve undergraduate and master's degree information programs, to increase the number of students who pursue undergraduate or master's degrees in information fields, to provide students with experience in government or industry related to their information studies, and, to the extent practicable, to do so using distance learning.

(2) **MERIT REVIEW; COMPETITION.**—Grants shall be awarded under this subsection on a merit-reviewed, competitive basis.

(3) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Grants awarded under this subsection shall be used for activities that enhance the ability of an institution of higher education (or consortium thereof) to provide high-quality information education, including certification and undergraduate and master's degree programs, and to recruit and retain increased numbers of students to such programs. Activities may include—

(A) developing and revising curriculum to better prepare undergraduate and master's degree students for careers in the information field;

(B) establishing degree and certificate programs in the information field;

(C) creating opportunities in information research for undergraduate students;

(D) acquiring equipment necessary for student instruction in these programs, including the installation of testbed networks for student use;

(E) providing opportunities for faculty to work with State, local, or Federal Government agencies, private industry, and other academic institutions to develop new expertise or to formulate new information research directions;

(F) establishing collaborations with other academic institutions or departments that seek to establish, expand, or enhance these programs;

(G) establishing student internships for students in these programs at State, local, and Federal Government agencies or in private industry;

(H) establishing or enhancing bridge programs in information fields between community colleges and universities; and

(I) any other activities the Director, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies as appropriate, determines will achieve the purposes described in paragraph (1).

(4) **SELECTION PROCESS.**—

(A) **APPLICATION.**—An institution of higher education (or a consortium thereof) seeking funding under this subsection shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and with such contents as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

(i) a description of the applicant's relevant research and instructional capacity, and in the case of an application from a consortium of institutions of higher education, a description of the role that each member will play in implementing the proposal;

(ii) a comprehensive plan by which the institution or consortium will build instructional capacity in information fields;

(iii) a description of relevant collaborations with State, local, or Federal Government agencies or private industry that inform the instructional program;

(iv) a survey of the applicant's historic student enrollment and placement data and a study of potential enrollment and placement for students enrolled in the proposed program; and

(v) a plan to evaluate the success of the proposed program, including postgraduate assessment of graduate school and job placement and retention rates as well as the relevance of the instructional program to graduate study and to the workplace.

(B) AWARDS.—The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that grants are awarded under this subsection in a wide range of geographic areas and categories of institutions of higher education.

(5) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Director, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies as appropriate, shall evaluate the program established under this subsection no later than 3 years after the establishment of the program. At a minimum, the Director shall evaluate the extent to which the grants have achieved their objectives of increasing the quality and quantity of students pursuing undergraduate or master's degrees in information fields. The Director shall make this assessment publicly available.

(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection—

- (A) \$9,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;
- (B) \$9,200,000 for fiscal year 2009;
- (C) \$9,400,000 for fiscal year 2010; and
- (D) \$9,600,000 for fiscal year 2011.

(b) SCIENTIFIC AND ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1992.—

(1) GRANTS.—The Director shall provide grants under the Scientific and Advanced Technology Act of 1992 for the purposes of section 3(a) and (b) of that Act, except that the activities supported pursuant to this subsection shall be limited to improving education in fields related to information.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection—

- (A) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;
- (B) \$7,200,000 for fiscal year 2009;
- (C) \$7,400,000 for fiscal year 2010; and
- (D) \$7,600,000 for fiscal year 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1467, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I and other Members of the Science and Technology Committee have been working on the issue of health care IT for several years. The genesis of this legislation, H.R. 1467, was a roundtable I held in Oregon in

August 2005. This roundtable was followed by an Environment, Standards and Technology Subcommittee field hearing on health care information technology in February of 2006. Representative REICHERT of Washington chaired the hearing, and our current ranking member, Mr. HALL, also had staff in attendance.

One of the common issues raised at both of these events was the lack of trained people who are experts in both health care and in information technology. Despite the Federal focus on developing a national electronic health care record system, there is no systematic plan for the training of current and prospective professionals in both health care and IT. Without this specialized training, the technology can sit on health care provider's desks as a box, cold and unused rather than as an integrated system of health care doing what it should do.

The need for individuals to manage health care IT is expected to grow 49 percent between 2000 and 2010, and nearly 75 percent of health care organizations indicate there are not enough qualified applicants for these positions.

I would like to point out that the Science and Technology Committee has a history of developing specific and specialized training and research programs for IT professionals.

During the 107th Congress, the committee became concerned that the lack of specialized computerized training for IT students and professionals was a contributing factor in the lack of decent computer security practices and software. As a result, the committee developed and moved H.R. 3394, the CyberSecurity Research and Development Act which subsequently became Public Law 107-305.

The bill under consideration today, H.R. 1467, consists of four components. It authorizes the National Science Foundation, NSF, to award research grants for innovative approaches enhancing health care informatics. I want to make clear that this provision builds upon existing NSF activities.

It authorizes NSF to support multidisciplinary health and medical informatics research centers to perform research and to train qualified health care informatics personnel and professionals.

Next, it authorizes NSF to establish a grant program to improve undergraduate, master's and certificate programs in health care informatics. The goal is to increase the number of students and the quality of training in their field. This program allows both 4-year and 2-year institutions to participate as well as allowing for the development of continuing education curricula.

Finally, it authorizes NSF's Advanced Technology Education Program which focuses solely on 2-year colleges to support improved education and technical training for health care informatics.

H.R. 1467 is a bipartisan product of the Science and Technology Com-

mittee. Ranking Member HALL and I introduced this bill in the last Congress. In this Congress, we introduced this legislation, along with Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member GINGREY of the Technology and Innovation Subcommittee.

I have spoken to Dr. GINGREY about health care IT, and he knows from his firsthand experience the challenges involved in integrating IT into health care settings.

We all recognize the benefits that an integrated health IT network could provide in terms of improved patient care, safety, privacy and potentially cost savings. However, investment in physical infrastructure and technology alone is not enough. We need research and training programs for health care and IT professionals in order to use and design the system well.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 1467, the 10,000 Trained by 2010 Act, and the primary goal it seeks to achieve. If implemented correctly and efficiently, health information technology, which we call IT, can revolutionize our health care system.

However, we have to have an educated workforce properly trained in health IT in order for it to be successful. This is what H.R. 1467 is all about. NSF is already doing incredible work in the IT area, but this measure focuses specifically on health IT by providing grants on new innovative approaches for health care hardware and software solutions.

Creating health medical informatics research centers and making improvements to undergraduate and master's degree programs for health care informatics, it also expands the Advanced Technology Education Program to include health IT.

The activities supported by H.R. 1467 are important if we are to have a sufficiently trained health IT workforce, and I encourage my colleagues to adopt this bill.

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for working with me, and his staff for working with our staff over a period of 3 years on this legislation.

I inquire of the gentleman whether he has any additional speakers.

Mr. HALL of Texas. We have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the staff on both sides of the aisle on the Science Committee for working hard through two Congresses to bring this legislation to the floor, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for adoption of this legislation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1467, the 10,000 Trained by 2010 Act.

The bill requires the National Science Foundation to award competitive grants for research to improve health care information systems.

As our health care information moves from paper to computer-based storage methods, it becomes increasingly important to develop systematic methods for organizing and sharing biomedical information.

Digital medical records must be transferable, and above all, patient confidentiality must be ensured.

H.R. 1467 would fund scientific and engineering activities to improve education in the health care information fields. The funding would be used to develop innovative approaches in health care information; and help students earn advanced degrees in these fields.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would promote technologies that will save us taxpayer dollars over the long term. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1467.

Mr. WU. 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 Oregon (Mr. WU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1467.

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.

□ 1140

GREEN ENERGY EDUCATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1716) to authorize higher education curriculum development and graduate training in advanced energy and green building technologies, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1716

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 "Green Energy Education Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) **DIRECTOR.**—The term "Director" means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(2) **HIGH PERFORMANCE BUILDING.**—The term "high performance building" has the meaning given that term in section 914(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16194(a)).

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. GRADUATE TRAINING IN ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **FUNDING.**—*In carrying out research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities authorized for the Department of Energy, the Secretary may contribute funds to the National Science Foundation for the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program to support projects that enable graduate education related to such activities.*

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—*The Director shall consult with the Secretary when preparing solicitations and awarding grants for projects described in subsection (a).*

SEC. 4. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR HIGH PERFORMANCE BUILDING DESIGN.

(a) **FUNDING.**—*In carrying out advanced energy technology research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities authorized for the Department of Energy related to high performance buildings, the Secretary may contribute funds to curriculum development activities at the National Science Foundation for the purpose of improving undergraduate or graduate interdisciplinary engineering and architecture education related to the design and construction of high performance buildings, including development of curricula, of laboratory activities, of training practicums, or of design projects. A primary goal of curriculum development activities supported under this section shall be to improve the ability of engineers, architects, landscape architects, and planners to work together on the incorporation of advanced energy technologies during the design and construction of high performance buildings.*

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—*The Director shall consult with the Secretary when preparing solicitations and awarding grants for projects described in subsection (a).*

(c) **PRIORITY.**—*In awarding grants with respect to which the Secretary has contributed funds under this section, the Director shall give priority to applications from departments, programs, or centers of a school of engineering that are partnered with schools, departments, or programs of design, architecture, and city, regional, or urban planning.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1716, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 1716, the Green Energy Education Act of 2007. I'd like to thank Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. HILL for their leadership on this important legislation.

This bill authorizes the Department of Energy to contribute funds to the National Science Foundation's successful Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program, known as IGERT. IGERT awards prepare doctoral students by integrating research and education in innovative ways that are tailored to the unique requirements of newly emerging interdisciplinary fields and new career options.

Many future green energy technologies, such as thin film solar technologies, will require interdisciplinary teams of scientists and engineers such as those trained under the IGERT program.

This bill also authorizes the Department of Energy's high-performance-

building technology programs to contribute to the National Science Foundation's ongoing curriculum development activities with the goal of improving the ability of engineers and architects to design and construct high-performance buildings.

Innovative technologies, coupled with a whole-buildings approach that optimizes interactions among building systems and components, enable buildings to use considerably less energy, while also helping to meet national goals for sustainable development, environmental protection and energy security.

The high-performance, or green, building movement is growing rapidly, but it is still a very small slice of the multibillion dollar building industry; and there's a real gap in university level education and training for the next generation of green building professionals. This bill helps address that gap.

In summary, this bill addresses a critical need to provide resources to universities to update their curricula and research efforts in alternative energy and high-performance buildings, and it improves coordination between the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation in achieving this goal.

I'm pleased to support H.R. 1716, the Green Energy Education Act of 2007. Again, I want to commend Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. HILL for this important legislation; and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1716.

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

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to first thank Mr. LIPINSKI and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their strong support of this bill, which I introduced in the last Congress; and I'm pleased to see it get to the House floor in this Congress.

The National Academies' Rising Above the Gathering Storm report echoed the call of many in the academic and business community for greater need to recruit and develop scientific and engineering talent to work on solving problems of national need.

Like many Members of Congress, I'm concerned about America's dependence on foreign sources of energy. Our reliance on imported energy only serves to increase our vulnerability to both external events and the actions of regimes that are, in many cases, openly hostile to the interests of the United States. One of the ways we can reduce the need for energy imports is to use our energy more efficiently.

Buildings consume more energy than any other sector of the economy, including industry and transportation. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, American buildings consume 39 percent of our Nation's primary energy and 70 percent of electricity. However, energy efficient building practices are not being fully utilized, in

part because of a lack of awareness about energy efficient technologies and design practices among building professionals.

That is why I introduced the Green Energy Education Act. This legislation authorizes the Department of Energy to partner with the National Science Foundation to support graduate education and curriculum development to advance DOE's broad energy technology development mission. Working through NSF, DOE will help develop the next generation of engineers and architects to produce buildings incorporating the latest in energy efficient technologies.

In order to reduce the likelihood of duplicative and wasteful programs, this bill also allows the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation to combine their efforts to find workable solutions to the issues surrounding building efficiency that then can be transferred to the marketplace.

Specifically, H.R. 1716 will authorize DOE's Office of Science and applied energy technology programs to contribute funds to the NSF's successful Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program, which is already doing great work in this area.

This bill also authorizes the DOE to contribute to NSF's curriculum development activities in order to improve the ability of engineers and architects to design and construct more efficient and durable buildings.

I urge my colleagues to support this important step towards increasing America's energy independence.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is another great effort that we are making, another important step in helping to reduce our energy consumption in this country. It's critical for national security, our economic security and to combat global climate change, and certainly energy efficient buildings, great work is being done in this, and much more work needs to be done.

I have seen at the Department of Energy lab the work that is being done on some of this. I think much more needs to be done. This bill will help to provide these opportunities for more students, more people to learn about what it takes to make our buildings more energy efficient.

Again, I commend Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. HILL for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider H.R. 1716, the Green Energy Education Act. As the lead Democratic sponsor of this bill, I am pleased that it has moved so quickly through committee. I believe its rapid movement onto the floor of the House for a vote is indicative of the bill's importance and timely subject matter.

H.R. 1716 promotes the design and construction of energy efficient buildings by authorizing the Department of Energy to partner

with the National Science Foundation (NSF) in support of multidisciplinary graduate education and curriculum development activities that will enhance the DOE's broad energy technology development mission. By working with the NSF, DOE will help develop the next generation of engineers and architects to work effectively together to produce buildings and incorporating the latest in energy efficient technologies.

Buildings in the U.S. consume a disproportionate share of our energy and electricity. We must do something to make our buildings more energy efficient and friendly to the environment. In fact, buildings in the U.S. consume more energy than any other sector of the country, including industry and transportation. According to 2003 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) statistics, U.S. buildings consume 39 percent of our nation's primary energy and 70 percent of electricity.

We need to do everything we can to address the harmful things we are doing to the environment. This bill is a step in that direction—making buildings more energy efficient and less stressful on our energy and electrical supplies. And, it will save businesses considerable sums of money in the long run.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this important bill and take a step forward in easing our dependence on foreign and harmful energy sources.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1716, the Green Energy Education Act of 2007.

Mr. Speaker, "green energy" is defined as energy that is produced and used in ways that lessen air pollution and other environmental impacts.

An investment in green energy education will benefit our Nation in important ways. It is good for the environment, because it reduces environmental impacts of the production and delivery of energy.

Green energy also reduces harmful greenhouse emissions.

H.R. 1716 directs the Department of Energy to contribute funds to the National Science Foundation for the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program. This program is important in supporting graduate education related to green energy projects.

The bill also supports energy technology research and development for high tech buildings and for educational activities to teach students how to improve building design that is not harmful to the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1716 and urge my colleagues to support it also.

Mr. LIPINSKI. 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 Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1716, 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. MCCAUL of Texas. 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.

□ 1150

H-PRIZE ACT OF 2007

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 632) to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish monetary prizes for achievements in overcoming scientific and technical barriers associated with hydrogen energy, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 632

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 "H-Prize Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTERING ENTITY.**—The term "administering entity" means the entity with which the Secretary enters into an agreement under section 3(c).

(2) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term "Department" means the Department of Energy.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. PRIZE AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a program to competitively award cash prizes in conformity with this Act to advance the research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of hydrogen energy technologies.

(b) **ADVERTISING AND SOLICITATION OF COMPETITORS.**—

(1) **ADVERTISING.**—The Secretary shall widely advertise prize competitions to encourage broad participation, including by individuals, universities (including historically Black colleges and universities and other minority serving institutions), and large and small businesses (including businesses owned or controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged persons).

(2) **ANNOUNCEMENT THROUGH FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.**—The Secretary shall announce each prize competition by publishing a notice in the Federal Register. This notice shall include essential elements of the competition such as the subject of the competition, the duration of the competition, the eligibility requirements for participation in the competition, the process for participants to register for the competition, the amount of the prize, and the criteria for awarding the prize.

(c) **ADMINISTERING THE COMPETITIONS.**—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with a private, nonprofit entity to administer the prize competitions, subject to the provisions of this Act. The duties of the administering entity under the agreement shall include—

(1) advertising prize competitions and their results;

(2) raising funds from private entities and individuals to pay for administrative costs and to contribute to cash prizes, including funds provided in exchange for the right to name a prize awarded under this section;

(3) developing, in consultation with and subject to the final approval of the Secretary, the criteria for selecting winners in prize competitions, based on goals provided by the Secretary;

(4) determining, in consultation with the Secretary, the appropriate amount and funding sources for each prize to be awarded, subject to the final approval of the Secretary with respect to Federal funding;

(5) providing advice and consultation to the Secretary on the selection of judges in accordance with section 4(d), using criteria developed

in consultation with and subject to the final approval of the Secretary; and

(6) protecting against the entity's unauthorized use or disclosure of a registered participant's trade secrets and confidential business information. Any information properly identified as trade secrets or confidential business information that is submitted by a participant as part of a competitive program under this Act may be withheld from public disclosure.

(d) FUNDING SOURCES.—Prizes under this Act shall consist of Federal appropriated funds and any funds provided by the administering entity (including funds raised pursuant to subsection (c)(2)) for such cash prize programs. The Secretary may accept funds from other Federal agencies for such cash prizes and, notwithstanding section 3302(b) of title 31, United States Code, may use such funds for the cash prize program. Other than publication of the names of prize sponsors, the Secretary may not give any special consideration to any private sector entity or individual in return for a donation to the Secretary or administering entity.

(e) ANNOUNCEMENT OF PRIZES.—The Secretary may not issue a notice required by subsection (b)(2) until all the funds needed to pay out the announced amount of the prize have been appropriated or committed in writing by the administering entity. The Secretary may increase the amount of a prize after an initial announcement is made under subsection (b)(2) if—

(1) notice of the increase is provided in the same manner as the initial notice of the prize; and

(2) the funds needed to pay out the announced amount of the increase have been appropriated or committed in writing by the administering entity.

(f) SUNSET.—The authority to announce prize competitions under this Act shall terminate on September 30, 2018.

SEC. 4. PRIZE CATEGORIES.

(a) CATEGORIES.—The Secretary shall establish prizes for—

(1) advancements in technologies, components, or systems related to—

- (A) hydrogen production;
- (B) hydrogen storage;
- (C) hydrogen distribution; and
- (D) hydrogen utilization;

(2) prototypes of hydrogen-powered vehicles or other hydrogen-based products that best meet or exceed objective performance criteria, such as completion of a race over a certain distance or terrain or generation of energy at certain levels of efficiency; and

(3) transformational changes in technologies for the distribution or production of hydrogen that meet or exceed far-reaching objective criteria, which shall include minimal carbon emissions and which may include cost criteria designed to facilitate the eventual market success of a winning technology.

(b) AWARDS.—

(1) ADVANCEMENTS.—To the extent permitted under section 3(e), the prizes authorized under subsection (a)(1) shall be awarded biennially to the most significant advance made in each of the four subcategories described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (a)(1) since the submission deadline of the previous prize competition in the same category under subsection (a)(1) or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, unless no such advance is significant enough to merit an award. No one such prize may exceed \$1,000,000. If less than \$4,000,000 is available for a prize competition under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary may omit one or more subcategories, reduce the amount of the prizes, or not hold a prize competition.

(2) PROTOTYPES.—To the extent permitted under section 3(e), prizes authorized under subsection (a)(2) shall be awarded biennially in alternate years from the prizes authorized under subsection (a)(1). The Secretary is authorized to award up to one prize in this category in each

2-year period. No such prize may exceed \$4,000,000. If no registered participants meet the objective performance criteria established pursuant to subsection (c) for a competition under this paragraph, the Secretary shall not award a prize.

(3) TRANSFORMATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES.—To the extent permitted under section 3(e), the Secretary shall announce one prize competition authorized under subsection (a)(3) as soon after the date of enactment of this Act as is practicable. A prize offered under this paragraph shall be not less than \$10,000,000, paid to the winner in a lump sum, and an additional amount paid to the winner as a match for each dollar of private funding raised by the winner for the hydrogen technology beginning on the date the winner was named. The match shall be provided for 3 years after the date the prize winner is named or until the full amount of the prize has been paid out, whichever occurs first. A prize winner may elect to have the match amount paid to another entity that is continuing the development of the winning technology. The Secretary shall announce the rules for receiving the match in the notice required by section 3(b)(2). The Secretary shall award a prize under this paragraph only when a registered participant has met the objective criteria established for the prize pursuant to subsection (c) and announced pursuant to section 3(b)(2). Not more than \$10,000,000 in Federal funds may be used for the prize award under this paragraph. The administering entity shall seek to raise \$40,000,000 toward the matching award under this paragraph.

(c) CRITERIA.—In establishing the criteria required by this Act, the Secretary—

(1) shall consult with the Department's Hydrogen Technical and Fuel Cell Advisory Committee;

(2) shall consult with other Federal agencies, including the National Science Foundation; and

(3) may consult with other experts such as private organizations, including professional societies, industry associations, and the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering.

(d) JUDGES.—For each prize competition, the Secretary in consultation with the administering entity shall assemble a panel of qualified judges to select the winner or winners on the basis of the criteria established under subsection (c). Judges for each prize competition shall include individuals from outside the Department, including from the private sector. A judge, spouse, minor children, and members of the judge's household may not—

(1) have personal or financial interests in, or be an employee, officer, director, or agent of, any entity that is a registered participant in the prize competition for which he or she will serve as a judge; or

(2) have a familial or financial relationship with an individual who is a registered participant in the prize competition for which he or she will serve as a judge.

SEC. 5. ELIGIBILITY.

To be eligible to win a prize under this Act, an individual or entity—

(1) shall have complied with all the requirements in accordance with the Federal Register notice required under section 3(b)(2);

(2) in the case of a private entity, shall be incorporated in and maintain a primary place of business in the United States, and in the case of an individual, whether participating singly or in a group, shall be a citizen of, or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in, the United States; and

(3) shall not be a Federal entity, a Federal employee acting within the scope of his employment, or an employee of a national laboratory acting within the scope of his employment.

SEC. 6. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.

The Federal Government shall not, by virtue of offering or awarding a prize under this Act,

be entitled to any intellectual property rights derived as a consequence of, or direct relation to, the participation by a registered participant in a competition authorized by this Act. This section shall not be construed to prevent the Federal Government from negotiating a license for the use of intellectual property developed for a prize competition under this Act.

SEC. 7. LIABILITY.

(a) WAIVER OF LIABILITY.—The Secretary may require registered participants to waive claims against the Federal Government and the administering entity (except claims for willful misconduct) for any injury, death, damage, or loss of property, revenue, or profits arising from the registered participants' participation in a competition under this Act. The Secretary shall give notice of any waiver required under this subsection in the notice required by section 3(b)(2). The Secretary may not require a registered participant to waive claims against the administering entity arising out of the unauthorized use or disclosure by the administering entity of the registered participant's trade secrets or confidential business information.

(b) LIABILITY INSURANCE.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—Registered participants shall be required to obtain liability insurance or demonstrate financial responsibility, in amounts determined by the Secretary, for claims by—

(A) a third party for death, bodily injury, or property damage or loss resulting from an activity carried out in connection with participation in a competition under this Act; and

(B) the Federal Government for damage or loss to Government property resulting from such an activity.

(2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INSURED.—The Federal Government shall be named as an additional insured under a registered participant's insurance policy required under paragraph (1)(A), and registered participants shall be required to agree to indemnify the Federal Government against third party claims for damages arising from or related to competition activities.

SEC. 8. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 60 days after the awarding of the first prize under this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress a report that—

(1) identifies each award recipient;

(2) describes the technologies developed by each award recipient; and

(3) specifies actions being taken toward commercial application of all technologies with respect to which a prize has been awarded under this Act.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AWARDS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the period encompassing fiscal years 2008 through 2017 for carrying out this Act—

(A) \$20,000,000 for awards described in section 4(a)(1);

(B) \$20,000,000 for awards described in section 4(a)(2); and

(C) \$10,000,000 for the award described in section 4(a)(3).

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In addition to the amounts authorized in paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009 \$2,000,000 for the administrative costs of carrying out this Act.

(b) CARRYOVER OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated for prize awards under this Act shall remain available until expended, and may be transferred, reprogrammed, or expended for other purposes only after the expiration of 10 fiscal years after the fiscal year for which the funds were originally appropriated. No provision in this Act permits obligation or payment of funds in violation of section 1341 of title 31 of the United States Code (commonly referred to as the Anti-Deficiency Act).

SEC. 10. NONSUBSTITUTION.

The programs created under this Act shall not be considered a substitute for Federal research and development programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 632, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 632, the H-Prize Act of 2007, an innovative bill I introduced, along with Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and that we passed in this House last year by a vote of 416-6.

America faces a great challenge today, finding a new clean energy source that will free us from our dependence on foreign oil and will combat global climate change. Hydrogen has great potential to be this new source and the H-Prize Act will help focus America's technological and entrepreneurial talent on making it happen.

Hydrogen-fuel cars already exist. Last year I had the opportunity to drive a hydrogen-fuel car. It didn't drive much differently than a gas-powered car, except for the silence, silence that I am used to somewhat from driving a hybrid. But that was the only real performance difference. There is no performance difference. The only difference I know of is the silence.

But there are really currently significant technical and economic barriers that must still be overcome before we can put a hydrogen car in every American garage. Current hydrogen-powered vehicles cost about \$1 million. But while several significant technological advances are necessary, they are within reach.

Just yesterday, it was reported in the Chicago Tribune that engineers at Purdue University are researching methods of producing hydrogen gas by combining aluminum with another metal, gallium, and adding water. This research could yield ways of overcoming hydrogen storage problems, allowing automobile engines to burn this gas with little modification.

While we must continue to invest in traditional grants to fund university research, we in Congress have the responsibility to find creative and new ways to inspire researchers, business leaders and our youth to solve the problems that society faces today.

The H-Prize will help expand the possibility of hydrogen research, pro-

moting people not normally involved in Federal research to explore one of the greatest challenges facing us today.

Specifically, this legislation would establish competitively awarded cash prizes to spur innovations that advance the use of hydrogen as a fuel for transportation. Every 2 years, four \$1 million prizes would be given for advances in the production, storage, distribution and utilization of hydrogen, and one \$4 million prize would be awarded for advances in prototype hydrogen vehicles. At the end of 10 years, one grand prize of \$10 million would be given for a transformational advance in hydrogen energy technology.

In addition to this \$10 million grand prize, we are also seeking to raise up to \$40 million to add to that grand prize, \$40 million in private contributions.

When these advances are made, hydrogen can fill critical energy needs even beyond transportation. Hydrogen will also be used to provide heat and generate electricity. The future possibilities of this energy source are enormous.

Most importantly, hydrogen will be a clean, domestic energy source. When used for energy, hydrogen produces no emissions besides water, zero emissions, an amazing advance over current energy resources. By utilizing hydrogen, we can improve our national security by lessening our dependence on foreign oil that often comes from unstable countries.

Mr. Speaker, America has always been at the forefront of technological breakthroughs. We have responded to great challenges, perhaps most famously, President John F. Kennedy's challenge to land a man on the moon before the end of the 1960s. We have seen that prizes have been an effective way to inspire technological advances.

Perhaps most famously the prize won by Lindbergh for his successful nonstop flight across the Atlantic. More recently, the Ansari X-Prize given to the first private team to build and fly a spaceship 100 kilometers above earth. The H-Prize is patterned after this X-Prize.

We have seen that challenges and prizes help to spark the imagination of scientists, engineers and entrepreneurs, who invest blood, sweat, tears and often large sums of money, sums of money even larger than the prizes being given, to achieve a great goal.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill today. Perhaps one day we will look back on the H-Prize as a catalyst to a better, cleaner, more secure America and world.

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

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to one of the co-chairs of the House Hydrogen Caucus, CHARLIE DENT from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I too want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from South Caro-

lina (Mr. INGLIS) for working together so well to bring this important piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join 415 of my colleagues in supporting this bill last Congress, and I am pleased that the H-Prize Act has been brought up again so that we can have an opportunity to enact this important legislation into law.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 632, the H-Prize Act. The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress has the power to promote the progress of science and the useful arts. We, in Congress, have an opportunity and obligation to promote scientific advancement today. For more than a century, America's industry, transportation, and households have been heavily reliant on foreign oil. We must now face newer realities.

Petroleum is a finite resource. No matter how much we explore and discover, we will one day run out and booming worldwide demand is burning up resources and driving up prices. We must search for alternatives to wean us off our addiction to foreign sources of oil. The drive to produce energy economically can be advanced to American innovation and competition.

Fossil fuel technology was the impetus for 20th century industrial development. Today, hydrogen holds a promise of being the driver for the economy of the future and ushering in a new generation of an American energy independence.

Hydrogen makes up 98 percent of the known universe, and it is the third most abundant element of the earth's surface. It is the lightest of all gases, the coldest of all liquids, next to helium. As a component of water, minerals and acids, it makes up a fundamental part of all hydrocarbons and organic substances. Hydrogen is renewable, abundant, efficient and clean. Unlike carbon-based fuels, it does not create fumes or other harmful emissions.

In fact, using hydrogen in fuel cells produces only electricity and pure water. By awarding prizes in three of the most critical areas of technological development, the H-Prize Act will incentivize the realization of scientific advancements that will break down the obstacles that stand in the way of the hydrogen economy.

Specifically, H-Prize will promote technological advancements in hydrogen production, storage, distribution and utilization. Prizes will be awarded for the development of hydrogen vehicle prototypes that meet ambitious performance goals. Finally, the bill will award the implementation of critical transformational technologies.

We are not that far away from making hydrogen a functional source of energy. H.R. 632 will speed the development of breakthrough technologies that will make hydrogen a practical alternative to oil in our transportation sector and set our Nation on a path toward energy independence. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 632.

Again, I do want to commend the two gentlemen, Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, for their strong advocacy on this critical issue.

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

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentelady from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of the H-Prize bill that we have before us, H.R. 632.

This legislation encourages the best of what this House can offer, and that is ingenuity and the genius of the American inventor. We have always known that when the American people in our free markets put our minds to a problem, there is no stopping them. When we faced the challenges of World War II, for the run-away inflation of the 1970s, American genius and the free market prevailed and delivered our solutions.

Today's challenge is for us to reduce our dependence on foreign oil sources. Our goal is to create a free market diversified portfolio of energy sources, so that we are never again reliant on one single source for our energy needs. Whether with wind, solar, nuclear or biofuel, this Congress' goal should be to protect the environment with as little prejudice for or against alternative energy sources as possible.

One might ask why? As we are already seeing with ethanol, we should never forget the law of unintended consequences. By forcing ethanol into our gas tanks, Congress has unfortunately raised the price of our gas and the price of feed for our livestock.

□ 1200

Listen up, America. Our experience with ethanol should be a cautionary reminder of the burdens government regulation places on our economy and the everyday lives of American families.

What is so brilliant about the H-Prize is that, unlike most of the programs coming out of Congress, this bill doesn't mandate a specific form of technology or add additional regulatory burden. Indeed, instead, the H-Prize encourages the inventor and the market to generate the ideas and solutions.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans pretty much have been shut out of debate and denied amendments, but this bill was one of our ideas from the last Congress which I voted for then, and I certainly will vote for now. I commend you for moving a free market approach through to the floor so that the 110th Congress can also do the right thing.

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

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

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr.

LIPINSKI) for his work on a number of energy initiatives that we're collaborating on. This is one of those. I think it's a very exciting bill that won't solve all of our challenges, but it will get us down the road toward a brighter energy future.

And it's always helpful to have a picture tell a thousand words. This is a picture of a gas line in a province in China on August 17, 2005. That's a line of cars waiting to buy gas.

ExxonMobil tells us the global energy demand is expected to grow by 60 percent between now and 2030. So we've got to find something to do in order to get to a brighter energy future, one that does not involve the restricted supply that we have when it comes to petroleum. So what we've come up with is an idea of using the incentives of a prize to make it happen, to make some breakthroughs happen when it comes to hydrogen.

Well, the good news is we've done prizes before. In 1927, Charles Lindbergh won a prize for being the first to make a successful transatlantic flight. It worked with flight, and it worked again here more recently when the Ansari X-Prize was created to incentivize space flight. On October 4, 2004, Burt Rutan's Spaceship 1 became the first private spacecraft with commercial potential, succeeding in going into space twice within 2 weeks; and the result was they won the Ansari X-Prize.

So the concept here is to build on that kind of legacy and create the H-Prize. The good news for our colleagues is this shouldn't be a terribly controversial vote. The last time we did it, we got 416 votes in favor of the H-Prize. So it's a do-over with a 416-6 margin last time. So we're hoping that it's going to be successful here today on the floor.

As my colleague from Illinois just said, Mr. LIPINSKI was telling us that the concept is to incentivize breakthroughs in hydrogen technology; and, as he said, technical breakthroughs would be rewarded with a \$1 million prize and then prototypes every other year, \$4 million. And then the transformational technology prize, the big one, would be a \$10 million prize, hopefully augmented by up to \$40 million of private money that's authorized under the bill.

So the concept is to, basically, create the most nongovernmental way to achieve a governmental purpose, which is to break this dependence on oil. So we've created the H-Prize. It's a way of incentivizing entrepreneurs and inventors to come together and to create teams that can make this breakthrough.

The beauty of a prize, two beauties of the prizes to point out here to our colleagues, one is, if nobody does it, you don't pay the prize money out, so they've got to win it in order for us to incur the obligation to pay the money out. That's a good thing about prizes.

The second thing that's very important about prizes is the breakthroughs

may come from way outside the normal realm that you would expect; and it could be that it's not the normal people or the normal suspects that might come forward with a breakthrough. It may be somebody way afield.

For example, hydrogen breakthroughs may come from biological agents that create hydrogen as part of their metabolism. That's way outside the field of where a lot of people are expecting hydrogen production to come from. But if you have a prize that isn't restricted as to how you create the hydrogen, then you get a lot more entrants, and you get interest from a broad range of fields that may come in with the out-of-the-box thinking that can transform our energy supply.

So I'm very pleased that we've got it on the floor today. I thank the gentleman from Illinois once again for his collaboration on these topics. I'm hopeful that today we'll pass it with a large margin and that we'll be successful with the other body and then a signature by the President, and this will be one of the ways that we can break this addiction to oil and move to a more stable energy future for America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is another great example of what we have been able to do on the Science and Technology Committee by working together in a bipartisan manner. Led by Chairman GORDON, working with Ranking Member HALL, I hope that we can continue this cooperation on other critical issues related to America's future technological competitiveness, energy dependence and global climate change. This is the type of bipartisan work we need to continue to be doing to make progress.

I'd also like to thank Mr. INGLIS for all the work he has done on this. We worked on this bill last year. We worked together on that, and Mr. INGLIS is the one who came forward at that time with the original idea on this. He's worked very well. We have continued to work to make progress, and I'm very hopeful that this year we have worked with the Senate and the administration. We can get this past not just the House but signed into law. Because I think this H-Prize act has really great potential. It has the great potential to solve the great energy challenge we face today. But perhaps it may be most important in spurring the imagination of our youth, our most valuable resource in this country.

I remember in the 1970s there was great excitement about alternative energy. There was an environmental movement, and there was the gasoline crisis, and there was great interest in helping clean up the environment, investing in alternative energy.

It's something that really got me excited. I was caught up in it when I was in grade school back in the 1970s. I remember I did my eighth grade science

fair project on solar energy. That was back in 1980. We saw, unfortunately, though, that the interest in alternative energy really dropped off after that time. Not only interest, but then Federal funding dropped off.

□ 1210

Just in talking to the Science Coalition this morning, they talked about how critical that was when that research funding dropped off. We can't afford to let that happen again. But what did happen with me is it really inspired me, got me interested. I went out and got a degree in mechanical engineering, and although I did not continue down that road, today I bring that background to this House and continue to work on these issues, understanding the importance of this issue and understanding the importance of the Federal Government's really investing in our future and especially in alternative energy. And these challenges are great. We must really confront them.

So today maybe this H-Prize Act will inspire another child out there today. He or she may become an engineer or a scientist or an entrepreneur who plays a hand in the next technological breakthrough. So there is great hope with this H-Prize Act. And today, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me by passing this bill, and hopefully in the future we can look back to today and see it as a major change and a major move forward for America and for the world.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 632, the H-Prize Act of 2007.

The federal government should become more involved in supporting cutting-edge technologies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and move our nation toward renewable energy.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Technology, I committed toward supporting a variety of renewable energy technologies—including hydrogen.

H.R. 632 would create competitive cash prizes to reward innovative research, development commercial application of hydrogen energy technologies.

Hydrogen cars and other vehicles would make such a difference in air quality, Mr. Speaker, especially in Texas. Cities in Texas have some of the poorest air quality in the Nation.

Hydrogen-powered vehicles could be designed for mass-scale use. These vehicles would emit only water vapor as a byproduct and reduce our dependence on foreign oil in the long term.

Hydrogen, solar, wind, geothermal, and nuclear are all cleaner energy sources than fossil fuels. H.R. 632 is a positive step toward developing energy technologies that create a brighter future for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the H-Prize Act of 2007, H.R. 632, an important step forward in making America more competitive and energy independent. As a founding member of the House Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Caucus and a cosponsor of this bill, I believe we must move forward in fostering innovation and competition

in hydrogen technology, in order to end our addiction to oil.

According to the Department of Energy, major advances must be made in hydrogen production, distribution, and storage before it can be widely used as a fuel source. The H-Prize Act would excite and attract innovators throughout the country to take up this important task. Specifically, the bill would authorize \$50 million from fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2017 to be awarded in cash prizes to non-federal entities in three categories—technologies created to assist in the distribution or production of hydrogen; development of hydrogen powered vehicles; and “transformational technology” related to production, storage, distribution, or use of hydrogen fuel. And importantly, the cash prizes would only go to individuals who produce breakthrough results in these categories, spurring competition and innovation into much needed technology.

Solution to our energy crisis can be found in our backyard. Hydrogen can be produced here on American soil. Companies such as UTC Power and Fuel Cell Energy in my district in Connecticut produce hydrogen fuel cells which are a clean, reliable form of energy. Technology such as this can relieve us from our dependence on foreign nations for our energy and create a much healthier alternative for our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me today in advancing science and supporting H.R. 632. It's time for us to take leadership and commit to the safety and health of our nation by inspiring our nation's brightest to make hydrogen technology a reality.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 632, 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. LIPINSKI. 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.

SECURELY PROTECT YOURSELF AGAINST CYBER TRESPASS ACT

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 964) to protect users of the Internet from unknowing transmission of their personally identifiable information through spyware programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 964

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 “Securely Protect Yourself Against Cyber Trespass Act” or the “Spy Act”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION OF UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES RELATING TO SPYWARE.

(a) PROHIBITION.—It is unlawful for any person, who is not the owner or authorized user of a protected computer, to engage in unfair or deceptive acts or practices that involve any of the following conduct with respect to the protected computer:

(1) Taking control of the computer by—

(A) utilizing such computer to send unsolicited information or material from the computer to others;

(B) diverting the Internet browser of the computer, or similar program of the computer used to access and navigate the Internet—

(i) without authorization of the owner or authorized user of the computer; and

(ii) away from the site the user intended to view, to one or more other Web pages, such that the user is prevented from viewing the content at the intended Web page, unless such diverting is otherwise authorized;

(C) accessing, hijacking, or otherwise using the modem, or Internet connection or service, for the computer and thereby causing damage to the computer or causing the owner or authorized user or a third party defrauded by such conduct to incur charges or other costs for a service that is not authorized by such owner or authorized user;

(D) using the computer as part of an activity performed by a group of computers that causes damage to another computer; or

(E) delivering advertisements or a series of advertisements that a user of the computer cannot close or terminate without undue effort or knowledge by the user or without turning off the computer or closing all sessions of the Internet browser for the computer.

(2) Modifying settings related to use of the computer or to the computer's access to or use of the Internet by altering—

(A) the Web page that appears when the owner or authorized user launches an Internet browser or similar program used to access and navigate the Internet;

(B) the default provider used to access or search the Internet, or other existing Internet connections settings;

(C) a list of bookmarks used by the computer to access Web pages; or

(D) security or other settings of the computer that protect information about the owner or authorized user for the purposes of causing damage or harm to the computer or owner or user.

(3) Collecting personally identifiable information through the use of a keystroke logging function.

(4) Inducing the owner or authorized user of the computer to disclose personally identifiable information by means of a Web page that—

(A) is substantially similar to a Web page established or provided by another person; and

(B) misleads the owner or authorized user that such Web page is provided by such other person.

(5) Inducing the owner or authorized user to install a component of computer software onto the computer, or preventing reasonable efforts to block the installation or execution of, or to disable, a component of computer software by—

(A) presenting the owner or authorized user with an option to decline installation of such a component such that, when the option is selected by the owner or authorized user or when the owner or authorized user reasonably attempts to decline the installation, the installation nevertheless proceeds; or

(B) causing such a component that the owner or authorized user has properly removed or disabled to automatically reinstall or reactivate on the computer.

(6) Misrepresenting that installing a separate component of computer software or providing log-in and password information is necessary for security or privacy reasons, or that installing a separate component of computer software is necessary to open, view, or play a particular type of content.

(7) Inducing the owner or authorized user to install or execute computer software by misrepresenting the identity or authority of the person or entity providing the computer software to the owner or user.

(8) Inducing the owner or authorized user to provide personally identifiable, password, or account information to another person—

(A) by misrepresenting the identity of the person seeking the information; or

(B) without the authority of the intended recipient of the information.

(9) Removing, disabling, or rendering inoperative a security, anti-spyware, or anti-virus technology installed on the computer.

(10) Installing or executing on the computer one or more additional components of computer software with the intent of causing a person to use such components in a way that violates any other provision of this section.

(b) GUIDANCE.—The Commission shall issue guidance regarding compliance with and violations of this section. This subsection shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 6-month period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION OF COLLECTION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION WITHOUT NOTICE AND CONSENT.

(a) OPT-IN REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (e), it is unlawful for any person—

(1) to transmit to a protected computer, which is not owned by such person and for which such person is not an authorized user, any information collection program, unless—

(A) such information collection program provides notice in accordance with subsection (c) before downloading or installing any of the information collection program; and

(B) such information collection program includes the functions required under subsection (d); or

(2) to execute any information collection program installed on such a protected computer unless—

(A) before execution of any of the information collection functions of the program, the owner or an authorized user of the protected computer has consented to such execution pursuant to notice in accordance with subsection (c); and

(B) such information collection program includes the functions required under subsection (d).

(b) INFORMATION COLLECTION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term “information collection program” means computer software that performs either of the following functions:

(A) COLLECTION OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The computer software—

(i) collects personally identifiable information; and

(ii)(I) sends such information to a person other than the owner or authorized user of the computer, or

(II) uses such information to deliver advertising to, or display advertising on, the computer.

(B) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION REGARDING INTERNET ACTIVITY TO DELIVER ADVERTISING.—The computer software—

(i) collects information regarding the user’s Internet activity using the computer; and

(ii) uses such information to deliver advertising to, or display advertising on, the computer.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR SOFTWARE COLLECTING INFORMATION REGARDING INTERNET ACTIVITY WITHIN A PARTICULAR WEB SITE.—Computer software that otherwise would be considered an information collection program by reason of paragraph (1)(B) shall not be considered such a program if—

(A) the only information collected by the software regarding the user’s internet activity, and used to deliver advertising to, or display advertising on, the protected computer, is—

(i) information regarding Web pages within a particular Web site; or

(ii) in the case of any Internet-based search function, user-supplied search terms necessary to complete the search and return results to the user;

(B) such information collected is not sent to a person other than—

(i) the provider of the Web site accessed or Internet-based search function; or

(ii) a party authorized to facilitate the display or functionality of Web pages within the Web site accessed; and

(C) the only advertising delivered to or displayed on the computer using such information is advertising on Web pages within that particular Web site.

(c) NOTICE AND CONSENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notice in accordance with this subsection with respect to an information collection program is clear and conspicuous notice in plain language, set forth as the Commission shall provide, that meets all of the following requirements:

(A) The notice clearly distinguishes a statement required under subparagraph (B) from any other information visually presented contemporaneously on the computer.

(B) The notice contains one of the following statements, as applicable, or a substantially similar statement:

(i) With respect to an information collection program described in subsection (b)(1)(A): “This program will collect and transmit information about you. Do you accept?”

(ii) With respect to an information collection program described in subsection (b)(1)(B): “This program will collect information about Web pages you access and will use that information to display advertising on your computer. Do you accept?”

(iii) With respect to an information collection program that performs the actions described in both subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(1): “This program will collect and transmit information about you and will collect information about Web pages you access and use that information to display advertising on your computer. Do you accept?”

(C) The notice provides for the user—

(i) to grant or deny consent referred to in subsection (a) by selecting an option to grant or deny such consent; and

(ii) to abandon or cancel the transmission or execution referred to in subsection (a) without granting or denying such consent.

(D) The notice provides an option for the user to select to display on the computer, before granting or denying consent using the option required under subparagraph (C), a clear description of—

(i) the types of information to be collected and sent (if any) by the information collection program;

(ii) the purpose for which such information is to be collected and sent; and

(iii) in the case of an information collection program that first executes any of the information collection functions of the program together with the first execution of other computer software, the identity of any such software that is an information collection program.

(E) The notice provides for concurrent display of the information required under subparagraphs (B) and (C) and the option required under subparagraph (D) until the user—

(i) grants or denies consent using the option required under subparagraph (C)(i);

(ii) abandons or cancels the transmission or execution pursuant to subparagraph (C)(ii); or

(iii) selects the option required under subparagraph (D).

(2) SINGLE NOTICE.—The Commission shall provide that, in the case in which multiple information collection programs are provided to the protected computer together, or as part of a suite of functionally related software, the notice requirements of paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of subsection (a) may be met by providing, before execution of any of the information collection functions of the programs, clear and conspicuous notice in plain language in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection by means of a single notice that applies to all such information collection programs, except that such notice shall provide the option under subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to each such information collection program.

(3) CHANGE IN INFORMATION COLLECTION.—If an owner or authorized user has granted consent to execution of an information collection program pursuant to a notice in accordance with this subsection:

(A) IN GENERAL.—No subsequent such notice is required, except as provided in subparagraph (B).

(B) SUBSEQUENT NOTICE.—The person who transmitted the program shall provide another notice in accordance with this subsection and obtain consent before such program may be used to collect or send information of a type or for a purpose that is materially different from, and outside the scope of, the type or purpose set forth in the initial or any previous notice.

(4) REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall issue regulations to carry out this subsection.

(d) REQUIRED FUNCTIONS.—The functions required under this subsection to be included in an information collection program that executes any information collection functions with respect to a protected computer are as follows:

(1) DISABLING FUNCTION.—With respect to any information collection program, a function of the program that allows a user of the program to remove the program or disable operation of the program with respect to such protected computer by a function that—

(A) is easily identifiable to a user of the computer; and

(B) can be performed without undue effort or knowledge by the user of the protected computer.

(2) IDENTITY FUNCTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect only to an information collection program that uses information collected in the manner described in subparagraph (A)(i)(II) or (B)(ii) of subsection (b)(1) and subject to subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, a function of the program

that provides that each display of an advertisement directed or displayed using such information, when the owner or authorized user is accessing a Web page or online location other than of the provider of the computer software, is accompanied by the name of the information collection program, a logogram or trademark used for the exclusive purpose of identifying the program, or a statement or other information sufficient to clearly identify the program.

(B) EXEMPTION FOR EMBEDDED ADVERTISEMENTS.—The Commission shall, by regulation, exempt from the applicability of subparagraph (A) the embedded display of any advertisement on a Web page that contemporaneously displays other information.

(3) RULEMAKING.—The Commission may issue regulations to carry out this subsection.

(e) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—A telecommunications carrier, a provider of information service or interactive computer service, a cable operator, or a provider of transmission capability shall not be liable under this section to the extent that the carrier, operator, or provider—

(1) transmits, routes, hosts, stores, or provides connections for an information collection program through a system or network controlled or operated by or for the carrier, operator, or provider; or

(2) provides an information location tool, such as a directory, index, reference, pointer, or hypertext link, through which the owner or user of a protected computer locates an information collection program.

(f) STUDY AND ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION.—

(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Commission shall conduct a study to determine the applicability of the information collection prohibitions of this section to information that is input directly by users in a field provided on a website. The study shall examine—

(A) the nature of such fields for user input;

(B) the use of a user's information once input and whether such information is sent to a person other than the provider of the Web site;

(C) whether such information is used to deliver advertisements to the user's computer; and

(D) the extent of any notice provided to the user prior to such input.

(2) REPORT.—The Commission shall transmit a report on such study to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than the expiration of the 6-month period that begins on the date on which final regulations are issued under section 9. The requirements of subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the report required under this subsection.

(3) REGULATION.—If the Commission finds that users have adequate notice regarding the uses of any information input directly by the user in a field provided on a website, such that an exemption from the requirements of this section, or a modification of the notice required by this section is appropriate for such information, and that such an exemption or modification is consistent with the public interest, the protection of consumers, and the purposes of this Act, the Commission may prescribe such an exemption or modification by regulation.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACT OR PRACTICE.—This Act shall be enforced by the Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.). A violation of any provision of this Act or of a regulation issued under this Act shall be treated as an unfair or deceptive act or practice vio-

lating a rule promulgated under section 18 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a).

(b) PENALTY FOR PATTERN OR PRACTICE VIOLATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) and the Federal Trade Commission Act, in the case of a person who engages in a pattern or practice that violates section 2 or 3, the Commission may, in its discretion, seek a civil penalty for such pattern or practice of violations in an amount, as determined by the Commission, of not more than—

(A) \$3,000,000 for each violation of section 2; and

(B) \$1,000,000 for each violation of section 3.

(2) TREATMENT OF SINGLE ACTION OR CONDUCT.—In applying paragraph (1)—

(A) any single action or conduct that violates section 2 or 3 with respect to multiple protected computers shall be treated as a single violation; and

(B) any single action or conduct that violates more than one paragraph of section 2(a) shall be considered multiple violations, based on the number of such paragraphs violated.

(c) REQUIRED SCIENTER.—Civil penalties sought under this section for any action may not be granted by the Commission or any court unless the Commission or court, respectively, establishes that the action was committed with actual knowledge or knowledge fairly implied on the basis of objective circumstances that such act is unfair or deceptive or violates this Act.

(d) FACTORS IN AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—In determining the amount of any penalty pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the court shall take into account the degree of culpability, any history of prior such conduct, ability to pay, effect on ability to continue to do business, and such other matters as justice may require.

(e) EXCLUSIVENESS OF REMEDIES.—The remedies in this section (and other remedies available to the Commission in an enforcement action against unfair and deceptive acts and practices) are the exclusive remedies for violations of this Act.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—To the extent only that this section applies to violations of section 2(a), this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 6-month period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. LIMITATIONS.

(a) LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—Sections 2 and 3 shall not apply to—

(1) any act taken by a law enforcement agent in the performance of official duties; or

(2) the transmission or execution of an information collection program in compliance with a law enforcement, investigatory, national security, or regulatory agency or department of the United States or any State in response to a request or demand made under authority granted to that agency or department, including a warrant issued under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, an equivalent State warrant, a court order, or other lawful process.

(b) EXCEPTION RELATING TO SECURITY.—Nothing in this Act shall apply to—

(1) any monitoring of, or interaction with, a protected computer—

(A) in connection with the provision of a network access service or other service or product with respect to which the user of the protected computer is an actual or prospective customer, subscriber, registered user, or account holder;

(B) by the provider of that service or product or with such provider's authorization; and

(C) that involves or enables the collection of information about the user's activities only with respect to the user's relationship with or use of such service or product,

to the extent that such monitoring or interaction is for the purpose of network security, computer security, diagnostics, technical support or repair, network management, authorized updates of software, or for the detection or prevention of fraudulent activities; or

(2) a discrete interaction with a protected computer by a provider of computer software solely to determine whether the user of the computer is authorized to use such software, that occurs upon—

(A) initialization of the software; or

(B) an affirmative request by the owner or authorized user for an update of, addition to, or technical service for, the software.

(c) GOOD SAMARITAN PROTECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No provider of computer software or of interactive computer service may be held liable under this Act on account of any action voluntarily taken, or service provided, in good faith to remove or disable a program used to violate section 2 or 3 that is installed on a computer of a customer of such provider, if such provider notifies the customer and obtains the consent of the customer before undertaking such action or providing such service.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the liability of a provider of computer software or of an interactive computer service for any anti-competitive act otherwise prohibited by law.

(d) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—A manufacturer or retailer of computer equipment shall not be liable under this Act to the extent that the manufacturer or retailer is providing third party branded computer software that is installed on the equipment the manufacturer or retailer is manufacturing or selling.

(e) SERVICES PROVIDED BY CABLE OPERATORS AND SATELLITE CARRIERS.—It shall not be a violation of section 3 for a satellite carrier (as such term is defined in section 338(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 338(k)) or cable operator (as such term is defined in section 631(a)(2) of such Act (47 U.S.C. 551(a)(2))) to—

(1) utilize a navigation device (as such term is defined in the rules of the Federal Communications Commission);

(2) interact with such a navigation device; or

(3) transmit software to or execute software installed on such a navigation device to provide service or collect or disclose subscriber information,

if the provision of such service, the utilization of or the interaction with such device, or the collection of or disclosure of such information, is subject to section 338(i) or section 631 of the Communications Act of 1934.

SEC. 6. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

(a) PREEMPTION OF STATE LAW.—

(1) PREEMPTION OF SPYWARE LAWS.—This Act supersedes any provision of a statute, regulation, or rule of a State or political subdivision of a State that expressly regulates—

(A) unfair or deceptive conduct with respect to computers similar to that described in section 2(a);

(B) the transmission or execution of a computer program similar to that described in section 3; or

(C) the use of computer software that displays advertising content based on the Web pages accessed using a computer.

(2) ADDITIONAL PREEMPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No person other than the Attorney General of a State may bring a civil action under the law of any State if

such action is premised in whole or in part upon the defendant violating any provision of this Act.

(B) PROTECTION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS.—This paragraph shall not be construed to limit the enforcement of any State consumer protection law by an Attorney General of a State.

(3) PROTECTION OF CERTAIN STATE LAWS.—This Act shall not be construed to preempt the applicability of—

(A) State trespass, contract, or tort law; or
(B) other State laws to the extent that those laws relate to acts of fraud.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The preemption provided for under this subsection shall take effect, with respect to specific provisions of this Act, on the effective date for such provisions.

(b) PRESERVATION OF FTC AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act may be construed in any way to limit or affect the Commission's authority under any other provision of law, including the authority to issue advisory opinions (under part 1 of volume 16 of the Code of Federal Regulations), policy statements, or guidance regarding this Act.

SEC. 7. FTC REPORT ON COOKIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period that begins on the date on which final regulations are issued under section 9, the Commission shall submit a report to the Congress regarding the use of cookies in the delivery or display of advertising to the owners and users of computers. The report shall examine the extent to which cookies are or may be used to transmit to a third party personally identifiable information of a computer owner or user, information regarding Web pages accessed by the owner or user, or information regarding advertisements previously delivered to a computer, for the purpose of—

(1) delivering or displaying advertising to the owner or user; or
(2) assisting the intended recipient to deliver or display advertising to the owner, user, or others.

The report shall examine and describe the methods by which cookies and the Web sites that place them on computers function separately and together, and shall compare the use of cookies with the use of information collection programs (as such term is defined in section 3) to determine the extent to which such uses are similar or different. The report may include such recommendations as the Commission considers necessary and appropriate, including treatment of cookies under this Act or other laws.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PAPERWORK REDUCTION REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the report required under this section.

SEC. 8. FTC REPORT ON INFORMATION COLLECTION PROGRAMS INSTALLED BEFORE EFFECTIVE DATE.

Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period that begins on the date on which final regulations are issued under section 9, the Commission shall submit a report to the Congress on the extent to which there are installed on protected computers information collection programs that, but for installation prior to the effective date under section 11(a), would be subject to the requirements of section 3. The report shall include recommendations regarding the means of affording computer users affected by such information collection programs the protections of section 3, including recommendations regarding requiring a one-time notice and consent by the owner or authorized user

of a computer to the continued collection of information by such a program so installed on the computer. The requirements of subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the report required under this section.

SEC. 9. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall issue the regulations required by this Act not later than the expiration of the 9-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act. In exercising its authority to issue any regulation under this Act, the Commission shall determine that the regulation is consistent with the public interest and the purposes of this Act. Any regulations issued pursuant to this Act shall be issued in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) CABLE OPERATOR.—The term “cable operator” has the meaning given such term in section 602 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 522).

(2) COLLECT.—The term “collect”, when used with respect to information and for purposes only of section 3(b)(1)(A), does not include obtaining of the information by a party who is intended by the owner or authorized user of a protected computer to receive the information or by a third party authorized by such intended recipient to receive the information, pursuant to the owner or authorized user—

(A) transferring the information to such intended recipient using the protected computer; or

(B) storing the information on the protected computer in a manner so that it is accessible by such intended recipient.

(3) COMPUTER; PROTECTED COMPUTER.—The terms “computer” and “protected computer” have the meanings given such terms in section 1030(e) of title 18, United States Code.

(4) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “computer software” means a set of statements or instructions that can be installed and executed on a computer for the purpose of bringing about a certain result.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term does not include—

(i) computer software that is placed on the computer system of a user by an Internet service provider, interactive computer service, or Internet Web site solely to enable the user subsequently to use such provider or service or to access such Web site;

(ii) a cookie; or

(iii) any other type of text or data file that solely may be read or transferred by a computer.

(5) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(6) DAMAGE.—The term “damage” has the meaning given such term in section 1030(e) of title 18, United States Code.

(7) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—The term “unfair or deceptive acts or practices” has the meaning applicable to such term for purposes of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45).

(8) DISABLE.—The term “disable” means, with respect to an information collection program, to permanently prevent such program from executing any of the functions described in section 3(b)(1) that such program is otherwise capable of executing (including by removing, deleting, or disabling the program), unless the owner or operator of a protected computer takes a subsequent affirma-

tive action to enable the execution of such functions.

(9) INFORMATION COLLECTION FUNCTIONS.—The term “information collection functions” means, with respect to an information collection program, the functions of the program described in subsection (b)(1) of section 3.

(10) INFORMATION SERVICE.—The term “information service” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(11) INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE.—The term “interactive computer service” has the meaning given such term in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)).

(12) INTERNET.—The term “Internet” means collectively the myriad of computer and telecommunications facilities, including equipment and operating software, which comprise the interconnected world-wide network of networks that employ the Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol, or any predecessor or successor protocols to such protocol, to communicate information of all kinds by wire or radio.

(13) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “personally identifiable information” means the following information, to the extent only that such information allows a living individual to be identified from that information:

(i) First and last name of an individual.
(ii) A home or other physical address of an individual, including street name, name of a city or town, and zip code.

(iii) An electronic mail address.

(iv) A telephone number.

(v) A social security number, tax identification number, passport number, driver's license number, or any other government-issued identification number.

(vi) A credit card number.

(vii) Any access code, password, or account number, other than an access code or password transmitted by an owner or authorized user of a protected computer to the intended recipient to register for, or log onto, a Web page or other Internet service or a network connection or service of a subscriber that is protected by an access code or password.

(viii) Date of birth, birth certificate number, or place of birth of an individual, except in the case of a date of birth transmitted or collected for the purpose of compliance with the law.

(B) RULEMAKING.—The Commission may, by regulation, add to the types of information described in subparagraph (A) that shall be considered personally identifiable information for purposes of this Act, except that such additional types of information shall be considered personally identifiable information only to the extent that such information allows living individuals, particular computers, particular users of computers, or particular email addresses or other locations of computers to be identified from that information.

(14) SUITE OF FUNCTIONALLY RELATED SOFTWARE.—The term suite of “functionally related software” means a group of computer software programs distributed to an end user by a single provider, which programs enable features or functionalities of an integrated service offered by the provider.

(15) TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER.—The term “telecommunications carrier” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(16) TRANSMIT.—The term “transmit” means, with respect to an information collection program, transmission by any means.

(17) WEB PAGE.—The term “Web page” means a location, with respect to the World

Wide Web, that has a single Uniform Resource Locator or another single location with respect to the Internet, as the Federal Trade Commission may prescribe.

(18) WEB SITE.—The term “web site” means a collection of Web pages that are presented and made available by means of the World Wide Web as a single Web site (or a single Web page so presented and made available), which Web pages have any of the following characteristics:

(A) A common domain name.

(B) Common ownership, management, or registration.

SEC. 11. APPLICABILITY AND SUNSET.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as specifically provided otherwise in this Act, this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the 12-month period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 3 shall not apply to an information collection program installed on a protected computer before the effective date under subsection (a) of this section.

(c) SUNSET.—This Act shall not apply after December 31, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today the House takes up H.R. 964, the Securely Protect Yourself Against Cyber Trespass Act, or SPY Act.

This bill is not unfamiliar to the House of Representatives. Twice this body has passed the SPY Act with overwhelming margins, and it is my hope that today will be the third time. H.R. 964 aggressively tackles the problem of “spyware,” the insidious software that consumers unwittingly download onto their computers, only to have their personal private information extracted for commercial or fraudulent purposes.

In the past two Congresses, Mrs. BONO and Mr. TOWNS introduced the bipartisan SPY Act, and both times the bill enjoyed overwhelming support. This year, Mr. TOWNS and Mrs. BONO have once again teamed up to introduce the SPY Act as H.R. 964. And on March 15, the Consumer Protection Subcommittee held another legislative hearing on the bill. On May 10, 2007, the Energy and Commerce Committee unanimously reported H.R. 964, the SPY Act, as amended.

H.R. 964 provides a broad regulatory framework that empowers consumers with knowledge and the ability to control what software is installed, and is

not installed, on their personal computers. This bill prohibits unfair or deceptive acts and practices related to spyware and creates an “opt in” regime whereby entity cannot execute any program that collects a person’s personal information without, first, giving explicit notice to the consumer and second, receiving his or her consent. H.R. 964 provides that the FTC will enforce the SPY Act and will have the authority to impose significant civil penalties. During both the full committee and the subcommittee markups of H.R. 964, I introduced manager’s amendments tweaking provisions of the bill, and they were the work product of deliberative bipartisan cooperation. This bill has been thoroughly honed to be effective without being overbearing.

Mr. Speaker, the SPY Act is a quality piece of legislation that all Members of the House should enthusiastically support. The full Committee on Energy and Commerce and the subcommittee that I am privileged to chair, the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, have a long history of bipartisan cooperation, and this bill is an extension of that longstanding tradition.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the bill.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased again, I have been here a number of times, to consider H.R. 964, the SPY Act, a bill which is important to fight Internet privacy. In the past and as we speak on the floor today, this has bipartisan support with bipartisan leadership. It has been offered by my colleague from California, MARY BONO, and my colleague from New York, ED TOWNS. Both of them have worked dutifully to try to pass this bill. And, unfortunately, the last time we passed it overwhelmingly in the House, it did not get through the Senate; so we are back at it again.

I also want to thank the new chairman of the committee that I chaired last year, Mr. RUSH, for his commitment to maintaining a bipartisan process in this, and that is why we are here on the floor today. If it hadn’t been for the leadership of these individuals combined with what I think is a Federal Trade Commission commitment and the stakeholders in the community in this process, we would not have had a workable legislative solution.

So I think today that we have to realize that even at the last 11th hour we might have some people who don’t totally agree, but I think the bill is a strong bill. It takes a firm and, I think, a fair on balance approach in balancing the need to address bad actors and the need to protect the functions of legitimate business tools.

Both at the committee level and on the floor, we have voted on this spyware before, as I mentioned, three times. Three times we have gone

through the process of holding hearings, receiving testimony from many witnesses, listening to the horrors of spyware and how it can be a tool of identity thieves, and we know how identity theft is prevalent today, conducting negotiations, and we have asked for ways to improve the bill. So we have seen support across the board in industry for this bill. We asked what is the best way to improve this bill. So I think we have worked hard on this legislation.

And, my colleagues, I think it is time we move this to the Senate, and if there are any further problems with this bill, we certainly can handle these problems in the conference between the House and the Senate.

Now, you should realize that there are some in the business community who have raised a 11th hour concern about a specific provision that was added at the full committee markup. Not in our subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, but in our full committee. I have been through seven hearings on the question of privacy on the question of opt in and opt out. I am well aware of the feelings of Members dealing with opt in and opt out, depending upon how you view this process. So I share some of the concerns of the business community in their 11th hour attempt to bring this to our attention. But the responsibility of continuing to move this process forward, I think, is important. That is why I have decided to vote “yes” today to support this bill. And, hopefully, when the Senate has it, they can make the changes. If not, we can do it in conference. But to take a bill that has been in this long process and has had so many hearings for so many years and decide that it should not go forward is not the right process.

□ 1220

And we all in Congress here know that sometimes the enemy of the good is the perfect.

So we can solve this issue, I think, to satisfy all interested parties. It is a strong piece of legislation; and I cannot think of a reason why our Senate colleagues should not act on it, also.

So, in closing, the SPY Act is a solid consumer protection bill that returns control of personal computers and private information to where it belongs, and that is to the consumer.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 964.

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York, my colleague, my friend (Mr. TOWNS).

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 964, the SPY Act, which would greatly improve the privacy of consumers’ online computer use. The time has come for this bill to pass.

A lot of hard work has been put into this legislation. First and foremost, I

would like to commend Congresswoman MARY BONO, the Republican sponsor of the bill. Of course, without her hard work, insight and persistence on this issue, we would not be where we are today. I have been proud to work with her on this bill, and I salute her for all of her efforts.

Of course, we have been down this road a few times now with several hearings; and, of course, we passed it before. But this time I think that people realize how important this legislation is, and I do feel that it should go all the way.

I also want to commend Chairman DINGELL and Ranking Member BARTON for their strong commitment to this issue and leadership in getting our bill to the floor. I would like to thank my very good friend, the subcommittee chairman, Chairman RUSH of Chicago, Illinois, Ranking Member STEARNS, who has been a friend for many, many years as well, for their hard work on this legislation. They have stayed with it and gone through the process over and over again because they recognize how important this legislation is to our country.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge all of the staff for their hard work, especially Consuela Washington and David Cavicke for their hard work and, of course, their suggestions and ideas and recommendations. I would like to just take this opportunity to thank them.

There is no question that spyware is a serious problem. Spyware software, which is downloaded without a computer owner's knowledge, invades one's privacy by recording and transmitting personal information, monitoring the Web site someone visits, or even stealing documents from an individual's computer. Other programs hijack a computer by changing home pages or forcing a person to click through multiple screens until a spyware program is downloaded.

In fact, problems related to spyware have become so widespread that I cannot run into someone who hasn't been negatively affected by it. This is a big change from when we first began this effort a few years ago. There were only a few people complaining, but now we have a lot of people complaining. Now we know the seriousness of the problem and that we need Federal legislation to safeguard privacy, as well as to ensure the long-term integrity of e-commerce.

Today's legislation provides consumers with new tools to protect themselves from unwanted, harmful software. Under the bill, consumers would have to receive a clear and concise warning about the spyware program. Second, consumers would have to provide their affirmative consent before the program could operate on their computer. Finally, Mr. Speaker, consumers must have the option to easily disable any harmful spyware programs to their computer. While some consumers may want to share their information to receive free games other dis-

count offers, all consumers have the right to make that choice.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and this time I really mean finally, any time we legislate on highly technical matters there is always a danger of stifling innovation and making the use of legitimate software too burdensome. It is a very difficult tightrope to walk. But I think we have done an excellent job in walking that tightrope.

This bill addresses many of the concerns raised, while at the same time retaining a meaningful notice and consent regime to protect consumer privacy.

Through much hard work, we have carefully crafted a strong bipartisan consumer protection bill, and I would urge my colleagues to support this. This is a quality piece of legislation, and I hope that we are able to move it through both Houses very quickly and that the President would sign it into law.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentlelady from California (Mrs. BONO).

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 964, the Securely Protect Yourself Against Cyber Trespass Act.

When the gentleman from New York and I first introduced the spyware bill in 2003, few people knew what spyware was or how problematic it could be to American citizens; and since that time the online threat of spyware remains. According to a recent Consumer Report survey, spyware and viruses cost American computer users nearly \$8 billion over a 2-year period.

Historically, spyware legislation in this House has received strong bipartisan support. Our initial bill in the 108th Congress passed 399-1; and in the 109th Congress, our spyware bill again received overwhelming bipartisan support, garnering over 60 cosponsors and passing the House 393-4.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, H.R. 964, the Securely Protect Yourself Against Cyber Trespass Act, or SPY Act, has again garnered wide bipartisan support with 41 cosponsors.

Because of the Internet's role in interstate commerce, the need for Federal spyware legislation is clear. We cannot expect online companies to function efficiently when they are faced with a patchwork of State anti-spyware statutes. There needs to be legal uniformity.

Additionally, I remain a strong proponent of anti-spyware legislation because I believe consumers should have the final say about what plants itself on their computer, not a third party with potentially conflicting interests. The SPY Act accomplishes this by prohibiting commonly known, unfair or deceptive acts relating to spyware.

H.R. 964 also prohibits the collection of personal information from a computer without notice and consent before the first execution of any information collection program. The bill also requires that the user is able to easily remove or disable the spyware.

I also understand there are instances where spyware can be useful. H.R. 964 exempts action taken by law enforcement and national security pursuant to warrant, court order or other lawful process, or actions taken in good faith with the user's consent. H.R. 964 also protects the developers of anti-spyware software from the threat of serious lawsuits.

Simply stated, this bill works to restore privacy on the home computer, which has become the control center for our business transactions as well as as our personal interactions.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York and I began this effort in 2003; and I thank the gentleman, ED TOWNS, for all of his efforts and for being such a terrific partner in this process. Again, since that time, this effort has received the bipartisan support of the House. It is my hope that the 110th Congress will continue to act in a bipartisan way that passes this legislation.

I ask for the support of my colleagues and hope that once again we can take back our computers so the consumer owns their computer, not a third party. Let's pass the SPY Act, H.R. 964.

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

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, as was indicated earlier, this is the third time that this bill has been before this body. It was passed overwhelmingly two times in prior Congresses. We really believe that the third time should be the charm. This bill should pass out of this House with the same kind of margins that it passed out of two previous Congresses, and I would urge my colleagues to vote for this bill once again.

This bill needs to become law. This bill protects the American consumer. This bill protects the American economy. This is a good bill. It needs to become law.

None of the practices outlawed by section 2 of the bill are "legitimate." As for section 3's consumer notice, consent, identification, and easy disabling requirements, legitimate business practices are exempted by the exceptions in section 3(b)(2) and the limitations in section 5 of the SPY Act. The committee added new rule-making authority to exempt a broad class of entities operating Internet Web sites that collect information if the FTC finds that their notice to consumers is adequate.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, we have corrected the bill, made minor tweaking improvements on the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 964, the Securely Protect Yourself Against Cyber Trespass Act—the SPY Act. It is a strong consumer protection bill, of which I am an original cosponsor, that will help us in the fight against identity theft.

With today's vote, the House will have passed the SPY Act three times. Let's hope that the third time's a charm—and that today's passage means this bill will finally get signed into law.

The SPY Act is important because it protects consumers from spyware, the unwanted and sneaky software that is so powerful that it can steal information from, monitor and control others' computers—without the computer's owner even knowing the software has been installed.

The SPY Act would put the control of computers back in the hands of consumers—where it belongs. It prohibits indefensible uses of the software, like phishing and logging every keystroke entered, and requires that consumers be notified and opt-in before software is installed on their computers. Furthermore, the SPY Act gives the Federal Trade Commission the additional power it needs to pursue deceptive uses of the software.

I believe that this bill will go a long way toward protecting consumers from having their valuable and personal information stolen by purveyors of spyware. I am glad that I was part of the bipartisan process that brought this bill to the floor today. I urge my colleagues to support its passage. Thank you.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 964, the SPY Act.

The continued growth of the Internet has brought tremendous enhancements to our quality of life—from advances in the delivery of health care, to the ability of consumers to instantaneously conduct transactions online. Increasingly, consumers want a fast connection to the Internet and want the delivery of online services to be seamless and online service providers have invested significant resources to develop software to make their services as safe, reliable and fast as possible.

However, as Congress considers legislation to combat spyware, I believe that four overarching principles should guide our efforts. First, we must punish the bad actors, while protecting legitimate online companies. Second, we must not over-regulate, but rather encourage innovative new services and the growth of the Internet. Third, we must not stifle the tree market interactions between consumers and service providers. Fourth, we must target the behavior, not the technology. It is my hope that any legislation Congress enacts to combat spyware will adhere to these core principles.

On May 23, 2005, the House of Representatives passed legislation, similar to H.R. 964, which sought to solve the spyware problem by targeting the technology, instead of the criminal behavior behind the technology. However, many developments have occurred during the intervening two years which have convinced me that this regulatory approach to combating spyware is even more unwise than previously thought.

For example, just last month, the House Energy and Commerce Committee adopted an amendment to H.R. 964 that would have had enormous consequences for the Internet and online innovation. This amendment would have, in part, regulated Internet "cookies" for the first time under the bill. Internet cookies are used by most websites to enhance consumers' experiences with the Internet and to make the Internet more seamless and navigable with fewer stoplights. To make every online company that uses cookies comply with

the notice and consent regime under the bill would have significantly interfered with consumers' Internet experiences. By forcing consumers to click through even more prescribed alert messages, this change would have, ironically, exacerbated the likelihood that consumers would become desensitized to these notices and click "accept" without reading them. In addition, this desensitization is likely to also give nefarious software installers a false legitimacy since there would be no distinction between the notices they provide and the notices legitimate online companies provide.

Apparently, the Democratic Leadership saw the error in the regulation of cookies and stripped the bill of this language just before the bill came to the Floor today. However, this mistake by the committee highlights the difficulties with trying to impose one-size-fits-all regulations to solve problems involving ever-evolving technologies.

In addition, Chairman Majoras of the Federal Trade Commission testified in October of 2005 that a notice-and-choice approach was not recommended for combating spyware for many reasons. He noted the fact that consumers will be overwhelmed by the notices they will receive when using the Internet and will most likely ignore the notices and click through them.

Furthermore, in the past few years there have been major developments in technological solutions to help consumers combat spyware. Consumer packages are becoming more and more effective in screening out unwanted spyware from their computers and are offered by many Internet service providers, as well as independent software providers.

Finally, a broad cross-section of legitimate online businesses and trade associations has expressed opposition to the regulatory approach of H.R. 964. On June 5, 2007, a coalition of over 30 trade associations and companies, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Retail Federation, the Financial Services Roundtable, and numerous technology-based entities, sent a letter to all Members of the House of Representatives detailing their concerns with H.R. 964. This letter specifically expresses opposition to regulating Internet cookies, as well as opposition to including web sites (where consumers willingly submit information online) within the scope of the legislation.

The better approach to combating spyware would be to target the criminal behavior of those who actually use spyware, and to continue our policy of letting innovative online companies interact with consumers to develop the exciting new online services that consumers have come to enjoy and expect from the Internet.

I have introduced legislation, along with my colleague ZOE LOFGREN of California, to combat spyware by going after the criminals using spyware, rather than trying to regulate all software regardless of whether it is harmful or helpful. This legislation, H.R. 1525, was passed by the House and now awaits further action in the Senate. I urge my colleagues to support this targeted approach.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today—the Towns-Bono SPY Act—is an important piece of legislation to me. We've been working on this bill for 4 years now, before many of us ever heard the term "spyware." I applaud the bipartisan spon-

sors for their unwavering commitment to pass this legislation.

The surreptitious installation of spyware on your computer without your knowledge and without your consent is a little like sneaking into your home and planting a bug: it is an invasion of your privacy and it is clearly wrong. This bill prohibits all the nefarious conduct that is used to harm consumers. The legislation provides the FTC a strong mandate to go after bad actors and their destructive behavior.

There are many important and legitimate business functions of the Internet, and I have no problem with businesses trying to compete and sell their goods and services. And I recognize advertising is a part of commerce. But I feel strongly that there is a line that should not be crossed regarding the sharing of my personal information without first obtaining my consent. Consumers have the right to know if they are being profiled, if their personal information is going to be shared, and with whom it might be shared. My computer and my personal information are my property. This legislation will ensure I have control over both.

This bill strikes a fair balance between the need to protect the functions of legitimate business tools and punishing bad actors.

In closing, I want to thank Chairman RUSH, Chairman DINGELL, and Ranking Member STEARNS for moving the bill through the Committee. I commend MARY BONO and ED TOWNS for their tireless efforts to address this insidious activity.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this important piece of legislation and hope that our Senate colleagues will do the same.

Mr. RUSH. 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 Illinois (Mr. RUSH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 964, 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. WESTMORELAND. 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.

HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2007

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2560) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit human cloning, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2560

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 "Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AGAINST HUMAN CLONING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER X—HUMAN CLONING**“PROHIBITION AGAINST HUMAN CLONING**

“SEC. 1001. (a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person—

“(1) to perform or attempt to perform human cloning; or

“(2) to ship, mail, transport, or receive the product of human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology knowing that such product is for the purpose of human cloning.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(1) The term ‘human cloning’ means the implantation of the product of human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology into a uterus or the functional equivalent of a uterus.

“(2) The term ‘human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology’ means transferring the nuclear material of a human somatic cell into an egg cell from which the nuclear material has been removed or rendered inert.

“(3) The term ‘person’ includes a governmental entity.”

(b) PROHIBITED ACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(jj) The violation of section 1001(a).”

(2) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Section 303(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 333(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) Notwithstanding subsection (a), any person who violates section 301(jj) shall be imprisoned not more than 10 years or fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, or both.”

(3) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 333) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f); and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(g)(1) Any person who violates section 301(jj) shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed the greater of—

“(A) \$10,000,000; or

“(B) an amount equal to the amount of any gross pecuniary gain derived from such violation multiplied by 2.

“(2) Paragraphs (3) through (5) of subsection (f) apply with respect to a civil penalty under this subsection to the same extent and in the same manner as such paragraphs (3) through (5) apply with respect to a civil penalty under subsection (f).”

(4) FORFEITURE.—Section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by paragraph (3), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) Any property, real or personal, derived from or used to commit a violation of section 301(jj), or any property traceable to such property, shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. DEGETTE. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2560, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2007. Tomorrow, the House will debate S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, which will expand the number of stem cell lines that are eligible for federally funded research. Similar to legislation passed in the House earlier this year with overwhelming bipartisan support, the goal of S. 5 is to accelerate scientific progress towards cures and treatments for a wide range of diseases and debilitating health conditions. When we debated the bill in January, opponents of the bill chose to muddle the debate by offering a motion to recommit involving cloning, a topic unrelated to H.R. 3.

After the debate, a number of my colleagues asked me if we could address the issue of human reproductive cloning because they, like I, were opposed to reproductive cloning. So, as we prepare to debate embryonic stem cell research tomorrow, I have introduced H.R. 2560 with my colleague from Connecticut so that we can discuss this important issue.

Since scientists in Scotland were able to create a cloned sheep named Dolly, some have speculated about the possibility of one day cloning human beings. But we can all agree that there is universal opposition to conducting human reproductive cloning and it should be illegal. Human reproductive cloning is morally and scientifically wrong. Unfortunately, at this time, though, there is nothing to prevent irresponsible individuals from conducting research in an attempt to achieve human reproductive cloning. The most effective way to prevent human reproductive cloning in the United States is to pass a Federal prohibition on this practice and impose severe penalties for doing so.

This is why my colleague, Congressman Chris Murphy, and I have introduced the Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2007. Our bill would make it illegal to use cloning technology to initiate a pregnancy and therefore create a cloned human being. The penalty for such an act would include severe criminal sanctions, in addition to as much as \$10 million in civil fines. These strict penalties are necessary to ensure that such an act is prevented from occurring.

Unbelievably, people actually are opposing this bill because they are seeking to characterize it as a much broader bill. While they make many false claims, the fact of the matter is this legislation today is solely a ban on human reproductive cloning, something that all Members of Congress as well as, I think, the vast majority of the American public support. The accusations that this bill expressly allows something new are completely false.

I also find it ironic that those who oppose our bill argue that one of its

flaws is that it would force all cloned embryos to be killed. The bill bans human reproductive cloning. Nothing more, nothing less. So the argument of those who say they are against cloning is that we should defeat our bill to prevent cloned embryos from being killed. It defies logic, just like it defies logic why anyone would vote against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope today we can take the rhetoric down and that we can focus on what this bill does, which is to prevent human reproductive cloning. We all agree this practice should be banned, so let's pass this bill and make it happen.

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

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

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2560. This bill is being marketed as a ban on human cloning. However, H.R. 2560 does nothing to prevent human cloning. In fact, the bill allows for unlimited cloning of human embryos but prevents women and doctors from trying to implant one of these embryos to initiate a pregnancy. In practice, this means that embryos will be cloned, used for experimentation, harvesting, research, then assigned a death sentence. So cloned embryos would be required by law to die. Not only does this bill allow the practice of cloning to move forward, it also mandates the killing of those human embryos.

The bill before us today is a ruse. It is not a ban on cloning. It is a permission to clone, and I hope no one here today will be confused about what we are being asked to do. The bill's supporters state that this would ban reproductive cloning, but this claim is highly misleading because the language does not restrict the actual act of human cloning by allowing for somatic cell nuclear transfer, a confusing and technical way of defining research cloning.

The bill before us is called the Human Cloning Prohibition Ban, and you might think that it does what it says instead of the opposite of what it says. If it did what it said, I would vote for it. Part of the problem we are having is the consequence of having had no committee process to determine what the bill actually does. We have had no hearings. We have had no markups. In fact, the bill was not even introduced until last night. And now the bill that nobody has seen is on the suspension calendar. Intentional or otherwise, this is another duplicity. The suspension calendar is for noncontroversial measures, like naming post offices, not for highly controversial legislation that is a wolf in Dolly the sheep's clothing.

This bill is bad policy, and so was the process by which it got here. How many times will we have this discussion? The week before Memorial Day we discussed a bill on Medicare payments that came to the House floor the same way. Yesterday, a resolution on how Congress will handle future ethics

matters was introduced on the same day that it was inserted in the suspension calendar with no committee hearings.

□ 1240

The Senate could be forgiven for concluding that the new majority promises for open government are still not being realized after 5 months.

The bill is opposed by the White House. In their statement of administration policy which came out, they said that this would "prohibit human cloning for reproductive purposes but permit the creation of cloned embryos or development of human embryo farms for research which would require destruction of nascent human life."

That is exactly what H.R. 2560 does. It crosses a new moral line by making it a criminal act to let the cloned embryos survive. To put it directly, this bill would create a class of living human beings that must be killed under the law.

Mr. Speaker, this is not progress. It is a disturbing step in the wrong direction. It should be rejected on this floor, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, just briefly, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, our committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, did have robust hearings on cloning several years ago where we brought in several scientists as well as a cult called the Raelians who are actually trying to clone human beings, and that is why we need this kind of limitation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative DEGETTE, for being such a leader on this issue in the past and allowing me to join with her today to offer this very commonsense measure regarding the banning of human reproductive cloning.

I rise in support of this act today. I do so because to me the bill before us is relatively simple. This is a straightforward ban on human reproductive cloning, taking material through somatic cell nuclear transfer and turning that material into a living, breathing human being. As Representative DEGETTE said, nothing more, nothing less.

Under this law, if someone uses cloning technology to initiate a pregnancy and creates a cloned human being, they would face severe criminal and civil sanctions.

This legislation is something that the vast majority of the American public supports, and it is something that all Members of Congress I think should support as well.

In Connecticut, as part of our State's historic Stem Cell Investment Act, which I was very honored to have au-

thored, we recognize that human being reproductive cloning is a practice that perverts the promise of science; and we banned it outright in our legislation. In fact, I think it is pretty amazing that we are standing here having this debate today, that the Federal Government has, until today, not stepped forward and said that human reproductive cloning, bringing that material to the stage of a human being created from that material, is illegal. We should do what we did in Connecticut here today.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are some members who want to turn this ban on human reproductive cloning into a ban on somatic cell nuclear transfer, called by some therapeutic cloning, and I understand the discomfort many Members have with this innovative line of stem cell research. Personally, for me, I join the scientific community in my belief that it is this research that holds the most potential for lifesaving treatments and cures.

But I recognize there are those who disagree. However, the debate surrounding this particular disagreement is not the subject of today's legislation. Today's legislation is simply about the line that we all can agree to draw, that which clearly and cleanly prohibits the manipulation of cells or embryos into a cloned human being.

The moral and ethical questions surrounding somatic cell nuclear transfer are legitimate subjects for debate. But that debate will occur later this week when we revisit the comprehensive stem cell authorization bill coming back to this House from the Senate.

Today, Mr. Speaker, our task is simple: Ban what we all agree is beyond the scientific and ethical pale, human reproductive cloning.

We are dealing with an issue as complicated as cloning technology. The morass of scientific arcana and the ease of sound bite simplification can obscure the simple facts. So let's be clear. Today, human cloning, creating a replica of a person's DNA, implanting an embryo into the womb of a woman and creating a new human being out of that material, that practice is legal today in this country with exceptions such as Connecticut and other States that have done the right thing and banned it. With the enactment of this legislation, human reproductive cloning will be illegal. Nothing more, Mr. Speaker, nothing less.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a leader on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, beware of false and misleading bill titles.

H.R. 2560, rushed to the floor today after only being introduced several hours ago, is misnamed the "Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2007."

The fact is, this bill doesn't ban any human cloning at all. Absolutely none.

Researchers are absolutely free, are given the green light, to clone human life to their heart's content, so long as they kill and destroy the cloned human embryo at some point, perhaps weeks, after its creation. As a matter of fact, the legislation makes it a serious crime to allow a cloned human being to survive pass a certain point.

In other words, this bizarre piece of legislation would make it illegal not to kill a cloned human being; and the penalties are stiff, up to 10 years in prison and a \$10 million fine.

By redefining human cloning as "implantation" rather than the creation of a new human being that would be then transferred into a uterus or a functional equivalent, this phony ban sanctions unlimited human cloning for research. Even more bizarre, under the bill, if a woman were to have a cloned human embryo implanted in her womb, she could go to jail for up to 10 years and/or be fined up to \$10 million. Is that something we want to vote for? I think not. The plain language in the Weldon-Stupak cloning ban penalizes those who facilitate the creation of the clone—not the woman.

My colleagues, I am sure all of us are aware of the fact that a cloned human embryo will be indistinguishable from an embryo created using in-vitro fertilization. Dolly the Sheep looked just like every other sheep. How will this be enforced? If a woman is found carrying a cloned baby, are you willing to fine her and send her to jail for 10 years?

Mr. Speaker, the United States should join many countries, including Canada, Germany, Italy and France, in totally banning all cloning. The Democratic leadership should bring the Weldon-Stupak bill to the floor, instead of the DeGette pro-cloning measure.

Finally, what a difference a few years makes. In 2003, Ms. DEGETTE said, "We are not and we do not support creating embryos for the purpose of research." This legislation begs the question. Apparently you do. Why aren't you bringing a total ban before this body?

I would point out when a similar bill to H.R. 2560 was brought to the floor as an amendment in the nature of a substitute by Congressman Jim Greenwood we voted it down 174-231. Charles Krauthammer wrote, and I think this is very insightful, that "Greenwood," and read that now DEGETTE, "is a nightmare and an abomination. It sanctions, licenses and protects the launching of the most ghoulish and dangerous enterprise in modern scientific history, the creation of nascent cloned human life for the sole purpose of its exploitation and destruction."

I urge my colleagues, let's pass a real ban on cloning, not this phony ban.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I just would make two points toward the gentleman from New Jersey's comments. The first one is the Weldon-Stupak bill, which he says he supports, also would make it a crime for a woman to carry a cloned embryo in her uterus as a

pregnancy. Frankly, we think that cloning should be a crime. I am surprised to hear the gentleman say that he does not think it should be.

Secondly, the so-called Greenwood-DeGette bill from several sessions of Congress ago that he is referring to is a completely different bill than this bill today. People should probably read the legislation in front of them to see that all this bill does is make reproductive cloning illegal.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), a real leader on these issues.

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

□ 1250

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2560, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act. In recent years, Congress has debated various means of banning human cloning. In an area that can be complex and confusing, I am pleased that this bill, which is exceptionally simple and straightforward, has come to the floor here today. Clearly some of my colleagues on the other side of this issue are among those who find it too complex and are confused. Hopefully we can clarify that before the vote today.

H.R. 2560 would make it illegal to use cloning technology to initiate a pregnancy and thereby create a cloned human being. The bill also includes strict penalties to insure that such an Act is prevented from taking place. Unfortunately, there seems to be some misinformation circulating among my colleagues and outside groups surrounding the implications of this bill.

I want to be very clear, this legislation in no way encourages or endorses therapeutic cloning, otherwise known as somatic cell nuclear transfer or any other type of research. On the contrary, this legislation will simply ensure that as technology advances, ethical safeguards are in place to keep human cloning, something we all agree would be a frightening development, from occurring.

For the record, there are no incentives included in this bill, not even any words of encouragement, for any specific types of research. This bill is a simple ban on human cloning once and for all.

Regardless of my colleagues' feelings on stem cell research or any other type of medical research, I cannot imagine why any of them would oppose a ban on human cloning.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will take the time to understand what this bill does and what it does not do and why it is important and vote in favor of H.R. 2560.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to a leader on this issue, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This bill before us today entitled the Human Cloning Prohibition Act, is better entitled the "Human Clone Implantation Prohibition Act." Essentially what it does is make it a crime to implant a cloned human embryo in the uterus of a woman.

While the gentlewoman from Colorado has said this is a very different bill from the Greenwood substitute, it is true if you sit down with the two of them and read them, they read differently; but the net effect, let's be serious, is the same. It is the goal pursued by many research scientists, who I assume do not ascribe to a belief in the sanctity of human life, that they want to begin experimentation on human embryos produced through the process of human cloning.

My position when we began debating this issue 5, 6 years ago, remains the same. There are a host of problems with this, not the least of which is that I and millions of Americans like me believe that human life is sacred and we should not be wholesale producing it to be experimented with in the lab and then discarded when the experimentation is done.

Are we really trying to say to the American people we want to make the human embryo the lab rat of the 21st century?

I will add, this is going to create a huge demand for human eggs. It has been very surprising to me to see so many people on the left who claim to be great champions of women's issues, it is going to create a lot of pressure for more human eggs. And the way you get human eggs, it is not a simple, overnight procedure. You have to give women a powerful medication that produces something called superovulation. It has the potential for complications, depression in some 25 percent of the women who get these drugs, possible significant complications requiring hospitalization called the superovulation syndrome.

And who will be donating their eggs to all these research labs? We all know who it will be, it will be women who really need the money. You will probably have problems and complications, suicides from depression. What will end up happening is they will end up going overseas to Third World countries where they can't bring litigation.

This is why many leaders in the feminist movement chose to support the Stupak-Weldon bill over this alternative. It is just down right bad policy.

Let me say as well, the lady said previously that the women could, under my previous bill, could be criminally prosecuted. I disagree wholeheartedly. I thought the language of the Stupak-Weldon bill was very clear, that the criminal act would be the creation of the human embryo through the process of somatic cell nuclear transfer. That is the way they created Dolly; that is the way this process begins.

Let me just say in closing, the process by which we have undergone this,

when we were in the majority, we had committee hearings. We allowed a substitute. And to rush this to the floor on the suspension calendar is an inappropriate way for us to deal with a very, very significant issue.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is a profound slippery slope. They will not be satisfied with doing research on human embryos. The next target will be the human fetus itself, creating human models of disease so research scientists can do research on certain forms of human disease by doing research on human embryos and fetuses. That is the direction we are going, patenting some of those diseased human embryos.

I say this is a place where we should be drawing the line. We should defeat this on the suspension calendar. I believe if you brought it forward under regular order, it would go down under regular order, and I encourage all of my colleague to vote "no" on this piece of legislation.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I don't normally come to the floor to talk on suspension bills because normally, suspension bills have been cleared by the majority with the minority and they are bills that we have if not unanimous agreement on, we have general agreement on. But I feel very strongly about this particular bill and the way it is being done.

The gentlelady, who is the chief sponsor of the bill, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) is a good friend of mine. When I was chairman, I helped her and Mr. CASTLE bring to the floor the stem cell bill which was very controversial and which the President ultimately vetoed. I voted for that bill, and spoke for the bill on the floor. We had an arrangement between Mr. DINGELL and myself about how we were going to bring that bill to the floor. Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. CASTLE were part of that discussion.

This bill was introduced after 7 p.m. last night. JOHN DINGELL didn't call me. DIANE DEGETTE didn't call me. We can't find anybody from the majority who called anybody on the minority. There have been no hearings on the bill. There has been no markup of the bill. We just basically take the gentlelady's word that it is what it is.

We know that cloning is controversial. We know that most of us in this body are opposed to human cloning, for whatever purpose. There is a good chance if we had a legislative hearing, we had a markup, we could probably come to a consensus on a bill that Mr. WELDON could support and Mr. SMITH could support and Ms. DEGETTE could support; but not this bill. Not this process.

A bill is introduced at 7:30 one night and is on the floor of the suspension calendar the next day, there have been no hearings, no process, and you can't amend it because it is under suspension of the rules. I think that is a subversion of the process.

It is a way to give some Members a vote for political cover because tomorrow when the main stem cell bill comes up, which was noticed last week, the last time the stem cell bill was on the floor, the minority who has the right to offer a motion to recommit, part of the motion to recommit dealt with cloning, and some of the Members in the majority voted for it.

□ 1300

So this is a way for the majority to give some Members of their party a way to vote for a cloning bill so they can vote against the motion to recommit tomorrow, if that's what it is. So I understand the political strategy, but I don't understand the process of ignoring the Energy and Commerce Committee repeatedly, and I don't understand a bill as controversial as this being brought under suspension with no hearings and a bill that wasn't even introduced until after dark last night.

That's wrong. I hope we vote "no," N-O, "no."

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Texas, the ranking member of Energy and Commerce, who just spoke from the well, he said it exactly right. This is a political ploy, bringing this bill up under suspension, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to give Members on the other side of the aisle the opportunity for cover on this bill, this Castle-DeGette legislation that's coming up tomorrow.

When King Solomon ordered that the baby be cut in half, Mr. Speaker, who knew that someone would actually take him up on the offer. And yet regrettably, this bill before us today, H.R. 2560, it aims to figuratively and literally cut the baby in half.

Supporters of this legislation claim that H.R. 2650 bans human cloning. This claim could not be further from the truth. If we really want to ban human cloning, then the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), in a bipartisan way, they have the right bill, and this was reintroduced by Representative WELDON last night. I'm a proud cosponsor of that. That bans human cloning for any purpose, reproductive or research.

I'm not impugning the motive of Representative DEGETTE, maybe it's

inadvertent, and maybe hopefully she understands through this discussion today about the bill that, inadvertently, this promotes cloning for research purposes.

We believe, those of us who are part of the pro-life caucus, strongly believe that when you clone a human Dolly, that is a human being, and then you slice it and dice it to get stem cells and then it's required that you destroy it because it becomes a crime if it's implanted in a woman to become a child. Then we say that you are indeed creating life and destroying life, not maybe for the purpose of reproduction but for the purpose of research, and that is wrong.

And that is why we need to vote down this bill today, and I strongly oppose it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and so we're prepared to close. And, with that, I reserve my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I stand before this House and say that I oppose human cloning.

As a physician, I'm extremely concerned about the consequences of human cloning and all of its ramifications, but this bill doesn't ban human cloning, not as we all know it.

The author says, read the bill. Well, I would suggest to my colleagues, that is exactly what they ought to do, read the bill.

The definition on page 2 of human cloning says, "The term 'human cloning' means the implantation of the product of human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology into a uterus or the functional equivalent of a uterus." It confines the definition to implantation. Cloning means to copy. Human cloning means to copy a human.

Dorland's medical dictionary definition of human cloning is, "The transplantation of a nucleus from a somatic cell into an ovum which then develops into an embryo." It doesn't confine it to implantation, because implantation is the next step.

Cloning doesn't have to do with implantation. This is another, Mr. Speaker, in a long list of Orwellian democracy actions by this majority, saying one thing and doing another. This bill wouldn't ban human cloning at all.

What a shame, what a sham. I urge my colleagues to read the bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say in conclusion that, as we all know, Dolly the sheep was a cloned animal. Let me remind you that Dolly the sheep was the 277th try. There were 276 before her who were defective and deformed and died. In fact, the history of cloning is replete with defects, deformity and death; and as they seek to create little human embryos for the purposes of research and experimentation and harvesting and death, we should remember this fact.

The researcher in South Korea that failed to identify what he was doing, Dr. Hwang, and his team obtained 2,000 eggs from over 100 women that they paid for their cloning attempts.

Human cloning exploits women. It ushers in an era of eugenics. It embraces a utilitarian view of humans. It involves the creation of little human embryos for research experiments. And for these reasons and all the reasons that are stated, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

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

Well, I've been in Congress now 10 years; and some days I feel like I'm in Alice in Wonderland. Today happens to be one of them. Because when you listen to the arguments from the other side you'd never dream that the bill under consideration right now is a ban on human reproductive cloning.

Maybe I will start by talking about the status of the law in the United States today. Right now, in the United States, SCNT, somatic cell nuclear transfer, is legal. It is legal today, and there is nothing about H.R. 2560, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act, that changes that or alters it in any way.

We hear the other side talking about egg farms and forcing women to donate eggs and all of that. If that was going to happen, it would be happening today because this bill does nothing to stop the status of current law on SCNT or therapeutic cloning.

What we do have happening today, however, is there are some unethical scientists who are trying to do reproductive cloning. They are trying to take the results of SCNT, implant them in women's uteruses and create cloned human beings.

I just heard my colleague from Pennsylvania talking about Dolly the sheep and all of the failed attempts with animal cloning before Dolly the sheep. He is absolutely right. It is a terrible problem, and that is why it is reprehensible and immoral to try to clone human beings. That is also why we need to make it illegal in this country.

He also talked about the example of South Korea, and he's also absolutely right about South Korea. There was an unethical researcher in South Korea who, with no ethical standards or controls, tried to make experiments and lied about the results.

By the way, that's why we need to pass S. 5 tomorrow, because currently in this country there are no ethical controls either over embryonic stem cell research or SCNT research, controls which we could really use in this country, and they certainly could have used in South Korea, but that's all sort of aside from the point.

The point is, right now, in this country it is not illegal to clone a human being for reproductive purposes, and there's a national consensus that it should be.

□ 1310

I do want to apologize to my ranking member, Mr. BARTON, about the process. Perhaps there should have been notice. But the truth is, there is a consensus on reproductive cloning.

This is a simple bill, and we have tried, over the years in Congress, to ban reproductive cloning. The reason we haven't been able to do it is because the other side gets up and makes all of these false arguments, which then complicate the situation, and we have not been able to ban reproductive cloning. We felt that under a suspension calendar, with a clean vote and a simple bill, it would work.

For people who try to say, well, somehow this is going to cause more problems, I can't believe that they would support reproductive cloning. I can't believe that the opponents of this bill would actually vote against a bill that bans reproductive cloning. I can't believe that they would say they think that we would encourage reproductive cloning in this country.

I would tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, this vote will be a clear vote today. The vote will be, do you oppose human reproductive cloning and think that it should be a Federal crime in this country, or are you in the pocket of the special interests who will make any argument because they don't think this bill goes far enough to ban other types of research, which are legal right now in this country and for which the results which they fear have not happened to date.

I will say, let's make the clear statement in Congress. Let's stand up for our constituents. Let's ban reproductive cloning today. There is no Member of Congress who supports human reproductive cloning, which is exactly what this bill prohibits.

Vote "yes" on H.R. 2560, and then we can have the rest of this debate tomorrow on S. 5.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2560, the "Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2007."

This legislation, offered by my colleague, Representative DEGETTE, specifies that it is illegal to utilize cloning technology for unethical purposes.

The bill text defines human cloning as the implantation of the product of human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology into a uterus.

In my view, H.R. 2560 would allow important stem cell research to be done in an ethical manner.

However, it specifies criminal penalties for individuals who do attempt to clone humans.

Mr. Speaker, as a nurse and long-time member of the Committee on Science and Technology, I have long advocated for federal resources to be used to support stem cell research.

After careful review of the bill text, I feel that this is a sound piece of legislation that does what it says it will do—prohibit stem cell technology from being used unethically to "clone" human beings.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2560.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2560.

Mr. Speaker, I am a fervent supporter of the promise and optimism of embryonic stem cell research. As the father of a child who suffers from juvenile diabetes, I know full well the importance of stem cell research in developing a cure for life threatening diseases. For millions of Americans like my son, stem cell research represents promising hope of a cure within their lifetime.

Unfortunately, many Americans confuse embryonic stem cell research as human cloning, a practice which I adamantly oppose.

While technological advances continue to give scientists opportunities to explore beyond our horizons, we have an obligation to pursue our goals responsibly. The pursuit of science cannot go unchecked; occasionally, Congress must intervene.

The artificial creation of human life through cloning challenges the ethical foundations of this Nation. The development of human life is a natural process that cannot be replaced by scientists in a laboratory. I cannot in good conscience support a world where the chance and wonder of the birth of a child is eliminated in favor of a cold, sterile process.

Embryonic stem cell research differs from cloning by developing embryos that might otherwise be destroyed for specific functions. The goal of this practice is not to create new human life, but rather to sustain existing human life by replacing failing parts of the human anatomy.

I will always support saving an American life. I cannot support artificially engineering one.

The importance of this distinction is critical. I hope that my colleagues in the House will join me in educating the public on the differences between these practices.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2560. The purpose of government in free societies is to protect basic human rights, the most important of which is the right to life. It is because of the need to protect that right to life that I oppose this bill. Misnamed "The Human Cloning and Prohibition Act," H.R. 2560 purports to ban human cloning.

I wholeheartedly agree that human cloning should be outlawed. Yet the term "cloning" in this bill does not refer, as it normally does, to the simple act of creating a viable human embryo. Here the word cloning refers only to the implanting of a cloned embryo in a uterus and not to anything that precedes implantation. This bill is silent about and so condones the experimentation upon and destruction of human embryos prior to implantation. Even prior to implantation a human embryo has the entire genetic makeup of a new human being and is worthy of protection.

Those of us who seek to defend life at all stages have long argued that embryonic research would initiate a downward spiral for the sanctity of human life in this country. The government of the greatest nation in the world cannot treat human life as an expendable resource and allow taking the life of its most vulnerable citizens. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to support Representative WELDON's ethical and moral alternative, H.R. 2564, of which I am a cosponsor.

Ms. DEGETTE. 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 Colorado (Ms.

DEGETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2560.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. PITTS. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2446, AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM AND SECURITY SUPPORT ACT OF 2007

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 453

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2446 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 453.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 453 provides for consideration of H.R. 2446, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007 under a structured rule that makes in order all of the amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee, except for those withdrawn by their sponsors.

I want to acknowledge and express my respect for the work of Chairman LANTOS and Ranking Member ROSLEHTINEN for bringing such a fine example of bipartisan cooperation and collaboration before the House for consideration.

Following the ouster of the Taliban regime in late 2001, the United States, the United Nations and the international community embarked on what they hoped would be a comprehensive assistance program to help the new Afghan president, of President Hamid Karzai, establish a new democracy, rebuild the Afghan economy and provide for the general well-being of the Afghan people.

Regrettably, after a most promising start, progress has slowed in most parts of the country. Remnants of the Taliban continue to resist the new government and are reorganizing and strengthening their networks from neighboring countries. Instability has increased, including the introduction of suicide bombings against U.S. soldiers, NATO troops, Afghan officials, and civilians and international and Afghan humanitarian aid workers.

Narcotics production threatens to overwhelm the country. According to UN studies, a large percentage of Afghans, including farmers, laborers, traffickers, war lords, insurgents, and officials participate in and benefit from illegal poppy trade.

Congress first addressed the issue aiding Afghanistan by passing the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, which established a reconstruction program, mandated a relief coordinator, provided support to the NATO-led international security forces, and gave new security assistance authority to our President.

In addition to food aid, refugee relief and other forms of emergency disaster assistance, the United States implemented a wide-ranging assistance program for Afghanistan, including aid for schools, hospitals and farms, and support to reestablish the participation of

women and girls in society, education and the workplace.

The legislation the House will take up today, H.R. 2446, reauthorizes programs created by the original Afghanistan Freedom Support Act, creates a new focus on counternarcotics efforts, and provides for stronger and more enhanced oversight of U.S. strategic goals and performance in Afghanistan.

Overall, H.R. 2446 provides modest increases in authorized levels for humanitarian, development, democracy building and security assistance. I cannot stress enough how important it is that Afghanistan succeed in establishing and consolidating a representative government and rebuilding the country's economy and civil society.

When we overthrew the Taliban regime, we made promises to the Afghan people with the full backing of the international community. We cannot renege on those promises. We cannot fail the people of Afghanistan who came together in support of a common vision for the future.

I am very, very concerned that many of the difficulties confronting Afghanistan today, especially in the areas of security, are due in large part to taking our eye off the ball in Afghanistan and exhausting our economic and military resources in Iraq. We had the chance to make Afghanistan secure. We failed to do so because we chose not to invest the necessary resources in Afghanistan, but, rather, to transfer our attention and our resources to Iraq. We are now playing catch up in Afghanistan as the situation there is deteriorating.

I applaud the chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for this timely reauthorization.

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

□ 1320

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the time; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, after the defeat of the Soviet Army in Afghanistan, the brutal Taliban took over the country. The Taliban ruled that country through terror, through systematic assassination, torture, intimidation. They denied Afghans all personal freedoms and made women fifth-class citizens. They also provided safe harbor to Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda. It is from that safe harbor that al Qaeda was able to plan and train for the horrendous attack of September 11, 2001, against the United States of America.

Following the fall of the Taliban, due in large part to the heroic assistance of the United States Armed Forces and coalition forces from many, many countries throughout the world, the international community worked together under the auspices of the Bonn Compact to make possible what was

really a wonderful, historic accomplishment, a democratically elected government in Afghanistan.

In 2004, Afghanistan adopted a new constitution and held successful presidential elections. Parliamentary elections followed in 2005. Factions that once fought on the battlefield now, after decades of violence, debate and resolve their differences in parliament with ballots instead of bullets.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are remnants of the former Taliban regime, along with al Qaeda, that are intent on overthrowing the democratically elected government of Afghanistan. The Taliban is using suicide bombings against U.S. and NATO troops, against Afghan officials, against civilians, both international and Afghan humanitarian workers, assistance workers.

Opium poppy cultivation and drug trafficking have become significant negative factors in Afghanistan's fragile political and economic order. Afghanistan currently accounts, unfortunately, for a majority of the world's illicit opium production.

As the democratically elected government faces grave challenges, we must not turn our backs on that young democracy. We must continue our support as that country moves from a brutal dictatorship to a consolidated democracy.

In 2002, this Congress passed the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act. That law provided both economic and military aid to the young Afghan democracy.

This legislation will reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act through the year 2010. The programs reauthorized in this bill focus on countering narcotics production and boost security efforts to protect United States and NATO forces as well as Afghan officials and international assistance workers. This legislation calls for the President to set out a detailed strategy for Afghanistan and provide reports on progress there.

The Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007, this legislation that we bring to the floor today, builds on congressional initiatives enacted in 2002 and 2004; and I again congratulate the leaders, who in those Congresses back in 2002 and 2004, worked so hard to ensure that these initiatives that are being reauthorized today were passed. And these initiatives now are, as I say, reauthorized in this legislation, H.R. 2466, that will be before the House today.

Among those initiatives passed in 2002, 2004 are the creation of multiple programs, but this legislation calls for the creation of a coordinator role for the development of a coherent, consistent counter-narcotics strategy, and to strengthen the fight against the drug trade's links to totalitarian Islamic terrorism.

We also insured in this legislation that initiatives passed in 2002 and 2004 continued, such as prohibition on assistance to Afghan officials who are

found to be supporting criminal activities such as narcotics trafficking.

This bill, good legislation, Mr. Speaker. This bill reaffirms the commitment of the United States to support Afghanistan in its transition to a stable, representative democracy.

This bill, good legislation, Mr. Speaker, that we bring to the floor today, authorizes the appropriation of \$1.7 billion annually for humanitarian and economic assistance and \$320 million annually for military assistance during fiscal 2008 to 2010.

This is important legislation. It's important legislation for the fight against the international drug trade and totalitarian Islamists, dangerous remnants of the defeated Taliban, the Taliban who were overthrown, thank God.

Remnants of the Taliban are festering, and they use deadly tactics against United States and NATO forces, as well as Afghans and humanitarian workers. Those people have no scruples, and we only have to remember, Mr. Speaker what they did to the Afghan people when they were in power. So they use horrendous tactics, brutal tactics without limits against our troops and other international forces that are in Afghanistan pursuant to the request of the democratically elected government to secure the peace.

And, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, poppy cultivation and opium production continue to directly support insurgents, militias and terrorist groups. In the face of these very difficult challenges, we cannot allow that fledgling democracy, that budding democracy striving to be a stable society, to fail.

With regard to process, our friends on the other side of the aisle, again, the majority had another opportunity yesterday in the Rules Committee to open the process and comfort with an open rule. They voted down an amendment by our ranking member of the Committee on Rules to bring this legislation forth under an open rule. Yes, they made in order all of the amendments that were presented before the committee, and that's commendable. But why not come forth with an open rule? I think that was disappointing.

Let's not fail to see, however, Mr. Speaker, that this is, this underlying legislation that's being brought forward is extremely important. It's a very important piece of legislation.

And by the way, with regard, again, to process, precisely since it's such an important project that as a Nation we're working on and there's great national consensus on the need to do everything we can to consolidate, to help consolidate the representative democracy and the peace in Afghanistan, precisely I think there would have been no harm in allowing, as this debate proceeds, to allow any Member who's hearing the debate who has an idea for an amendment to bring it forth. That's why an open rule is appropriate.

I'd like to thank, Mr. Speaker, the chairman, the distinguished chairman

of the International Relations Committee, Mr. LANTOS, for his hard work on this important facet of our foreign policy and the legislation that's being brought forth today, as also the distinguished ranking member, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, who's also worked very hard on this legislation, and other members of the International Relations Committee. I want to thank them for their hard work on this important issue, which constitutes, as I said, a project where the American people, in consensus fashion, are moving forward and doing everything possible so that our friends and allies in Afghanistan can survive and defeat the brutal Taliban and al Qaeda.

□ 1330

This legislation brought forward today is an important bill. It is of the utmost importance to our national security and obviously to the region where Afghanistan is and, of course, to the people, to the noble people of Afghanistan, as they continue their efforts to consolidate their representative democracy and achieve peace and prosperity in their great country.

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

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

Let me just say that, again, the underlying legislation is incredibly important. We do have an obligation, a moral obligation, to the people of Afghanistan. And, quite frankly, from a national security perspective, that is where our attention should be and where our attention should have been. It is regrettable, it is regrettable that the President of the United States and his administration and many in this Chamber have chosen to take their eye off what our responsibility is in Afghanistan over these last several years, and instead, we find ourselves bogged down in a quagmire in Iraq.

Those who are responsible for September 11, those who are responsible for the murder of so many of our citizens, they were in Afghanistan. That is where al Qaeda was. And instead of holding al Qaeda accountable in Afghanistan, instead of making sure that our resources go to promoting democracy and stability in Afghanistan, instead of focusing on this ever-growing drug problem in Afghanistan, we have spent over half a trillion dollars in Iraq. And that is regrettable. And, quite frankly, when history looks back on how these last few years were conducted, they are going to take note of the fact that we missed important opportunities to better protect our country by taking our eye off of what our responsibility was in Afghanistan.

And let me just say about the rule, I will apologize to my colleague from Florida for a rule that we bring to the floor today that makes every single amendment that was offered in the Rules Committee and not withdrawn by its author in order. Every Republican amendment, every Democratic

amendment. And I know that that is different from the way things used to be when the Republicans were in charge of the Rules Committee. They had a tendency to just shut us all out routinely. But things are different now, and under the Democratic administration here in the Congress, we are trying to make sure that all points of view have an opportunity to be heard on the floor.

So I am happy that we have this rule, and, again, I apologize to the gentleman that it is not like what they used to do.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont, a member of the Rules Committee (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in April, I had the opportunity to join five of my colleagues on a delegation trip to Afghanistan. And our six-member delegation, three Democrats and three Republicans, spent 2 days in Iraq, 2 days in Afghanistan. And we had an opportunity to speak with American, Iraqi, Afghani soldiers; military leaders; security forces; government leaders; and civil servants. And at every turn in our trip, we encountered these extraordinary men and women from our country that are doing incredible work in very dangerous and trying circumstances. And I had the opportunity to meet troops from my State as my colleagues met troops from their States, and all of us were incredibly proud at the selflessness of these troops who are performing the missions that we have assigned to them.

But the circumstances in each country and each war are very different. Iraq is in a full-blown civil war. The British, our last remaining significant ally in Iraq, will soon withdraw, and American forces are now viewed as occupiers. The situation is much different in Afghanistan. And I came away, as did my colleagues, with the clear impression that there is will on the part of Afghani leaders to step up and to take control of their future.

In Afghanistan, we have 37 allied nations joining with us to help the Afghans drive out the Taliban and to restore order and to create a future for that country.

In fact, the differences between these two situations in Iraq and Afghanistan was best summed up by three soldiers I spoke to who had completed full tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I asked, What is the difference in your experience? And the soldiers said, In Iraq it seems as though everyone is interested in fighting each other and us. In Afghanistan everyone is interested in fighting for their future.

What this legislation recognizes is that we have partners, 37 other nations, working with us in Afghanistan, and we have a partner, the government and people of Afghanistan, in our effort to restore order and to create a future for that country.

H.R. 2446, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act, reinforces the United States' long-term commitment to support Afghanistan in its efforts to confront its challenges and to complete its transformation into a secure and prosperous future.

This bill enhances the narcotics operations. More importantly, it provides incentives to encourage greater participation from our NATO allies in the International Security and Assistance Force. If we have learned anything, it is that we have got to work together and not alone.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' kind words. What I had been referring to before with regard to the process is that I don't believe that any harm would have been done if the majority would have kept its promise of open rules. It is the majority that promised during the campaign that they were going to bring a significant amount, as many as possible, of bills to the floor under open rules. And this is a noncontroversial bill, and, yes, they made the amendments in order by the Members who went to the Rules Committee, and that is appreciated.

So what harm would it have caused if this legislation would have been brought forth under an open rule, as was proposed, in amendment form, by the ranking member of Rules? That is what my point was. No harm would have been done.

And, simply, I would like to remind the majority of the promises that the majority made during the campaign of bringing forth legislation under open rules. So I don't believe that any harm would have accrued if they would have kept their promise. That's all.

But with regard to the apology, I certainly appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' kind words, Mr. Speaker.

And, again, with regard to this underlying legislation, which is of extreme importance, there is a national consensus in the United States that we not only have an obligation, but we must do everything in our power so that the democratically elected government in Afghanistan survives, and that is what this legislation is about. We will have other continuing debates on nearby countries and what our obligations are or what is, rather, in our national interest with regard to the stability in neighboring countries of Afghanistan as well and in trying to prevent neighboring countries from becoming basically safe harbors for international terrorism.

□ 1340

Those are legitimate debates.

Today, the legislation being brought forth, Mr. Speaker, is one where there is a national consensus in the United States, thank God, fortunately, and that is that with regard to that country that was for so long oppressed by

the brutal Taliban and that had given sanctuary to the terrorists that carried out the mass murders of September 11, 2001, against the United States of America, that we certainly have an obligation to do everything we can to make certain that the people of Afghanistan have as much ability, that they have the wherewithal to proceed along a path towards a consolidated, representative democracy in peace and with prosperity.

That is why we agree that this legislation is very important; and it reauthorizes critical programs, programs of critical importance with regard to our assistance to Afghanistan that were authorized initially and appropriated by the Congress of the United States in 2002 and 2004.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I regret that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not pleased with the rule that makes all of the amendments that were offered in order, but I think that that is the way we should do business around here. It is in sharp contrast to the way they used to do business when the Republicans were in the majority, where there was a tendency to shut everything down, to close everything up, to not allow Members of the minority to be able to have amendments. But we're different, and I'm glad we are different.

On the underlying legislation, there should be unanimity in this House about the importance of passing this legislation. It is important that we keep our commitment to the people of Afghanistan. It is important that we keep our commitment to the people of the United States, who after September 11 we said, in the Congress and in the White House, that we are going to do everything we can do bring to justice, to hold to account those who are responsible for September 11.

Unfortunately, today, we are not anywhere near where we should be in Afghanistan; and the reason for that is because we have diverted our resources, we have diverted our soldiers and our political capital to a never-ending war in Iraq. We have put our soldiers in the middle of a civil war in Iraq. We have spent over half a trillion dollars in Iraq; and, as a result, those resources have not been sent to Afghanistan; and I think that is regrettable.

But we need to pass this bill today. I hope it passes with a unanimous vote. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. 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, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 453 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1716, the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 632, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 964.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 195, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—220

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

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—17

Baca	Holden	Pickering
Becerra	Hunter	Shuster
Cantor	Jefferson	Tancredo
Conyers	Meek (FL)	Waxman
Davis, Jo Ann	Nadler	Welch (VT)
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1408

Messrs. HASTERT, LINDER, TERRY, GOODLATTE, DENT, KIRK, SAXTON, GINGREY and ROYCE 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.

GREEN ENERGY EDUCATION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1716, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1716, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

YEAS—416

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

Lantos	Neal (MA)	Shea-Porter
Larsen (WA)	Neugebauer	Sherman
Larson (CT)	Nunes	Shimkus
Latham	Oberstar	Shuler
LaTourette	Obey	Simpson
Lee	Oliver	Sires
Levin	Ortiz	Skelton
Lewis (CA)	Pascrell	Slaughter
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Smith (NE)
Lewis (KY)	Paul	Smith (NJ)
Linder	Payne	Smith (TX)
Lipinski	Pearce	Smith (WA)
LoBiondo	Pence	Snyder
Loebsock	Perlmutter	Solis
Lofgren, Zoe	Peterson (MN)	Souder
Lowey	Peterson (PA)	Space
Lucas	Petri	Spratt
Lungren, Daniel	Pitts	Stark
E.	Platts	Stearns
Lynch	Poe	Stupak
Mack	Pomeroy	Sullivan
Mahoney (FL)	Porter	Sutton
Maloney (NY)	Price (GA)	Tanner
Manzullo	Price (NC)	Tauscher
Marchant	Pryce (OH)	Taylor
Markey	Putnam	Terry
Marshall	Radanovich	Thompson (CA)
Matheson	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Ramstad	Thornberry
McCarthy (CA)	Rangel	Tiahrt
McCarthy (NY)	Regula	Tiberi
McCaul (TX)	Rehberg	Tierney
McCollum (MN)	Reichert	Towns
McCotter	Renzi	Turner
McCrery	Reyes	Udall (CO)
McDermott	Reynolds	Udall (NM)
McGovern	Rodriguez	Upton
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Velázquez
McIntyre	Rogers (MI)	Visclosky
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Walberg
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden (OR)
Rodgers	Roskam	Walsh (NY)
McNerney	Ross	Walz (MN)
McNulty	Rothman	Wamp
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Meek (FL)	Royce	Schultz
Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Waters
Melancon	Rush	Watson
Mica	Ryan (WI)	Watt
Michaud	Salazar	Waxman
Miller (FL)	Sali	Weiner
Miller (MI)	Sánchez, Linda	Weldon (FL)
Miller (NC)	T.	Weller
Miller, Gary	Sanchez, Loretta	Westmoreland
Miller, George	Sarbanes	Wexler
Mitchell	Saxton	Whitfield
Mollohan	Schakowsky	Wicker
Moore (KS)	Schiff	Wilson (NM)
Moore (WI)	Schmidt	Wilson (OH)
Moran (KS)	Schwartz	Wilson (SC)
Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)	Wolf
Murphy (CT)	Scott (VA)	Wu
Murphy, Patrick	Sensenbrenner	Woolsey
Murphy, Tim	Serrano	Wynn
Murtha	Sessions	Yarmuth
Musgrave	Sestak	Young (AK)
Myrick	Shadegg	Young (FL)
Napolitano	Shays	

NOT VOTING—16

Baca	Holden	Ryan (OH)
Becerra	Hunter	Shuster
Cantor	Jefferson	Tancredo
Conyers	Nadler	Welch (VT)
Davis, Jo Ann	Pallone	
Hastings (FL)	Pickering	

□ 1417

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 431 and 432 I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

H-PRIZE ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 632, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 632, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 8, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

YEAS—408

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

Lofgren, Zoe	Payne	Sires
Lowe	Pearce	Skelton
Lucas	Pence	Slaughter
Lungren, Daniel	Perlmutter	Smith (NE)
E.	Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Lynch	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Mack	Petri	Smith (WA)
Mahoney (FL)	Pitts	Snyder
Maloney (NY)	Platts	Solis
Marchant	Poe	Souder
Markey	Pomeroy	Space
Marshall	Porter	Spratt
Matheson	Price (CA)	Stark
Matsui	Price (NC)	Stearns
McCarthy (CA)	Pryce (OH)	Stupak
McCarthy (NY)	Putnam	Sullivan
McCaul (TX)	Radanovich	Sutton
McCollum (MN)	Rahall	Tanner
McCotter	Ramstad	Tauscher
McCrery	Rangel	Taylor
McDermott	Regula	Terry
McGovern	Rehberg	Thompson (CA)
McHenry	Reichert	Thompson (MS)
McHugh	Renzi	Thornberry
McIntyre	Reyes	Tiahrt
McKeon	Reynolds	Tiberi
McMorris	Rodriguez	Tierney
Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Towns
McNerney	Rogers (KY)	Turner
McNulty	Rogers (MI)	Udall (CO)
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Udall (NM)
Meek (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Meeks (NY)	Roskam	Van Hollen
Melancon	Ross	Velázquez
Mica	Rothman	Visclosky
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Walberg
Miller (FL)	Ruppersberger	Walden (OR)
Miller (MI)	Rush	Walsh (NY)
Miller (NC)	Ryan (WI)	Walz (MN)
Miller, Gary	Salazar	Wamp
Miller, George	Sali	Wasserman
Mitchell	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Mollohan	T.	Waters
Moore (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson
Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Watt
Moran (KS)	Saxton	Waxman
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Weiner
Murphy (CT)	Schiff	Welch (VT)
Murphy, Patrick	Schmidt	Weldons (FL)
Murphy, Tim	Schwartz	Weller
Murtha	Scott (GA)	Wexler
Musgrave	Scott (VA)	Whitfield
Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Wicker
Napolitano	Serrano	Wilson (NM)
Neal (MA)	Sessions	Wilson (OH)
Neugebauer	Sestak	Wilson (SC)
Nunes	Shadegg	Wolf
Oberstar	Shays	Woolsey
Obey	Shea-Porter	Wu
Oliver	Sherman	Wynn
Ortiz	Shimkus	Yarmuth
Pascarell	Shuler	Young (AK)
Pastor	Simpson	Young (FL)

NAYS—8

Blackburn	Flake	Paul
Culberson	Foxx	Royce
Duncan	Manzullo	

NOT VOTING—16

Baca	Holden	Ryan (OH)
Becerra	Hunter	Shuster
Boyd (KS)	Jefferson	Tancredo
Cantor	Nadler	Westmoreland
Conyers	Pallone	
Hastings (FL)	Pickering	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1424

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 433, I was meeting with constituents in the Rayburn Room. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SECURELY PROTECT YOURSELF AGAINST CYBER TRESPASS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 964, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 964, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 48, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—368

Abercrombie	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Hirono
Alexander	Davis, David	Hobson
Allen	Davis, Jo Ann	Hodes
Altmire	Davis, Lincoln	Holt
Andrews	Deal (GA)	Hooley
Arcuri	DeFazio	Hoyer
Bachmann	DeGette	Hulshof
Baird	Delahunt	Insee
Baker	DeLauro	Israel
Baldwin	Dent	Issa
Barrow	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson (IL)
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson-Lee
Barton (TX)	Dicks	(TX)
Bean	Dingell	Jindal
Berkley	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Berman	Donnelly	Johnson (IL)
Berry	Doolittle	Johnson, E. B.
Bilbray	Doyle	Jones (NC)
Bilirakis	Drake	Jones (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Dreier	Kagen
Bishop (NY)	Duncan	Kanjorski
Bishop (UT)	Edwards	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Ehlers	Keller
Boehner	Ellison	Kennedy
Bono	Ellsworth	Kildee
Boozman	Emanuel	Kilpatrick
Boren	Emerson	Kind
Boswell	Engel	King (NY)
Boucher	English (PA)	Kirk
Boustany	Eshoo	Klein (FL)
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	Kline (MN)
Brady (PA)	Everett	Knollenberg
Brady (TX)	Fallin	Kucinich
Braleley (IA)	Farr	Kuhl (NY)
Brown (SC)	Fattah	Fattah
Brown, Corrine	Ferguson	Lamborn
Brown-Waite,	Filner	Lampson
Ginny	Forbes	Langevin
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Lantos
Burgess	Fossella	Larsen (WA)
Burton (IN)	Frank (MA)	Larson (CT)
Butterfield	Franks (AZ)	LaTourette
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Lee
Calvert	Gallely	Levin
Camp (MI)	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Campbell (CA)	Gerlach	Lewis (GA)
Cannon	Giffords	Lewis (KY)
Capito	Gilchrest	Linder
Capps	Gillibrand	Lipinski
Capuano	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Cardoza	Gohmert	Loebsack
Carnahan	Castor	Lowe
Carson	Chabot	Lucas
Carter	Chandler	Lynch
Castle	Clarke	Mack
Castor	Clay	Maloney (NY)
Chabot	Cleaver	Markey
Chandler	Clyburn	Marshall
Clarke	Coble	Matheson
Clay	Cohen	Matsui
Cleaver	Cole (OK)	McCarthy (CA)
Clyburn	Cooper	McCarthy (NY)
Coble	Costa	McCaul (TX)
Cohen	Costello	McCollum (MN)
Cole (OK)	Courtney	McCotter
Conaway	Cramer	McCotter
	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
	Crowley	Hayes
	Cubin	Heller
	Cuellar	Hensarling
	Culberson	Herger
	Cummings	Herseth Sandlin
	Davis (AL)	Higgins
		Hinchee

McNerney	Rehberg	Space
McNulty	Reichert	Spratt
Meehan	Renzi	Stark
Meek (FL)	Reyes	Stearns
Meeks (NY)	Reynolds	Stupak
Melancon	Rodriguez	Sullivan
Mica	Rogers (AZ)	Sutton
Michaud	Rogers (KY)	Tanner
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Tauscher
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Taylor
Miller (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry
Miller, Gary	Roskam	Thompson (CA)
Miller, George	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Mitchell	Rothman	Tiberi
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Moore (KS)	Royce	Towns
Moore (WI)	Ruppersberger	Turner
Moran (VA)	Rush	Udall (CO)
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (WI)	Udall (NM)
Murphy, Patrick	Salazar	Upton
Murphy, Tim	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Murtha	T.	Velázquez
Musgrave	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Myrick	Sarbanes	Walden (OR)
Napolitano	Saxton	Walsh (NY)
Neal (MA)	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)
Neugebauer	Schiff	Wamp
Oberstar	Schmidt	Wasserman
Obey	Schwartz	Schultz
Olver	Scott (GA)	Waters
Ortiz	Scott (VA)	Watson
Pascrell	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Pastor	Serrano	Waxman
Payne	Sestak	Weiner
Pence	Shadegg	Welch (VT)
Perlmutter	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Shea-Porter	Weller
Peterson (PA)	Sherman	Wexler
Petri	Shimkus	Whitfield
Pitts	Shuler	Wicker
Platts	Simpson	Wilson (NM)
Pomeroy	Sires	Wilson (OH)
Porter	Skelton	Wolf
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Woolsey
Pryce (OH)	Smith (NE)	Wu
Putnam	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Yarmuth
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Ramstad	Snyder	Young (FL)
Rangel	Solis	
Regula	Souder	

NAYS—48

Aderholt	Flake	Marchant
Akin	Foxx	McHenry
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Moran (KS)
Biggart	Goodlatte	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Hoekstra	Paul
Blunt	Honda	Pearce
Bonner	Inglis (SC)	Poe
Boustany	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Boyd (KS)	Jordan	Sali
Brady (TX)	King (IA)	Sessions
Cannon	Kingston	Thornberry
Carney	Latham	Tiahrt
Carter	Lofgren, Zoe	Walberg
Conaway	Lungren, Daniel	Westmoreland
Davis (KY)	E.	Wilson (SC)
Davis, Tom	Mahoney (FL)	
Feeney	Manzullo	

NOT VOTING—16

Baca	Hill	Pickering
Bachus	Holden	Ryan (OH)
Becerra	Hunter	Shuster
Cantor	Jefferson	Tancredo
Conyers	Nadler	
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	

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

□ 1431

Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. BURTON of Indiana changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING AMENDMENT NO. 11
TO BE OFFERED AT ANY TIME
DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R.
2446, AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM
AND SECURITY SUPPORT ACT OF
2007

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 2446 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 453, amendment No. 11 be permitted to be offered at any time.

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

There was no objection.

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 H.R. 2446.

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

There was no objection.

AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM AND
SECURITY SUPPORT ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 453 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2446.

□ 1436

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROSS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2446 and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Taliban is back, posing not only an insidious threat to the people of Afghanistan but to our Nation as well. We simply cannot allow a resurgence of the Taliban. If we do, al Qaeda will once again be able to use Afghanistan as a state-sponsored launching pad for terror.

And so every schoolhouse door in Afghanistan is a threshold to stopping terrorism. Every new power line in Af-

ghanistan is a frontline in the war on terror. Every farm in Afghanistan used for legitimate crops, instead of opium poppies, is fertile ground for peace.

So we ought to look at funding Afghanistan as both good foreign policy and good domestic policy. Every dollar we invest now translates into lives and dollars we save in the future, both in Afghanistan and in the United States.

Our initial efforts, Mr. Chairman, in Afghanistan must be redoubled. For that reason, it was my pleasure to join with the ranking Republican member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my good friend, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, in introducing this crucial reauthorization bill, which clearly demonstrates our long-term, bipartisan commitment to Afghanistan.

Our job in Afghanistan is not finished, not by a long shot. Yes, the Taliban was seemingly purged from that Nation in 2001 and a democratic government was established in its place, but we must not have a false sense of security.

The effectiveness and very existence of the Karzai government is threatened as we meet here today. As we speak, the volatile southern part of Afghanistan is aflame with clashes between NATO coalition troops and the reorganized forces of the Taliban. Make no mistake: Afghanistan is a brush fire that could ignite easily into an all-out conflagration.

Recently, Mr. Chairman, there has been an alarming return to the reign of terror against women in Afghanistan. Just today we learned of the slaying of a pioneering advocate of free speech, a courageous woman who owned a radio station near Kabul, shot to death in her home. This brutal attack shows how difficult the working environment has become for journalists, especially for journalists who are women.

So the Afghans need our help as much as ever. The teetering situation there is an echo of the instability just after the United States and our allies invaded that country. Security for the people and stability of the government are paramount.

Let me sketch, Mr. Chairman, the basic outline of our bipartisan legislation. The first title of the Lantos/Ros-Lehtinen bill provides much-needed financial aid for health care, energy development, programs for women and girls, assistance to combat corruption, and a crop substitution program to curtail the growing of poppy. Under this section of our bill, the administration will be required to certify whether any senior official in Afghanistan's provincial or local government is involved in the illegal narcotics trade and to take appropriate action.

Our bill also requires the President to appoint a coordinator for our Afghanistan assistance programs, including counter-narcotics. We mandate accountability in the effort to eliminate narcotics corruption.

Title II of our bill bolsters security and policing in Afghanistan, supporting the international security

force beyond October, 2007, and further training the Afghans. It encourages greater participation from countries in the region, and it mandates the creation of special drug interdiction teams.

We must recognize, Mr. Chairman, that security in Afghanistan is inextricably intertwined with the fight against the narcotics trade.

Title III of our bill ensures greater planning and accountability for the future of the country, and it fosters regional coordination. A structured blueprint for 2008 will be required, with updates as necessary. Reporting and evaluation measures will be expanded and extended. These are all crucial provisions for meeting benchmarks and assessing progress so that Congress can perform the oversight that is important to our successful effort in a war-torn country.

I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, we will not let Afghanistan fail. The world is watching, and it wants to know whether we have the resolve to fight the terrorist forces threatening Afghanistan, whether we are ready to maintain the country's security and stability.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs approved our bipartisan legislation unanimously. I want to repeat this because it indicates the unanimous conviction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, reflecting the view of this body and the American people, that Afghanistan will be a successful endeavor.

I want to express my appreciation for the support of not only the ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, but also the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. PENCE.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in strongly supporting this most important piece of legislation.

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

□ 1445

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the chairman of our committee, Chairman LANTOS, for his leadership for so long on this issue.

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

I would like to voice my strong support for the chairman's bill, H.R. 2446, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act, and that's the key part of what we're talking about today, security support. This legislation is the product of the bipartisan cooperation that our committee has shown on an issue of critical importance to the United States and our allies in the war against Islamic militant extremists.

Five years ago, our Nation experienced a terrible tragedy, and it led our Nation to destroy the al Qaeda safe haven in Afghanistan that the brutal Taliban regime had created there. Our focus was to provide a safe, stable and

secure Afghanistan that would deny global jihadists a base of operations to conduct their campaign of terror and destruction against our Nation and our critical security interests around the world.

Since then, Afghanistan has taken notable steps to emerge from decades of war, of violence, of oppression, toward a prosperous, secure, free, democratic nation. Today, over 5 million Afghan children are in school, including 2 million girls. This was prohibited under the Taliban rule. Hundreds of clinics and new schools are now open to serve the population as a result of international efforts. Media, cultural, business and political leaders are free to meet to discuss, to demonstrate and to guide policies that are transforming their nation across all sectors.

The Afghan economy is growing at an incredible rate, and institutional assistance for Afghan economic reconstruction has been forthcoming. Most importantly, the Afghanistan people, through their active direct participation in the political process, have demonstrated their desire to accelerate and ensure the movement of Afghanistan toward modern society.

However, challenges to these and other efforts remain, as Mr. LANTOS has pointed out. A dramatic increase in illicit opium cultivation is financing and strengthening the Taliban and anticoalition activity. It's increasing crime and corruption, and it is eroding the authority of the central government institutions.

Afghanistan's ballooning drug trade has succeeded in expanding the ranks of the Taliban. It is no coincidence that opium and heroin production dramatically increased at the same time that the Taliban-staged massive counteroffensive, particularly in the south of the country.

The issue of Taliban and al Qaeda resurgence cannot be considered in a vacuum. In response, this critical legislation seeks to address the current situation in an integrated fashion, to include the confluence of the short-term goals to reduce opium activity and related corruption, while addressing longer-term developmental goals which have an impact on our counterterrorism and our counternarcotics policies and objectives.

In particular, within this critical legislation, we have worked to establish the means for developing a long overdue and coherent interdepartmental and counternarcotics strategy that addresses the deadly and the neglected illicit drug trade and its links to radical Islamic terrorism that imperil the future of Afghanistan.

In February of this year, I, along with some of my other colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, wrote to the administration on the need for an across-the-board policy change on the illicit drug threat fueling the resurgence of the Taliban, the attacks on our coalition troops, and official corruption in Afghanistan.

The bill before us incorporates many of the recommendations that we proposed in this letter, and I thank Chairman LANTOS for working so closely with us. I believe that his bill will prompt much-needed changes by mandating the appointment of a high level, interdepartmental Afghan coordinator with emphasis on a development of a coherent government-wide counter drug policy. This includes bringing the U.S. military into the fight, providing meaningful support for the drug enforcement administration with an emphasis on interdiction and on the extradition of major drug kingpins.

This legislation also contains limitations on assistance to senior Afghan local and provincial government officials who, based on evidence, are found to be supporting Islamic terrorist activities or narco-traffickers or drug producers or are involved in other criminal activities. This important oversight provision will be instrumental in assuring that vital U.S. reconstruction assistance is properly allocated and utilized.

I am also pleased that we were able to come to an agreement with Chairman LANTOS on the extension of draw-down authority for military equipment, which promotes greater ability to operate with the international security assistance force and other allies in the country of Afghanistan.

In addition, the bill ensures that there will be prevetting of the recruits of the Afghan police to help adequately assess the candidates' aptitude, professional skills, integrity and other qualifications for law enforcement work before they enter the service. Our efforts in Afghanistan, in particular, and our campaign against militant Islamic extremists in general must be pursued in a comprehensive manner.

As illustrated by this critical legislation, it requires an effective and unified reconstruction strategy with a unified counternarcotics strategy, counterterrorism strategy, and an Afghan government committed to fighting and eliminating corruption.

Only with this comprehensive approach will we accelerate economic development and reconstruction, improve the quality of life for Afghanistan and address the underlying conditions that fuel extremist acts and decisively defeat the jihadist elements that want to once again control Afghanistan.

My daughter-in-law, Lindsay, after serving her military tour in Iraq as a marine pilot, is now serving in Afghanistan. We hope that she will be back home with us by Thanksgiving. But we thank every brave man and woman who is wearing our Nation's uniform in Afghanistan, and we thank them for freeing an entire population, and we hope that their contributions will always be celebrated in this House.

This bill before us brings us closer to making sure that Afghanistan remains a free country and be without the extremist Islamic elements that seek to destroy it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my good friend from Missouri, IKE SKELTON.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on this very important subject.

Mr. Chairman, for too long, Afghanistan has been the forgotten war. Opportunities there have been lost, and progress has been limited. Recently, there has been movement in a more positive direction.

Secretary Gates has been focusing more on Afghanistan and NATO-led and U.S. forces achieved some notable successes against the ongoing Taliban insurgency this spring. This, of course, is encouraging. I commend Secretary Gates for his efforts, and, of course, I commend our troops for their tremendous contributions.

However, over the same time, violence is on the rise in Afghanistan. Roadside bombs, suicide attacks are increasing, and the number of civilian casualties is, of course, troubling. Opium production is at high levels. The authority of the central government remains, of course, limited. Corruption and poverty still plague the country. These are significant challenges that will not be overcome either easily or quickly.

Lasting security in Afghanistan depends on long-term comprehensive efforts that, of course, are well coordinated. It is critical that our NATO partners who are there play a central role in this effort in terms of both troop contributions, as well as aid.

Earlier this year, I traveled to Afghanistan with a delegation led by Speaker PELOSI. I came away from that trip convinced that the effort in Afghanistan is winnable, and I am still optimistic.

But together with NATO, we must ensure that the Taliban and al Qaeda are destroyed and destroyed for good. Afghanistan will never again become a terrorist harbor as it once was.

The House Armed Services Committee, which I am pleased to chair, is committed to doing whatever it can to achieve this goal. Our committee has held comprehensive hearings on Afghanistan this year.

Just recently, in the defense bill that we passed, we had provisions regarding Afghanistan. This bill not only provides funds for Afghan national security forces, but it includes a range of provisions that will promote long-term security, as well as robust oversight of American activities in that country.

I am pleased to see that the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act builds upon our committee's efforts. This legislation includes many important bipartisan provisions that will further advance long-term security in Afghanistan.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this. We must build on re-

cent gains in that country and seize the moment to establish real security there.

I do support this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to Judge POE of Texas, a great member of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. POE. I thank the gentlelady from Florida for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I was a prosecutor and a judge in Texas for 30 years total, and I can tell you that I saw the results of poppy and opium fields in my courtroom. Opiates make victims out of capable, independent citizens, and they turn decent people into monsters, and I have seen it with my own eyes. Case after case after case.

Illicit drugs take complete control of people's lives, and they are now strangling the democracy in Afghanistan. Opiates not only poison Americans, the poppy trade funds our enemies. The Taliban, or more appropriately, those demons in the desert, are getting rich off of the poppy fields, and they are using that money against American troops and NATO troops.

They are using their wealth to become more numerous, more organized, and more deadly to the military of NATO and the United States. They are promoting intolerance and propping up evil and propelling Afghanistan really back toward the dark ages to a fundamentalist rule.

In the 2005 and 2006 growing season, poppy production in Afghanistan actually grew to almost 60 percent. That resulted in a net growth of almost 50 percent in the production of illicit opium, and all the profit from this drug trade lined the pockets of our enemies, the Taliban. Those poppy fields are growing like weeds, and they are choking Afghanistan's freedom. Also, those narcotics are eventually choking the lives out of many Americans addicted to opiates.

The administration, I know, recognized the importance of counter-narcotics operations. However, judging from the rapid spread of the poppy production in Afghanistan, it's evident that whatever we are doing is not working. The time has come for a clear and comprehensive and truly wide-reaching counternarcotics strategy in Afghanistan.

That is why I rise in support of this bill, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act. This bill does numerous things, but it specifically provides a comprehensive strategy and a priority to deal with the narcotics. It allows the military to give greater logistics support to the Drug Enforcement Administration, and, more importantly, though, this bill creates a coordinator role that will reach across government departments to develop a comprehensive strategy in how to deal with this problem.

Our military is unmatched in its ability to get the job done. Any time, anywhere. But including enhanced civilian interdiction teams, the fight

against the drug trade will help our troops get the bad guys, the kingpins in Afghanistan, these people that are making money off of the drug trade.

□ 1500

Also, the team will receive support from our military, international resources and Afghanistan law enforcement officers. I believe that allowing law enforcement to participate in taking down these desert kingpins will give the Afghanistan police a sense of ownership over their own security and help further train them in counter-narcotics operation. That could only be a good thing for the citizens of Afghanistan.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the administration's commitment to taking care of the poppy fields in Afghanistan that fund our enemies, but I think we're missing a link somewhere in our strategy. Provisions in this bill focus on funding that link, and that's a good start. All of our sacrifice and that of our NATO allies and the future of Afghanistan depend on establishing a stable and viable democracy in that region of the world. That democracy can only thrive amidst a legitimate economy. Our troops, our allies, and, most importantly, the Afghanistan people deserve a chance to live unfettered and free of the rule of kingpins of the drugs and the Taliban.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to Congressman ADAM SMITH, the chairman of the Armed Services Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee and a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the leadership in both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Armed Services Committee for their efforts to make Afghanistan a top priority and to focus on our challenges there. They've done a fabulous job.

I recently returned, during the last break, from a visit to Afghanistan. I am very optimistic about what's going on there but at the same time mindful of the effort that it's going to require in the years ahead to continue to succeed, and I believe this bill reflects an understanding of that required effort.

The Afghan people are on our side. They support the presence of the NATO troops to support the Karzai government. They do not want the Taliban to return, and they will fight them and appreciate our help in doing this.

I'm also very impressed with the job our military and the military of the NATO alliance is doing there. We have some of the most talented folks in our military there doing a fabulous job of fighting the Taliban. But as we go forward, there are remaining challenges, significant challenges.

Number one, we have to maintain the military presence. In fact, I believe we need more troops and further support to train the Afghan army and to fight off the Taliban as they try to resurge

in the south and throughout the country.

But overarching all of this is the economic challenge. That is the enormous challenge in Afghanistan. It is a country that has never had the best economy, and it has also faced 30 years of civil war. Their infrastructure is destroyed and needs to be rebuilt. Their ability to govern has also been significantly reduced and needs to be rebuilt.

The Karzai government has the support of the people, but the people also want infrastructure. They want electricity, and they want jobs. They want alternatives to the poppies, alternatives to that as a way of making their living, and we have to give them a long-term commitment to show them that we will help. We need that long-term financial commitment that is contained in this bill to get them to believe that their economy will be strong again. We need to reward their faith in the Karzai government, their faith in our ability to defeat the Taliban and to build a better future for Afghanistan; and this bill does that.

So, again, I thank the chairman. I want to thank the ranking member as well for putting together this piece of legislation and ask all Members of Congress to understand this is a long-term commitment in Afghanistan.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield such time as he may consume to Mr. PENCE of Indiana, the ranking member of the Middle East and South Asia Subcommittee who has traveled to Afghanistan and closely follows the developments there.

MR. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I especially want to thank our ranking member from Florida for yielding and the distinguished chairman of the full committee for their work on this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act, and I call for its passage. It was reported unanimously out of the Foreign Affairs Committee last month. Our action today would reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 passed 5 years ago this month, just a few short months after our invasion of the country that harbored the September 11 attackers.

Mr. Chairman, there is nearly unanimous agreement in this body that the battle currently under way in Afghanistan is in our vital national interests, and it is crucial and central to the war on terror. It is critical that we adequately resource and support our mission and the government and the people of Afghanistan.

As with any conflict, there are both positive and troubling signs today in Afghanistan. Challenges facing us include a resurgent Taliban, growing opium trade and slow progress on reconstruction.

On the positive side, our forces, in conjunction with NATO, are waging war on the Taliban, pursuing terrorist nests and providing support to the Karzai government. I was able to wit-

ness some of the early fruits of these efforts firsthand, along with some of my colleagues in December of 2004 when I visited. As in Iraq, our troops and civilian efforts there are inspiring in difficult and dangerous conditions.

Opium production remains a plague that will haunt this country until it is curbed. Tragically, Afghanistan is the world's largest opium producer. As Antonio Maria Costa of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime said last year, and I quote, "Afghanistan's drug situation remains vulnerable to reversal because of mass poverty, lack of security, and the fact that the authorities have inadequate control over its territory."

And that's why this bill is so important. In this legislation, \$1.6 billion per year over the next 3 years are authorized for reconstruction and security assistance, specifically a pilot program of crop substitution to encourage legitimate alternatives to poppy cultivation, as well as an anti-corruption effort.

This bill also addresses, as has been alluded to by my colleagues, the continuing humanitarian needs and offers programs for women and children.

One of the most inspiring experiences of my life, Mr. Chairman, was during a visit to an American installation in the mountains of Jalalabad where we walked outside of the military base and visited a school which, for the first time, had running water, which, for the first time, more poignantly, had little girls in the classrooms. It was an extraordinary experience as I approached the gates of that school surrounded, as I was, by heavily armed American military personnel, only to see the children run forward out of the gates, embrace those soldiers and greet them, not as the glowering menaces that they might appear to a stranger but as friends. And I stood and marveled as the soldiers taught me words in their native Afghan tongue to greet the children and to be able to speak to them. It was extraordinary.

This legislation providing for the humanitarian needs and for programs for women and girls like those which I saw is truly treasure in heaven.

This legislation also encourages greater cooperation from friendly countries in the region, and it requires the President to keep Congress informed on the progress of these various issues.

Mr. Chairman, our success in Afghanistan will require a multi-tracked effort on numerous fronts in order for the United States to stay on the offensive in the war on terror and to stabilize this key ally in our shared struggle. The Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act is an important and central component in that fight, and I urge its strong support from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my neighbor in California, a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. LYNN WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act and to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for this bipartisan bill.

H.R. 2446 provides for reconstruction and reconciliation. It provides for the future of Afghan people by supporting women's rights, supporting education, agricultural initiatives and civil society reform.

Actually, this bill is doing what we could and what we should do in Iraq. It builds a path, a true path to peace. With H.R. 2446, through economic political and reconstruction support, we can help rebuild a nation. We can provide hope for a safe and prosperous future for another nation. And we can also learn from this bill, learn that democracy and stability come from international partnerships, not from guns, not from bombs.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield such time as he may consume to Mr. DOOLITTLE, of California, a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Thank you to Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN and Chairman LANTOS. I'm very happy to see the strong support for Afghanistan manifested here by the statements on the floor and, obviously, by a bill like this with unanimous approval out of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, we had some great initial successes in Afghanistan, and those are now threatened by subsequent developments that would be absolutely tragic and really intolerable for us to allow any reversals to occur. We need to build upon a solid foundation that has been laid, and I'd just like to briefly cite what I think the need for this legislation is.

Others have alluded to it as well, but the fact is that remnants of the Taliban regime have regrouped and are using increasingly deadly tactics, including the introduction of suicide bombings against both U.S. and NATO troops, Afghan officials and civilians and international and Afghan assistance workers.

Also, the poppy cultivation and opium production which directly support local warlords and sustain and finance insurgents, militias and terrorist organizations is increasing at a staggering rate. Indeed, the narcotics problem in Afghanistan threatens to overwhelm the entire country. More than 500,000 laborers and an unknown number of traffickers, warlords, insurgents and officials also participate in and benefit from the drug trade.

The risk for Afghanistan to again devolve into a failed state is increasing. The ability of the Taliban and other insurgents to enjoy safe haven in Pakistan-controlled areas destabilizes the region and adds to the political tension between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

I'm very encouraged to see that this legislation establishes the means for developing a long-overdue and coherent

interdepartmental counternarcotics strategy that addresses a deadly and neglected illicit drug trade and its links to radical Islamist terrorism.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I endorse this bill and encourage our Members to support it and pray that it may further strengthen our efforts to bring stability and peace to that vital region of the world.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend and distinguished colleague from New York, Mrs. CAROLYN MALONEY, chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman LANTOS for his leadership on this important bill and in so many other areas; and I rise in strong support of the Afghan Freedom and Security Support Act.

The bill includes provisions from legislation that I introduced earlier this year, H.R. 937, the Afghan Women Empowerment Act, which targets critical assistance to Afghan women and girls. The bill authorizes \$45 million each year from fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2010 for programs in Afghanistan that benefit women and girls, as well as the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission and the Afghan Ministry of Women's Affairs.

The funding would be directed toward important needs, including medical care, education, vocational training, protection from violence and civil participation.

In 2003, I successfully attached, with the leadership and help of Chairman LANTOS, an amendment to the fiscal year 2004 emergency supplemental bill that provided \$60 million in funding for Afghan women and girls NGOs, including \$5 million for the creation of the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission.

□ 1515

During the past several years, the U.S. has invested in the reconstruction and development of Afghanistan, both because it is the right thing to do and because it is also critical to our national security. However, like many of my colleagues, I am troubled by the challenges facing Afghani women. In March, I had the pleasure and on other occasions of meeting with Dr. Sima Samar, head of the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission. She says Afghan women are losing ground. Many women continue to endure hardships including targeted violence, limited mobility, and a high rate of maternal mortality. I am also deeply concerned about reports that girls schools continue to be targeted for violence, including dozens in this past year.

Clearly, we have a great deal of more work to do. And by giving women access to the skills and opportunities that they need, they will become partners in creating Afghanistan's future and we will ensure that women will no longer be second class citizens.

I deeply thank Chairman LANTOS and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for

their leadership in getting this important bill to the floor, and I also want to acknowledge Congress Member ABERCROMBIE for his strong support for this legislation and his efforts on its behalf, along with the Feminist Majority, led by Ellie Smeal.

This legislation is another critical step in helping Afghan women, and I commend the House for passing this legislation today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER), the House Republican policy chairman.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to begin by commending the work of the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this bill to the floor.

Upon my first visit to Iraq in 2003, I was struck by the centralized reconstruction process. I believed it was a mistake, and I came back in November of that year and gave a speech on the floor of the House and I said that I thought that one of the things that we needed to do was to provide the Iraqi people a transactional benefit to undergird the transformational change to democracy. This lesson is equally applicable in Afghanistan, which is why this bill today is so welcomed, because it recognizes that the people of Afghanistan in the provinces, in the local levels are where the reconstruction money must really be targeted.

If you think about how the United States evolved into a democracy, we began with the family unit and went to the town halls and went to our county government level and eventually became States and eventually became a strong union. We can expect no more nor no less from the people of other nations who are yearning to breathe free and have been given the chance to seize the opportunity.

On a more personal note, having been on my first trip to Afghanistan with my colleagues, we had the opportunity to meet with some female parliamentarians, and I was struck by two things: The first, and I said this to them, was that I admired their courage and that there was a part of me that envied them. I envy them because here in the United States capital we see portraits and we see monuments and we continue to this day to hear testimonials to the courage and perseverance of our Nation's founders.

And I said that I was so honored to be in the presence of these female parliamentarians for in Afghanistan, as they move towards democracy, one day there will be testimonials and monuments and portraits of them hanging on the walls of their own chambers and in the homes of their fellow countrymen.

We promised that day not to forget or forsake them. And today, thanks to the leadership of the ranking member and the chairman, we can tell those female parliamentarians that we have not forgotten them and that we stand with them.

And, finally, let us not forget when we think about the role of the United States, which was conceived in liberty, those female parliamentarians were once considered property until they were emancipated by the United States of America and the coalition allies.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Texas, a distinguished colleague, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, chairwoman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, allow me to thank my good friend the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House for his energy and the focused way in which this committee is pursuing its business of engaging and improving the relations of the United States with those around the world. Let me thank the ranking member as well, whom I have worked with on many issues dealing with women and children, and I appreciate their collective leadership.

This bill is an important restatement of what many of us have argued for and continue to make the point that the building pieces that we can offer to Afghanistan will build a building of peace for decades and centuries to come. Frankly, many of us believe that the war on terror is seeded in Afghanistan and would like us to find or to be able to invest not only as it relates militarily to the concerns of the borders between Afghanistan and Pakistan and the rise of the Taliban but to seed out, if you will, the bad seeds of terrorism, to make Afghanistan the shining star, people desiring and hungering for the water of democracy.

So this legislation, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007, needs to be reauthorized and has in it a valuable statement about the United States' commitment, longevity in its commitment, to helping Afghanistan put forward the building blocks of peace. The fact that it authorizes \$1.7 billion in each of the fiscal years 2008 to 2010 emphasizes economic and development assistance and as well capacity building programs and, as has been mentioned, women and girls programs.

Let me cite, Mr. Chairman, an individual who has really been a sole champion on the issue of educating Afghan children. And, of course, I am very grateful for your accepting my amendment regarding the refugee resettlement in the manager's amendment and look forward to discussing my amendment regarding the emphasis on training girls to encourage them to finish secondary school, and as well, my amendment regarding the safety of women legislators. But I do want to pay tribute to Josanna Smith. She is a name that you may not have heard, but she has devised a little chalkboard that is able to travel in places where many of us couldn't in the high hills of Afghanistan to give to the children that

many of us see in pictures or have actually visited them, as I have done, and giving books to these children, sitting in little circles trying to learn.

This little simple, if you will, chalkboard that ties to it a piece of chalk allows children to learn. Josanna has put together a foundation where it is almost self-funded. She has been to Afghanistan and many places around the world.

I cite Josanna Smith as an example of the kind of good heartedness of Americans who really desire the best for Afghanistan and see it as the place where we can, in essence, make the fruits of democracy thrive.

This legislation acknowledges that the war on terror started first in the bowels of this country. It acknowledges the need to address the controversy and conflict on the Afghan and Pakistan border. It recognizes the rise of the Taliban. And, hopefully, it will characterize the foreign policy of this Nation, that is, that we must solve the terror in Afghanistan before we begin to completely finish the war on terror or at least make the forward step that we need to make.

I look forward to discussing the amendments that will hopefully further help women and women legislators take their rightful place in a free and open democracy that is safe and secure, and that is the country of Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2446, "the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007." This is an extremely important and timely piece of legislation, and I commend the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. LANTOS, for introducing it. In the nearly 5 years since the 9/11 attacks, and the subsequent ouster of the Taliban and al-Qaeda from Afghanistan, we have made significant efforts to secure that nation from the Taliban.

However, the Taliban continues to pose a very real threat to Afghanistan's stability. After enduring decades of violence and hardship, the people of Afghanistan continue to live in a climate of ongoing turmoil, particularly in the southern regions of the country, where there are ongoing and dangerous clashes between coalition-led forces and insurgents. Despite our positive efforts, the Taliban has been able to reorganize, and continues destabilize the country.

These unfortunate realities remind us of the need to continue U.S. programs in Afghanistan, as well as the necessity of continually studying and revising our involvement to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being put to the best possible use. If the United States is to ensure that Afghanistan is secure and stable in the long run, we must address the underlying causes of persistent violence, including the still-flourishing opium trade and the nation's lack of infrastructure.

Education, so long neglected under the Taliban regime, will be a vital component of Afghanistan's development. I commend the many individuals and groups who have been tirelessly furthering the cause of Afghanistan; individuals like Josanna Smith and her organization Worldwide Wisdom United, Inc. Ms. Smith's organization has distributed thousands of Learning Boards™, which are sturdy,

hand-held chalkboards containing eraser and a supply of chalk. This simple but ingenious device can mean the world of difference to a child in Afghanistan, opening up a future of economic success and self-sustainability. I commend Ms. Smith, and other Americans like her, for bravely recognizing and addressing this ongoing problem.

I am proud to have offered two important amendments to this legislation, both of which I believe will strengthen this bill and help it to achieve its intended purpose. My first amendment states that technical assistance should be provided to train national, provincial, and local governmental personnel for capacity-building purposes as it relates to education, health care, human rights (particularly women's rights), and political participation. This amendment also seeks to ensure girls complete secondary education so they are prepared and have the ability to pursue post-secondary education.

My second amendment seeks to bolster women's political participation by protecting women legislators when they return to the provinces they represent. It states that it is the sense of Congress that assistance provided to foreign countries and international organizations under this provision should be used, in part, to protect these female legislators.

This bill has many other important provisions. Key among these are programs to combat narcotics trafficking and rampant corruption. Additionally, this bill encourages greater regional cooperation. I believe this to be a vital aspect to any effort toward peace in Afghanistan, and I strongly encourage regional dialogue and the involvement of Afghanistan's neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to Afghanistan. We have pledged a commitment to Afghanistan's long-term stability. I believe that this bill is essential and urgent, and I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in support of it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Connecticut, Congressman JOE COURTNEY, distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to stand in support of the Afghan Freedom and Security Support Act.

Exactly 1 week ago, I was in Afghanistan with a congressional delegation from the Armed Services Committee and had the opportunity to see firsthand both the progress and challenges that face the people of Afghanistan. It is a land of contrasts. On the upside there is a healthy political life. President Karzai, who met with our delegation, is clearly a dynamic, moderate, engaged leader who has a national government which is clearly focused on trying to move the country forward. There are clear signs of economic life. The shops were open. There was traffic. Schools were being built. Roads are being constructed, 16 percent growth of GDP over the last couple of years and a clear commitment to strengthening and building the Afghan army and police. In fact, our delegation was present at a graduation ceremony for the Afghan national police and handed out

the diplomas to the young cadets who were taking on these important critical duties to Afghanistan's future.

There clearly are challenges, however. The reappearance of the narcotics trade; the resurgence of the Taliban; and the challenges in the border areas of Pakistan, which our military are fighting very bravely every day. Seven soldiers lost their lives the day that we were there because of the struggle that is still going on with the Taliban.

What is clearly needed, and this bill addresses it, is a strong, long-term commitment by this country to continue the efforts that have been made with our international allies, NATO allies, who were present also during our trip. French Marines, Scandinavian troops, Germans who are taking responsibility for control of some of the PRTs in the different provinces. And, clearly, lastly, most importantly, is the economic aid that is so critical to defeating the rise of the narcotics trade and defeating the Taliban. As one of the generals stated to us, where the roads end, the Taliban begins in Afghanistan.

Flying from Kabul to Jalalabad, we actually tracked a new road which was constructed by Chinese contractors that had heavy truck traffic and again showed that there were real opportunities in growth in that area which this bill will continue to build upon, and I applaud the chairman for his efforts and urge its unanimous passage.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this far-reaching bill.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, before yielding back, I would like to make just a couple of observations.

It is such a rare pleasure to manage a major bill of international significance on a bipartisan basis. Our Nation wins when Congress is united. This Congress is united on our policy with respect to Afghanistan. Just as importantly, Mr. Chairman, was my privilege some years back to point out that Afghanistan is not an American problem; it is a problem for the civilized world. And I called for NATO to take over the responsibility in Afghanistan.

NATO is now the principal operating entity on behalf of freedom and democracy in the country of Afghanistan. NATO should be performing this function. It is the greatest military alliance in the history of the world, and it is my earnest hope that, just as NATO has accepted its responsibility in the struggle in Afghanistan, it will do so in other troubled parts of the world.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this very important legislation.

During the first 6 months of 2007, this Congress has rightly spent a great deal of time debating and trying to reorient our policy in Iraq. It's important to remember that one of the chief reasons we need to leave Iraq is so that we can win the other war we've been fighting since 2001: the war against Al Qaeda and their Taliban allies in Afghanistan.

This bipartisan bill provides additional support for programs as diverse as assistance to women and girls, energy development and counter-narcotics. It authorizes \$6.435 billion for fiscal years 2008 through 2010, of which \$2.145 billion is authorized to be spent in fiscal year 2008. Let me comment on a couple of specific provisions that I think are particularly important.

This bill seeks to set standards, create performance metrics, and mandate a tightly coordinated interagency strategy for Afghanistan—the very kinds of measures that were absent in our effort in Iraq from the very beginning. Starting in December 2007 and every 6 months afterwards through September 30, 2010, this bill would require the President to submit detailed reports to Congress on the political, military, and economic progress being made—or not being made—in Afghanistan. It is long past time that Congress mandated such benchmarks so that we can know what is working in Afghanistan and make adjustments where things are not working.

This bill also mandates the creation of a special envoy to help more closely coordinate activities between those governments and the International Security Assistance Force in their joint efforts to interdict Al Qaeda and Taliban fighters who attempt to use Pakistani territory to launch attacks against civilian and military targets in Afghanistan. Pakistan's record in this area is at best mixed, and I am glad that the committee has recognized the need for our government to increase its effort to get both governments to make the borders no-go zones for insurgents.

Finally, this bill recognizes that the Taliban and Al Qaeda are not the only enemies of Afghanistan's fledgling democracy. The narcotics trade in Afghanistan is producing violence and corruption that threatens the people and government of Afghanistan just as much as the actions of the terrorists. Indeed, we know that in many cases the terrorists are using narco-trafficking to help fund their violent campaign to overthrow the Afghan government.

Weeding out potentially corrupt police who assist the drug lords and the terrorists is essential, and this bill would require that future assistance to the Afghan National Police include "vetting procedures to adequately assess each Afghan National Police candidate's aptitude, professional skills, integrity, and other qualifications that are essential to law enforcement work." This is exactly the type of framework that we have lacked in Iraq to deal with police corruption in that country, and so I'm pleased that the committee is including such a vetting requirement for Afghan police in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the day when the people of Afghanistan are free of the fear and uncertainty that decades of war and civil strife have produced in that ancient country. Let us hasten the arrival of that day by reaffirming our partnership with them by passing this bill.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2446, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007.

This bill reauthorizes the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, which has made a huge impact in the stability and security of a new democracy in that country.

Since 2002, we've seen major reconstruction of schools and infrastructure in that country, as well as the birth of a democratic nation.

Reauthorization of this bill is crucial ensuring that Afghanistan continues to strengthen its government and that its people start to feel safe and secure in a nation that has been riddled with so much violence and terrorism.

H.R. 2446 also makes some important enhancements to the original Act by dealing with a rising narcotics problem related to heroine and poppy production that is threatening to endanger Afghanistan's security.

H.R. 2446 also takes a strong step towards building international diplomacy and shared responsibility in the region with our allies.

The Act expresses the sense of Congress that greater humanitarian assistance is needed in the country for civilians, that the United Nations should play a larger role in assisting the people of Afghanistan and also provides means to train military from foreign countries to share responsibility in Afghanistan.

We also set strong benchmarks for accountability in the region by requiring more reporting, a better overall strategy for Afghanistan, and by pursuing policies that foster regional cooperation.

This bill will make Afghanistan stronger and more secure while securing our own homeland in the fight against global terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1530

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2446

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definition.

TITLE I—ECONOMIC AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN

Sec. 101. Declaration of policy.

Sec. 102. Purposes of assistance.

Sec. 103. Authorization of assistance.

Sec. 104. Certification and phased-in limitation on economic and democratic development assistance.

Sec. 105. Monitoring and evaluation of assistance.

Sec. 106. Coordination of assistance.

Sec. 107. Pilot program to provide scholarships to Afghan students for public policy internships in the United States.

Sec. 108. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 109. Clerical amendment.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE FOR A NEW SECURITY FRAMEWORK FOR AFGHANISTAN

Subtitle A—Amendments to the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002

Sec. 201. Authorization of assistance.

Sec. 202. Congressional notification requirements.

Sec. 203. Matters relating to the International Security Assistance Force.

Sec. 204. Sunset.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Sec. 211. Counter-narcotics activities in Afghanistan.

Sec. 212. Expansion of international contributions to the security of Afghanistan.

Sec. 213. Training for military personnel of foreign countries that are to be deployed for security operations in Afghanistan.

Sec. 214. Humanitarian assistance for war victims.

Sec. 215. Sense of Congress concerning United Nations mandate in Afghanistan.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Donor contributions to Afghanistan and reports.

Sec. 302. Report on progress toward security and stability in Afghanistan.

Sec. 303. Comprehensive interagency strategy for long-term security and stability in Afghanistan.

Sec. 304. Special envoy for Afghanistan-Pakistan cooperation.

Sec. 305. Transit through Pakistan of shipments by India in support of reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan.

Sec. 306. Reauthorization of Radio Free Afghanistan.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Nearly six years after the liberation of Afghanistan from the Taliban, who provided Osama Bin-Laden and Al-Qaeda with a safe haven for planning the attacks of September 11, 2001, Afghanistan remains highly unstable and the Government of President Hamid Karzai remains subject to attacks from remnants of the Taliban who have regrouped along with other insurgent groups, including some foreign fighters associated with Al-Qaeda.

(2) The Government of Afghanistan supports the continued deployment of international forces to supplement its own nascent national security forces, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which took over international stability operations for the entire country on October 5, 2006, must show continued commitment to these operations in order to assist Afghanistan in defeating the growing insurgency in rural areas of Afghanistan.

(3) The current United States counter-narcotics strategy for Afghanistan has not produced significant results, in part due to a failure to seek out and capture high-level warlords and kingpins who control the flow of illicit narcotics and because sufficient sustainable alternatives have not been provided to Afghan farmers who suffer from a lack of access to microfinance facilities, financial services, and land rights and whose crops are subject to eradication.

(4) In some cases, the misaligned eradication policy endorsed by the United States Government has led adversely-affected Afghan farmers and villagers to support insurgent groups, including the Taliban.

(5) The violence and instability in Afghanistan is further exacerbated by the flourishing trade in opium and opium-related crops, which has reached record levels and which fuel local militias, corrupts the national and local governments, and provides funding for insurgent and terrorist groups.

(6) The United States and the international community must continue to support Afghanistan both through increased support for its national and local police forces, the Afghan National Army, and Afghan counter-narcotics operations.

(7) The United States and the international community must also continue to support the growth of the Afghan economy through

foreign assistance and other means because Afghanistan remains one of the poorest countries in the world and economic growth is impeded by the lingering remnants of 25 years of civil war and occupation and the ongoing instability since December 2001, including the growing illicit drug economy.

(8) The United States and the international community must also continue to show a long-term commitment to support the promotion of democracy and the protection of human rights in Afghanistan, including increased assistance for the rule of law, freedom of the press, freedom of association, freedom of religion, and other measures of good governance.

(9) From January 31 to February 1, 2006, the Government of Afghanistan and the international community issued the Afghanistan Compact, which sets forth both the international community's commitment to Afghanistan and Afghanistan's commitment to state-building and reform over the next five years.

(10) The Afghanistan Compact, which supports the Afghan National Development Strategy, provides a strategy for building an effective, accountable state in Afghanistan, with goals and standards set forth in the Afghanistan Compact for improvements in security, governance, and development, including measures for reducing the narcotics economy, promoting regional cooperation, and making aid more effective. The Afghanistan Compact also established a mechanism to monitor Afghanistan and the international community's adherence to the timelines, goals, and objectives set forth in the document.

(11) The security of Afghanistan is closely intertwined with those of its regional neighbors and success in Afghanistan, both economic and political, will be dependent on security and stability in the region.

(12) The recent closure of four refugee camps in Pakistan and the deportation of Afghans from Iran have resulted in over 200,000 Afghan refugees repatriating to Afghanistan who will require urgent humanitarian services.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this Act, except as otherwise provided, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(b) AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c) of section 1 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7501 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Except as otherwise provided, 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) GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN.—The term ‘Government of Afghanistan’ includes—

“(A) the government of any political subdivision of Afghanistan; and

“(B) any agency or instrumentality of the Government of Afghanistan.

“(3) INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE FORCE OR ISAF.—The term ‘International Security Assistance Force’ or ‘ISAF’ means the international security assistance force established to assist in the maintenance of security in Afghanistan pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1386 (2001), as amended by United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1413 (2002), 1444

(2002), 1510 (2003), 1563 (2004), 1623 (2005), and 1707 (2006).”.

TITLE I—ECONOMIC AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN

SEC. 101. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

Section 101 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7511) is amended by striking paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(4) While the election of a President and the establishment of a National Parliament for Afghanistan concluded the process begun in December 5, 2001, in Bonn, Germany, the United States needs to continue to work with the Government of Afghanistan and other friendly countries to ensure that Afghanistan's neighboring countries and other countries in the region do not threaten or interfere in one another's sovereignty, territorial integrity, or political independence, including supporting diplomatic initiatives to support this goal for the establishment of an independent and neutral Afghanistan.

“(5) The United States must continue to demonstrate a long-term commitment to the people of Afghanistan by sustained assistance and the continued deployment of United States troops in Afghanistan with the support of the Government of Afghanistan as Afghanistan continues on its path toward a broad-based, multi-ethnic, gender-sensitive, and fully representative government in Afghanistan.

“(6) To foster stability and democratization and to effectively eliminate the causes of terrorism, the United States and the international community should also support efforts that advance the development of democratic civil authorities and institutions in Afghanistan's neighboring countries and throughout the Central Asia and South Asia regions.

“(7) While rampant corruption has impeded development and economic growth in Afghanistan and contributed to insecurity in the country, the United States should support all efforts to fight corruption in all levels of government in Afghanistan and assist in promoting an efficient and effective Government of Afghanistan.”.

SEC. 102. PURPOSES OF ASSISTANCE.

Section 102 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7512) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “the humanitarian crisis” and inserting “the continuing humanitarian needs”;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “heroin, and to” and inserting “heroin, to”;

(B) by adding at the end before the semicolon the following: “, and to establish a pilot program to test the effectiveness of a crop substitution combined with an appropriate offset policy and to provide practical information on the measures needed to implement such a policy with the potential of scaling up the pilot program for large-scale deployment”;

(3) in paragraph (7), by inserting “, the energy sector” after “the agriculture sector”.

SEC. 103. AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) CONTINUING HUMANITARIAN NEEDS.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 103 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7513) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “URGENT” and inserting “CONTINUING”;

(2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “urgent” and inserting “continuing”.

(b) COUNTER-NARCOTICS EFFORTS.—Subsection (a)(3) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i) of subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “To assist in” and inserting “To assist in the apprehension of individuals

who organize, facilitate, and profit from the drug trade.”; and

(B) by inserting “, including the destruction of drug laboratories” after “heroin production”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) To establish a pilot program to test the effectiveness of a crop substitution combined with an appropriate offset to encourage legitimate alternatives to poppy production for Afghan poppy farmers within an area in which poppy production is prevalent, such as in the Helmand or Nangarhar provinces, by providing—

“(i) seeds for alternative crops for which there is internal market demand and in an areas in which there is adequate infrastructure for access to market;

“(ii) technical assistance to such Afghan poppy farmers on how to best plant, grow, and harvest the alternative crops utilized; and

“(iii) an appropriate offset that would significantly address the difference in income that such Afghan poppy farmers would otherwise earn had they continued to grow and sell poppy.”;

(4) in subparagraph (C) (as redesignated)—

(A) by striking “(B)” and inserting “(B)(i)”;

(B) by striking “2003 through 2006” and inserting “2008 through 2010”;

(C) by striking the last sentence; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

“(ii) For each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010, \$10,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out activities described in subparagraph (B).

“(iii) Amounts made available under clauses (i) and (ii) are in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.”;

(5) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007, and every 180 days thereafter through the end of fiscal year 2010, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the status of the implementation of the activities described in subparagraph (B). The report required by this subparagraph may be included in the report required by section 304 of this Act.”.

(c) REESTABLISHMENT OF FOOD SECURITY, REHABILITATION OF THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR, IMPROVEMENT IN HEALTH CONDITIONS, AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF BASIC INFRASTRUCTURE.—Subsection (a)(4) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(B) increased access to credit, savings, and other financial services and to farm management and business advisory services.”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (K), (L), and (M) as subparagraphs (M), (N), and (O), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following new subparagraphs:

“(K) programs to train medical personnel, including doctors, nurses, physicians' assistants, and midwives;

“(L) programs to provide equipment to primary and secondary clinics and hospitals.”;

(4) in subparagraph (N) (as redesignated), by striking “and” at the end;

(5) in subparagraph (O) (as redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(6) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(P) rebuilding and constructing rural and urban roads and highways, including secondary and tertiary road systems.”

(d) EDUCATION, THE RULE OF LAW, ANTI-CORRUPTION, AND RELATED ISSUES.—Subsection (a)(5) of such section is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “, ANTI-CORRUPTION” after “THE RULE OF LAW”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking clause (v);

(B) by redesignating clauses (vi) through (viii) as clauses (v) through (vii), respectively;

(C) in clause (vi) (as redesignated), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) in clause (vii) (as redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

“(viii) support for the implementation of the Afghan Action Plan on Transitional Justice, including examination of abuses by all parties as specified by the document with a view to establishing truth, reconciliation, and justice; and

“(ix) support for land titling programs and reconciliation of land rights.”;

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) ANTI-CORRUPTION ASSISTANCE.—To combat corruption, improve transparency and accountability, increase the participatory nature of governmental institutions, and promote other forms of good governance and management in all levels of government in Afghanistan, including assistance such as—

“(i) providing technical assistance to the Government of Afghanistan to assist in the efforts to ratify the United Nations Convention against Corruption and assistance in creating implementation legislation and a monitoring mechanism to oversee implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption;

“(ii) supporting the establishment of audit offices, inspectors general offices, third party monitoring of government procurement processes, and anti-corruption agencies;

“(iii) promoting legal and judicial reforms that criminalize corruption and law enforcement reforms and development that encourage prosecutions of corruption;

“(iv) providing technical assistance to develop a legal framework for commercial transactions that fosters business practices that promote transparent, ethical, and competitive behavior in the economic sector, such as commercial codes that incorporate international standards and protection of core labor standards;

“(v) providing training and technical assistance relating to drafting of anti-corruption, privatization, and competitive statutory and administrative codes, and providing technical assistance to Afghan governmental ministries implementing anti-corruption laws and regulations;

“(vi) promoting the development of regulations relating to financial disclosure for public officials, political parties, and candidates for public offices;

“(vii) supporting transparent budgeting processes and financial management systems; and

“(viii) promoting civil society’s role in combating corruption.”.

(e) ASSISTANCE TO WOMEN AND GIRLS.—Subsection (a)(7) of such section is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking clauses (i) through (xii) and inserting the following new clauses:

“(i) to provide equipment, medical supplies, and other assistance to health care facilities for the purpose of reducing maternal and infant mortality and morbidity;

“(ii) to expand immunization programs for women and children;

“(iii) to establish and expand programs to provide services to women and girls suffering from mental illness problems, such as depression, anxiety, and posttraumatic stress disorder;

“(iv) to protect and provide services to vulnerable populations, including widows, orphans, and women head of households;

“(v) to develop and implement programs to protect women and girls against sexual and physical abuse, abduction, trafficking, exploitation, and sex discrimination, including emergency shelters for women and girls who face danger from violence;

“(vi) to establish primary and secondary schools for girls that include mathematics, science, and languages in their primary curriculum;

“(vii) to expand technical and vocational training programs to enable women to support themselves and their families;

“(viii) to maintain and expand adult literacy programs, including economic literacy programs that promote the well-being of women and their families;

“(ix) to provide special educational opportunities for girls whose schooling was ended by the Taliban and who now face obstacles to participating in the normal education system, such as girls who are now married and girls who are older than the normal age for their classes;

“(x) to disseminate information throughout Afghanistan on international standards for human rights, particularly as pertaining to women;

“(xi) to provide information and assistance to enable women to exercise property, inheritance, and voting rights, and to ensure equal access to the judicial system;

“(xii) to support the work of women-led and local nongovernmental organizations with demonstrated experience in delivering services to women and children in Afghanistan;

“(xiii) to monitor and investigate violations against women and to provide legal assistance to women who have suffered violations of their rights;

“(xiv) to increase political and civic participation of women in all levels of society, including the criminal justice system;

“(xv) to provide information and training related to human rights, particularly as pertaining to women, to military, police, and legal personnel; and

“(xvi) to provide assistance to the Ministry of Women’s Affairs and the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission for programs to advance the status of women.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), to read as follows:

“(B) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—For each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010—

“(i) \$5,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the President to be made available to the Afghan Ministry of Women’s Affairs for the administration and conduct of its programs;

“(ii) \$10,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the President to be made available to the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission for the administration and conduct of its programs; and

“(iii) \$30,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the President for grants to Afghan-led nongovernmental organizations, including Afghan women-led nongovernmental organizations, to support activities including the construction, establishment, and operation of schools for married girls and girls’ orphanages, vocational training for women and girls, primary health care clinics for

women and children, programs to strengthen Afghan women-led organizations and women’s leadership, and to provide monthly financial assistance to widows, orphans, and women head of households.”.

(f) ASSISTANCE FOR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND SHORT-TERM ENERGY SUPPLY.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(8) ASSISTANCE FOR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.—To support the development of local energy sources, new power generation, and energy transportation, including further development of existing hydrological power sources, studies of the utility of geothermal energy, expansion of local natural gas fields for internal consumption and export, and transport of natural gas or other appropriate energy sources to Afghanistan’s neighboring countries.

“(9) ASSISTANCE FOR SHORT-TERM ENERGY SUPPLY.—

“(A) ASSISTANCE OBJECTIVES.—To provide assistance for the supply of short-term energy resources such as diesel to secure the delivery of electricity to major Afghan cities.

“(B) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—For each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010, \$75,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out this paragraph.

“(C) RELATION TO OTHER AVAILABLE FUNDS.—Amounts made available under subparagraph (B) are in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.”.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON OPIC ACTIVITIES.—It is the sense of Congress that the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should, in accordance with its mandate to foster private investment and enhance the ability of private enterprise to make its full contribution to international development, exercise its authorities under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2191 et seq.) to further increase efforts to promote and support United States-sponsored private investment in the energy sector in Afghanistan, including—

(A) issuing loans, guaranties, and insurance, to support energy infrastructure reconstruction and development; and

(B) undertaking a special initiative that includes—

(i) sending a needs assessment team to Afghanistan to determine ways in which the Corporation can best support the essential investment required to restore the energy infrastructure in Afghanistan;

(ii) engaging in an exhaustive outreach program to involve United States business in energy development in Afghanistan and exploring potential new public-private partnerships, supported by the Corporation, which will assist Afghanistan in developing its energy sector; and

(iii) consulting and coordinating with the Government of Afghanistan and regional governments and international financial institutions to promote private investment in the energy sector.

(g) ASSISTANCE FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING.—Subsection (a) of such section, as amended by subsection (f)(1) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) ASSISTANCE FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING.—To increase the capacity and improve the sustainability of national, provincial, and local governmental institutions, including assistance such as—

“(A) providing technical assistance to all ministries through funding to the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund to improve transparency and ability to respond to the needs of the Afghan people;

“(B) promoting the implementation of fiscal and personnel management, including revenue tracking and expenditure systems;

“(C) assisting in developing ministry-wide recruitment systems;

“(D) creating or improving databases and other human resource information systems;

“(E) supporting the expansion of the Afghan National Solidarity Project and other provincial and local-led development projects;

“(F) providing training and technical assistance to the Ministry of Finance to better account for funding to the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund and other funds implemented by the Government of Afghanistan;

“(G) supporting the Afghanistan Independent Administrative Reform and Civil Service Commission; and

“(H) providing financial and technical assistance to support the Transition Support Strategy for Afghanistan, including the Public Administration Reform project.”.

(h) **LIMITATION.**—Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended by striking “adopting a constitution and”.

(i) **MONITORING OF ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN; REPORT.**—Subsection (d)(1)(A) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The report required by this paragraph may be included in the report required by section 304 of this Act.”.

SEC. 104. CERTIFICATION AND PHASED-IN LIMITATION ON ECONOMIC AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.

Title I of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7511 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 104 through 108 as sections 105 through 109, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 103 the following new section:

“SEC. 104. CERTIFICATION AND PHASED-IN LIMITATION ON UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN.

“(a) **CERTIFICATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than October 1, 2008 and each October 1 thereafter, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that contains a determination of whether or not, based upon substantiated and credible evidence, any senior official of the Government of Afghanistan, at the provincial or local levels, is engaged in or benefits from the illicit narcotics trade or is engaged in terrorist or criminal activities, including the names of any such senior officials and the provincial or local governments over which such senior officials exercise authority.

“(2) **FORM.**—The certification required by paragraph (1) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

“(b) **LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.**—For fiscal year 2009 and each subsequent fiscal year, assistance authorized under this title or under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) may not be provided to a provincial or local government of Afghanistan if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees pursuant to subsection (a) for such fiscal year that, based upon substantiated and credible evidence, one or more senior officials from such provincial or local government is engaged in or benefits from the narcotics trade or is engaged in terrorist or criminal activities.”.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF ASSISTANCE.

Title I of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7511 et seq.), as amended by section 104 of this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 105 through 109 (as redesignated) as sections 106 through 110, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 104 the following new section:

“SEC. 105. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF ASSISTANCE.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall establish and implement a system to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of assistance provided under this title on a program-by-program basis in order to maximize the long-term sustainable development impact of such assistance.

“(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the President shall—

“(1) establish performance goals for assistance authorized under this title and expresses such goals in an objective and quantifiable form, to the extent practicable;

“(2) establish performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the achievement of the performance goals described in paragraph (1); and

“(3) provide a basis for recommendations for adjustments to assistance authorized under this title to enhance the impact of such assistance.

“(c) **ASSISTANCE TO ENHANCE THE CAPACITY OF AFGHANISTAN.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the President shall provide assistance to enhance the capacity of the Government of Afghanistan to monitor and evaluate programs carried out by the national, provincial, and local governments in Afghanistan in order to maximize the long-term sustainable development impact of such programs.

“(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 110 for a fiscal year, not less than 5 percent of such amounts are authorized to be made available to carry out this section for such fiscal year.”.

SEC. 106. COORDINATION OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) **CONGRESSIONAL FINDING.**—Congress finds that the coordinator of assistance provided for in section 106 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (as redesignated) has not achieved the objectives of an integrated approach to United States assistance programs for Afghanistan.

(b) **APPOINTMENT OF COORDINATOR.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a coordinator who shall report directly to the President. The coordinator shall not hold any other position within the United States Government and shall have the rank and status of Ambassador.

(c) **DUTIES OF COORDINATOR.**—The coordinator shall be responsible for—

(1) designing an overall non-military strategy, in coordination with the heads of relevant United States Government departments and agencies, to advance United States interests in Afghanistan, including policy coordination relating to counter-narcotics efforts, reconstruction and development, and activities to equip and train the Afghan National Security Forces;

(2) ensuring policy coordination among relevant United States Government departments and agencies in carrying out the strategy described in paragraph (1);

(3) pursuing coordination with other countries and international organizations with respect to assistance for Afghanistan;

(4) coordinating the implementation and oversight by relevant United States Government departments and agencies for assist-

ance for Afghanistan described in paragraph (1);

(5) resolving policy disputes among relevant United States Government departments and agencies with respect to United States assistance for Afghanistan described in paragraph (1);

(6) ensuring policy coordination among relevant United States Government departments and agencies for counter-narcotics efforts and coordinating the implementation of such policies, including by facilitating the access of certain departments and agencies to sensitive sites in Afghanistan, where practicable, for the purpose of conducting critical counter-narcotics operations; and

(7) ensuring coordination among the United States, the Government of Afghanistan, the United Kingdom, and other international partners that are supporting counter-narcotics efforts, reconstruction and development, and activities to equip and train the Afghan National Security Forces in Afghanistan.

(d) **DEPUTY COORDINATORS.**—The coordinator may appoint up to two deputy coordinators to assist the coordinator with the duties of the coordinator described in subsection (c), including duties relating to counter-narcotics, reconstruction and development, or equipping and training of Afghan National Security Forces. A deputy coordinator shall not hold any other position within the United States Government.

(e) **REPEAL.**—Section 106 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (as redesignated by sections 104 and 105 of this Act), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 107. PILOT PROGRAM TO PROVIDE SCHOLARSHIPS TO AFGHAN STUDENTS FOR PUBLIC POLICY INTERNSHIPS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Title I of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7511 et seq.), as amended by sections 104 and 105 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 105 (as redesignated) the following new section:

“SEC. 106. PILOT PROGRAM TO PROVIDE SCHOLARSHIPS TO AFGHAN STUDENTS FOR PUBLIC POLICY INTERNSHIPS IN THE UNITED STATES.

“(a) **PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of State shall establish a pilot program to provide scholarships to undergraduate and graduate students in Afghanistan for public policy internships in the United States to improve the ability of such students to increase the capacity of the Government of Afghanistan. The pilot program required by this subsection shall be carried out as part of the educational and cultural exchange programs of the Department of State under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.).

“(b) **SCOPE OF PILOT PROGRAM.**—It is the sense of Congress that 20 students should participate in the pilot program required by subsection (a) for each fiscal year during which the pilot program is in effect.

“(c) **PERIOD OF PILOT PROGRAM.**—The pilot program required by subsection (a) shall be in effect during each of the fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010.”.

SEC. 108. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **AMENDMENTS.**—Subsection (a) of section 110 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (as redesignated) is amended—

(1) by striking “such sums as may be necessary” and inserting “\$1,600,000,000”; and

(2) by striking “2005 and 2006” and inserting “2008 through 2010”.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect the availability of funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under section 108 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22

U.S.C. 7518) before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 109. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7501 note) is amended by striking the items relating to sections 104 through 108 and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 104. Certification and phased-in limitation on United States economic and democratic development assistance for Afghanistan

“Sec. 105. Monitoring and evaluation of assistance

“Sec. 106. Pilot program to provide scholarships to Afghan students for public policy internships in the United States.

“Sec. 107. Sense of Congress regarding promoting cooperation in opium producing areas.

“Sec. 108. Administrative provisions.

“Sec. 109. Relationship to other authority.

“Sec. 110. Authorization of appropriations.”

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE FOR A NEW SECURITY FRAMEWORK FOR AFGHANISTAN
Subtitle A—Amendments to the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) EXTENSION OF DRAWDOWN AUTHORITY.—Subsection (b) of section 202 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7532) is amended by striking “\$550,000,000” and inserting “300,000,000 in any fiscal year”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that assistance provided to eligible foreign countries and international organizations under subsection (a) should promote greater interoperability with and among the military forces of the International Security Assistance Force, the United States, and the Government of Afghanistan.”

SEC. 202. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

Subsection (a) of section 205 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7535) is amended by striking “the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate” and inserting “the appropriate congressional committees”.

SEC. 203. MATTERS RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE FORCE.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGY.—Section 206 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7536) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and
 (2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(b) REPORTS ON EFFORTS TO EXPAND INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING AND SECURITY OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN.—Subsection (c)(1)(B) of such section (as redesignated) is amended in the first sentence, by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

(c) ARMS SALES INCENTIVE FOR COOPERATING NATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) ARMS SALES INCENTIVE FOR COOPERATING NATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to provide a subsidy of up to five percent of the total acquisition cost of defense articles and defense services sold pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) to a country if—

“(A) the country will use such defense articles and defense services in Afghanistan, or

“(B) the country will use defense articles and defense services of comparable quality and quantity in Afghanistan, in support of operations in Afghanistan for an extended period of time.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘defense article’ has the meaning given the term in paragraph (3) of section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794 note); and

“(B) the term ‘defense service’ has the meaning given the term in paragraph (4) of such section.

“(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010.”

SEC. 204. SUNSET.

Section 209 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7538) is amended by striking “2006” and inserting “2010”.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 211. COUNTER-NARCOTICS ACTIVITIES IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) SUPPORT FOR COUNTER-NARCOTICS INTERDICTION OPERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Secretary of Defense, shall direct the United States Armed Forces to continue to support counter-narcotics interdiction operations in Afghanistan, consistent with ongoing operational activities and the Department of Defense’s counter-narcotics strategy for Afghanistan.

(2) COORDINATION.—Such operations shall be conducted in coordination with the Government of Afghanistan and in coordination with any support for counter-narcotics interdiction operations provided by the United Kingdom and other appropriate countries.

(3) TYPES OF ACTIVITIES.—Such operations shall include—

(A) intelligence, surveillance, and information sharing;

(B) logistical support, to the extent practicable in light of ongoing operational activities, for interdiction efforts; and

(C) training and equipping the Afghan National Police, consistent with existing law.

(b) SPECIAL COUNTER-NARCOTICS INTERDICTION TEAMS.—The President shall enhance existing civilian special counter-narcotics interdiction teams and, in addition, such counter-narcotics interdiction teams shall, to the extent practicable in light of ongoing operational activities, receive the support described in subsection (a).

(c) PARTICIPATION OF FOREIGN COUNTER-NARCOTICS LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.—Counter-narcotics law enforcement personnel of NATO and other friendly countries may participate in the formation and operation of the counter-narcotics interdiction teams described in subsection (b) or other counter-narcotics operations in Afghanistan that are supported by the United States.

(d) VETTING OF CANDIDATES FOR THE AFGHAN NATIONAL POLICE.—The President shall ensure that assistance for the Afghan National Police include vetting procedures to adequately assess each Afghan National Police candidate’s aptitude, professional skills, integrity, and other qualifications that are essential to law enforcement work.

SEC. 212. EXPANSION OF INTERNATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SECURITY OF AFGHANISTAN.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that the President shall encourage the Governments of Pakistan and friendly Arab countries to increase reconstruction assistance to, and diplomatic support for, the Government of Afghanistan.

(b) PAKISTAN AND AFGHANISTAN MILITARY COOPERATION.—The President shall encourage the Governments of Pakistan and Af-

ghanistan to engage in greater military cooperation to promote greater trust and transparency between them, including greater communication and coordination between their respective military, border security, and counter-narcotic units operating on both sides of the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every six months thereafter until September 30, 2008, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of subsections (a) and (b). The report required by this subsection may be included in the report required by section 304 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (as amended by section 302 of this Act).

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 213. TRAINING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES THAT ARE TO BE DEPLOYED FOR SECURITY OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN.

Chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 550. TRAINING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES THAT ARE TO BE DEPLOYED FOR SECURITY OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN.

“(a) TRAINING AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to furnish training under this chapter for military personnel of foreign countries that are to be deployed for security operations in Afghanistan, particularly in the areas of special operations, counter-insurgency, border security, counter-terrorism, and counter-narcotics.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010. Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this subsection are in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.”

SEC. 214. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR WAR VICTIMS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should be commended for and should continue ongoing programs regarding assistance to innocent Afghan individuals or families of Afghan civilians who have suffered a serious loss during military operations conducted by United States forces.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the feasibility of expanding programs of assistance described in subsection (a) to include—

(1) the provision of special additional assistance to families of Afghan civilians who were injured or killed during such operations and who were the primary source of income for such families;

(2) the provision of assistance in excess of \$2,500 to families of Afghan civilians described in subsection (a); and

(3) the provision of other payments that might be required as a result of ongoing military operations in Afghanistan.

SEC. 215. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING UNITED NATIONS MANDATE IN AFGHANISTAN.

It is the sense of Congress that the United Nations Security Council should expand the United Nations mandate in Afghanistan to—

(1) authorize international civilian law enforcement missions in Afghanistan as a part of peace operations of the United Nations in Afghanistan;

(2) authorize the International Security Assistance Force to conduct counter-drug interdiction operations, consistent with ongoing operational activities and as opportunities arise, against the top narcotic traffickers, their operations, and their infrastructure in Afghanistan, with the concurrence of the Government of Afghanistan;

(3) install effective centralized authority within the United Nations Special Representative for Afghanistan such that the international community's political objectives can be prioritized and communicated directly with the Government of Afghanistan; and

(4) extend the authorization of the International Security Assistance Force beyond October 13, 2007.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO AFGHANISTAN AND REPORTS.

Subsection (c)(1) of section 303 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7553) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives” and inserting “the appropriate congressional committees”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “December 31, 2004” and inserting “December 31, 2010”.

SEC. 302. REPORT ON PROGRESS TOWARD SECURITY AND STABILITY IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7551 et seq.) is amended by striking section 304 and inserting the following new section:

“SEC. 304. REPORT ON PROGRESS TOWARD SECURITY AND STABILITY IN AFGHANISTAN.

“(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than December 1, 2007, and every six months thereafter until September 30, 2010, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on a comprehensive set of performance indicators and measures for progress toward security and stability in Afghanistan.

“(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) With respect to stability and security in Afghanistan, the following:

“(A) Key measures of political stability, including the important political objectives that must be achieved over the next year to ensure that all segments of Afghan society become committed to the elected government in Kabul.

“(B) The primary indicators of a stable security environment in Afghanistan, such as the following:

“(i) The number of engagements per day by each of the following:

“(I) The Afghan forces, United States forces, and other Coalition forces.

“(II) ISAF.

“(ii) The numbers of trained Afghan security forces, including the Afghan National Army and the Afghan National Police.

“(iii) The trends relating to numbers and types of ethnic and religious-based hostile encounters.

“(C) An assessment of the estimated strength of the insurgency in Afghanistan and the extent to which it is composed of non-Afghan fighters, including whether insurgents are obtaining weapons and other

military material from outside of Afghanistan and whether the insurgents are based in or use the territory of countries other than Afghanistan.

“(D) A description of the extent to which warlords in Afghanistan exercise effective control over personnel, natural resources, infrastructure, villages and towns, and material that should be under the direct sovereign control of the Government of Afghanistan, including—

“(i) an identification of each warlord and the extent and means of control that the warlord exercises over personnel, natural resources, infrastructure, villages and towns, and material that should be under the direct sovereign control of the Government of Afghanistan; and

“(ii) a description of actions undertaken by the Governments of the United States, Afghanistan, and countries participating in ISAF, individually or collectively, in the previous year to diminish and ultimately eliminate control by each warlord identified under clause (i) over the Afghan resources described in clause (i), and a description of actions that will be undertaken in the coming year.

“(E) A description of all militias, tribal forces, and terrorist and insurgent groups operating in Afghanistan, including the number, size, equipment strength, military effectiveness, sources of support, legal status, and efforts to disarm or reintegrate such militias, tribal forces, and terrorist and insurgent groups.

“(F) Efforts by ISAF to establish a unified command, unified rules of engagement, information detailing the specific restrictions placed by each country participating in ISAF, or any successor coalition force, on the military activities of its national military personnel within Afghanistan, an assessment of the impact of such restrictions on ISAF's effectiveness, and an assessment of the capabilities of ISAF forces, including any equipment and logistics shortages.

“(2) With respect to the training and performance of security forces in Afghanistan, the following:

“(A) The training provided to Afghan military and other Ministry of Defense forces and the equipment used by such forces.

“(B) Key criteria for assessing the capabilities and readiness of the Afghan National Army and other Ministry of Defense forces, including capability and readiness levels, including recruiting, training, and equipping such forces.

“(C) The operational readiness status of the Afghan National Army, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of Afghan battalions that are—

“(i) capable of conducting operations independently;

“(ii) capable of conducting operations with the support of United States or Coalition forces or ISAF; or

“(iii) not ready to conduct operations.

“(D) The rates of recruitment, retention, and absenteeism in the Afghan National Army and the extent to which insurgents have infiltrated such forces.

“(E) The training provided to Afghan National Police and other Ministry of Interior forces and the equipment used by such forces.

“(F) Key criteria for assessing the capabilities and readiness of the Afghan National Police and other Ministry of Interior forces, including capability and readiness levels, including recruiting, training, and equipping such forces, including—

“(i) the number of police recruits that have received classroom or field instruction and the duration of such instruction;

“(ii) the number of experienced veteran police officers who have received classroom and

field instruction and the duration of such instruction;

“(iii) a description of any vetting that police candidates receive, the number of candidates vetted, the number of candidates derived from other entry procedures, and the success rates of those groups of candidates;

“(iv) the number of Afghan National Police forces that have received field training by international police trainers and the duration of such training; and

“(v) attrition rates and measures of absenteeism and infiltration by insurgents.

“(G) The estimated total number of Afghan National Army battalions needed for the Army to perform duties now being undertaken by United States, NATO, or Coalition forces, including securing the borders of Afghanistan and providing adequate levels of law and order throughout Afghanistan.

“(H) The effectiveness of the Afghan military and police officer cadres and the chain of command.

“(I) The number of United States and Coalition trainers, advisors, and mentors needed to support the Afghan security and associated ministries.

“(J) An assessment, in a classified annex if necessary, of United States military requirements, including planned force rotations, through the end of calendar year 2008.

“(3) With respect to the economic and political stability of Afghanistan, the following:

“(A) An estimate of the annual budget for the Government of Afghanistan for the Afghan fiscal year, including the costs of operating and maintaining the Afghan security forces.

“(B) An estimate of the amount of Afghan Government revenue and the amount of international assistance for budget support for the Afghan Government.

“(C) An estimate of the amount of funds pledged by all major donors for the calendar year and the amounts committed, obligated, and expended during the reporting period.

“(D) An assessment of United States reconstruction assistance programs in Afghanistan, including—

“(i) a description of existing efforts to improve the monitoring and evaluation of the reconstruction assistance programs, including from the design of such programs through implementation and eventual transfer to the Government of Afghanistan;

“(ii) a description, by project, of ongoing and future reconstruction assistance programs and the amount of funding obligated and expended to carry out such programs, including programs in the security, rule of law, counter-narcotics, power, rural development, education, health, and governance and anti-corruption sectors;

“(iii) an analysis of completed reconstruction assistance programs, on a project basis, and a determination of the impact of and the benefits yielded from such programs on Afghanistan and its people;

“(iv) a description of ongoing efforts that have improved the employment situation in Afghanistan, including efforts that have created job opportunities and increased private sector development; and

“(v) a description of the progress made in implementing all of the elements of the Interim Afghanistan National Development Strategy, including—

“(I) the Afghanistan National Solidarity Program; and

“(II) the Afghanistan Compact, including a description of the goals and objectives in the Afghanistan Compact that have been achieved.

“(E) Key indicators of economic and political development activity that should be

considered the most important for determining the prospects of stability in Afghanistan, including—

- “(i) unemployment levels;
- “(ii) agricultural production;
- “(iii) construction of roads, irrigation, and other basic infrastructure;
- “(iv) education rates, particularly of girls;
- “(v) electricity rates;
- “(vi) hunger and poverty levels;
- “(vii) illiteracy rates;
- “(viii) maternal and infant mortality rates;
- “(ix) appropriate measures for the protection of human rights;
- “(x) appropriate measures for the protection of political and religious freedom and freedom of association;
- “(xi) access of women to political and civil society participation; and
- “(xii) appropriate measure for the protection of freedom of the press.

“(4) With respect to opium production and counter-narcotics activities in Afghanistan, the following:

“(A) An estimate of the number of hectares and amount of poppy production for the current year, including by province.

“(B) The number of hectares and the amount of poppy destroyed by eradication.

“(C) The number of counter-narcotics raids against drug labs, storage facilities, and caches, including the number of narcotics confiscated.

“(D) The number of raids against narcotics traffickers and the number of traffickers arrested, prosecuted, convicted, sentenced, and extradited, including high-value targets.

“(E) The number of Afghan counter-narcotics forces, including the Afghan National Counter-Narcotics Police, trained and equipped, the attrition rate of such forces, and the number of such forces available for counter-narcotics operations, including an assessment of the number of operations such forces conducted, the outcomes of such operations, and any additional resource needs of such forces.

“(F) The number and type of alternative livelihood programs, a description of where such programs have been conducted, and an assessment of the number of hectares planted with poppy in the year following such programs.

“(G) The amount and type of NATO and United States assistance provided to Afghan counter-narcotic teams in conducting raids and investigations, including close-air support and helicopter lift, and the number and type of requests for assistance by United States or Afghan counter-narcotics teams.

“(H) An assessment of Afghan efforts to extradite suspects to the United States and other countries, including—

“(i) a list of the persons whose extradition has been requested from Afghanistan, indicating—

“(I) those individuals who have been surrendered to the custody of United States authorities;

“(II) those individuals who have been detained by the authorities and who are being processed for extradition;

“(III) those individuals who have been detained by the authorities and who are not yet being processed for extradition; and

“(IV) those individuals who are at large;

“(ii) a determination of whether Afghan Government officials and entities receiving assistance from the United States are making good-faith efforts to ensure the prompt extradition of each of the persons sought by United States authorities; and

“(iii) an analysis of any legal obstacles in the laws of Afghanistan regarding prompt extradition of persons sought by United States authorities and the steps taken by authorities of the United States and the au-

thorities of Afghanistan to overcome such obstacles.

“(c) UPDATE OF REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the transmission of each report required by subsection (a), the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees an update of the report, to the extent necessary.

“(d) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex, if necessary.

“(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

“(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7501 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 304 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 304. Report on progress toward security and stability in Afghanistan.”.

SEC. 303. COMPREHENSIVE INTERAGENCY STRATEGY FOR LONG-TERM SECURITY AND STABILITY IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 305 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7555) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “submit such strategy” and all that follows and inserting “submit such strategy to the appropriate congressional committees.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) COMPREHENSIVE INTERAGENCY STRATEGY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall formulate a comprehensive interagency strategy for long-term security and stability in Afghanistan which, in addition to the specific and measurable goals specified in subsection (a)(2), shall be composed of the elements specified in paragraph (2).

“(2) ELEMENTS.—The comprehensive interagency strategy required by paragraph (1) shall contain the following elements:

“(A) REINVIGORATED RECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AND PROVINCIAL RECONSTRUCTION TEAMS.—A comprehensive interagency reconstruction strategy for Afghanistan, including objectives for the strategy, a plan to implement the objectives of the strategy, and a long-term budget to carry out the strategy. The strategy shall—

“(i) include a plan to implement all of the elements of the Interim Afghanistan National Development Strategy, including the Afghanistan National Solidarity Program, and the Afghanistan Compact, including a description of the goals and objectives that have yet to be achieved, and the impediments in achieving such goals and objectives;

“(ii) include a mechanism for tracking and oversight of the reconstruction funding provided by countries participating in ISAF and other donor countries, international organizations, and international financial entities, including a description of the progress by such parties in fulfilling their pledges of financial, technical, and other assistance;

“(iii) include a mechanism for tracking and increasing oversight of the reconstruction programs implemented by the provincial reconstruction teams, including the amount of reconstruction funding spent by

such teams, the purpose of such funding, and the evaluation of the success of such programs;

“(iv) provide for a mechanism to enhance coordination between the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development and other relevant departments and agencies of the United States Government in carrying out reconstruction programs, by—

“(I) coordinating existing and future efforts in the reconstruction programs carried out by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development with the reconstruction programs carried out by other relevant departments and agencies of the United States Government; and

“(II) coordinating existing and future efforts needed to achieve enhanced coordination between the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development and other relevant departments and agencies of the United States Government in the design and implementation of reconstruction programs;

“(v) include a plan to enhance monitoring, evaluation, and oversight of reconstruction programs to ensure the effective impact of such programs on Afghanistan and its people;

“(vi) provide a plan to identify and implement critical reconstruction programs, by project, including in the areas of security, rule of law, counter-narcotics, power, rural development, education, health, and governance and anti-corruption, that will improve the security and economic stability of Afghanistan, and the amount of funding needed to implement such programs;

“(vii) include actions to significantly increase contributions from countries participating in ISAF and from other international partners for reconstruction programs, including in the areas of security, rule of law, counter-narcotics, power, rural development, education, health, and governance and anti-corruption sectors;

“(viii) provide a plan to improve the employment situation in Afghanistan, including a plan to increase job creation opportunities and enhance private sector development in Afghanistan;

“(ix) include actions to ensure enhancement of the capacity of the Government of Afghanistan, on all levels, to respond to the needs of its people;

“(x) include actions to enhance the design and implementation of programs carried out by the Government of Afghanistan, on all levels, including efforts to increase funding and implementation of reconstruction programs carried out by the National Solidarity Program;

“(xi) include a plan to increase significantly the number of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs), particularly in the southern and eastern regions of Afghanistan by December 31, 2009, including a review of the operation of and lessons learned from existing PRTs prior to the preparation of the strategy;

“(xii) clarify a single chain of command and operations plans for PRTs, including their relationship with ISAF;

“(xiii) increase staffing, particularly staffing of civilian specialists, and increase staff training for PRTs;

“(xiv) incorporate measures to improve the effectiveness of PRTs in providing reconstruction and development assistance and in promoting security and stability in their areas of operations, including coordination between PRT civilian elements and ISAF reconstruction goals; and

“(xv) include efforts to ensure that a significant amount of the material, financial, and personnel support for the increase in the

number of PRTs is provided by foreign sources.

“(B) COUNTER-NARCOTICS STRATEGY.—A comprehensive interagency counter-narcotics strategy for Afghanistan, including objectives for the strategy, a plan to implement the objectives of the strategy, and a long-term budget to carry out the strategy. The strategy shall—

“(i) address the five pillars that comprise Afghanistan’s counter-narcotics strategy and implementation plan: public information, rural development (alternative livelihoods), elimination and eradication activities, interdiction, and law enforcement and justice reform;

“(ii) identify the roles and responsibilities of relevant departments and agencies of the United States Government with respect to the activities described in clause (i);

“(iii) include the strategic direction of current and planned activities of the United States relating to counter-narcotics efforts in Afghanistan, and shall specifically include a description of steps that have been conducted and planned to—

“(I) improve coordination with all relevant departments and agencies of the United States Government;

“(II) strengthen significantly the Afghanistan National Counter-Narcotics Police;

“(III) build the capacity of the Afghan Government to assume greater responsibility for counter-narcotics related-activities;

“(IV) strengthen anti-corruption measures that target narcotics producers and traffickers and the individuals influenced by them;

“(V) improve counter-narcotics intelligence capabilities;

“(VI) strengthen narcotics-related interdiction activities;

“(VII) strengthen the capacity of the judicial sector to investigate, prosecute, and penalize narcotics producers and traffickers and government officials benefitting from narcotics-related activities;

“(VIII) effectively address any problems with eradication strategies; and

“(IX) significantly increase the focus on creating alternative livelihoods for the Afghan people;

“(iv) include current and planned actions to involve and coordinate with the United Kingdom and other appropriate international partners in supporting counter-narcotics efforts in Afghanistan.

“(C) SUSTAINABILITY OF THE AFGHANISTAN NATIONAL SECURITY FORCES.—A comprehensive interagency strategy for building and sustaining the Afghanistan National Security Forces (ANSF), including objectives for the strategy, a plan to implement the objectives of the strategy, and a long-term budget to carry out the strategy. The strategy shall—

“(i) include a mechanism for tracking funding, including obligations and expenditures, as well as equipment, training, and services provided for the ANSF by the United States, countries participating in the International Security Assistance Force, and other international partners;

“(ii) include actions to build and sustain effective Afghan security institutions with fully-capable leadership and staff, including—

“(I) a reformed Ministry of Interior, a fully-established Ministry of Defense, and logistics, intelligence, medical, and recruiting units (ANSF-sustaining institutions);

“(II) fully-trained, equipped, and capable ANSF in sufficient numbers;

“(III) strong ANSF-readiness assessment tools and metrics;

“(IV) a strong core of senior-level ANSF officers;

“(V) strong ANSF command, control, and communication between central ANSF headquarters and regions, provinces, and districts;

“(VI) a robust mentoring and advising program for the ANSF;

“(VII) a strong professional military training and education program for all junior, mid-level, and senior ANSF personnel;

“(VIII) effective merit-based salary, rank, promotion, and incentive structures for the ANSF;

“(IX) an established code of professional standards for the ANSF;

“(X) a mechanism for incorporating lessons learned and best practices into ANSF operations;

“(XI) AN ANSF personnel accountability system with effective internal discipline procedures and mechanisms;

“(XII) a system for addressing ANSF personnel complaints; and

“(XIII) a strong record-keeping and accountability system to track ANSF equipment and personnel issues, and other ANSF oversight mechanisms; and

“(iii) provide for coordination between all relevant departments and agencies of the United States Government, as well as ISAF countries and other international partners, including on—

“(I) funding;

“(II) reform and establishment of ANSF-sustaining institutions; and

“(III) efforts to ensure that progress on sustaining the ANSF is reinforced with progress in other pillars of the Afghan security sector, particularly progress on building an effective judiciary, curbing production and trafficking of illicit narcotics, and demobilizing, disarming, and reintegrating militia fighters.

“(3) REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 1, 2007, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees an update of the report required by subsection (c) for 2007 that contains the comprehensive interagency strategy required by paragraph (1).

“(B) FORM.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex, if necessary.”

(b) MONITORING.—Subsection (c) of such section (as redesignated) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) UPDATES OF STRATEGY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of the strategy required by subsection (b)(3), and every 90 days thereafter through September 30, 2010, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update of the strategy required by subsection (a) and the strategy required by subsection (b), as necessary.

“(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ includes the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.”

SEC. 304. SPECIAL ENVOY FOR AFGHANISTAN-PAKISTAN COOPERATION.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress declares that it is strongly in the national interest of the United States that Afghanistan and Pakistan work together to address common challenges hampering the stability, security, and development of their region and to enhance their cooperation.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President is authorized to appoint a special envoy to promote closer cooperation between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

(c) APPOINTMENT.—The special envoy—

(1) shall be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall have the rank of Ambassador-at-Large; and

(2) may be appointed from among individuals who are officials of the Department of State.

(d) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The primary responsibility of the special envoy shall be to coordinate United States policy on issues relating to bilateral relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

(2) ADVISORY ROLE.—The special envoy shall advise the President and the Secretary of State, as appropriate, and, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Affairs, shall make recommendations regarding effective strategies and tactics to achieve United States policy objectives to—

(A) stem cross-border terror activities;

(B) provide assistance to Afghan refugees who repatriate from Pakistan;

(C) bolster people-to-people ties and economic cooperation between Afghanistan and Pakistan, including bilateral trade relations; and

(D) offer comprehensive efforts to support effective counter-narcotics strategies in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

SEC. 305. TRANSIT THROUGH PAKISTAN OF SHIPMENTS BY INDIA IN SUPPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use all appropriate means to encourage Pakistan to permit shipments by India of equipment and material to Afghanistan in support of Indian reconstruction and development projects in Afghanistan to be transported across the territory of Pakistan and to remove any obstacles to such transportation.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until January 1, 2010, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on actions by Pakistan to permit or impede transit of shipments described in subsection (a). The report required by this subsection may be included in the report required by section 304 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (as amended by section 302 of this Act).

(2) SUNSET.—The requirement to transmit the report under paragraph (1) shall cease to apply if the President determines and transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a determination that India no longer needs to make shipments to Afghanistan for the purposes described in subsection (a).

SEC. 306. REAUTHORIZATION OF RADIO FREE AFGHANISTAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Since January 30, 2002, RFE/RL, Incorporated (formerly known as Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty) has provided 12 hours of daily surrogate broadcasting services through Radio Free Afghanistan in Dari and Pashto languages to the people of Afghanistan.

(2) Radio Free Afghanistan is the leading broadcaster in Afghanistan with an audience of nearly 60 percent of the adult population.

(3) It is in the national interest to continue Radio Free Afghanistan’s surrogate broadcasts to Afghanistan in order to provide accurate news and information, help give voice to ordinary Afghans, and provide programs on the fundamentals of democracy.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010, such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be appropriated to the Broadcasting Board of Governors for grants to support 12

hours of daily surrogate broadcasting services through Radio Free Afghanistan in Dari and Pashto languages to the people of Afghanistan.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 110-174. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report except amendment No. 11 which may be offered at any time, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-174.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. LANTOS: Page 5, line 23, strike "supports" and insert "is supported by".

Page 5, line 25, strike "a strategy" and insert "the core framework".

Page 6, line 6, insert before the period the following: ", particularly at the local and provincial levels".

Page 12, line 12, strike "(B)" and insert "(C)".

Page 12, line 13, strike "(B)" and insert "(C)".

Page 12, lines 19 through 25, move the margins of clauses (ii) and (iii) two ems to the left.

Page 18, line 3, insert "helping women deliver healthier babies and" after "for the purpose of".

Page 35, line 11, strike "\$300,000,000" and insert "\$300,000,000".

Page 37, line 1, strike "The President" and insert "Pursuant to the authorities of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) or section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763), the President".

Page 43, line 16, strike "to conduct" and insert "to participate in, to the extent appropriate and practicable,".

Page 46, strike lines 1 through 4 and insert the following new subclauses:

(I) The Afghan forces.

(II) ISAF.

(III) Non-ISAF United States forces.

(IV) Other Coalition forces.

Page 47, beginning on line 10, strike "and countries participating in ISAF" and insert "countries participating in ISAF, and other Coalition countries".

Page 57, line 24, strike "Affairs" and insert "Relations".

Page 66, line 9, insert "and" after the semicolon.

Page 70, after line 17, insert the following new subsection:

(c) CONCURRENT SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) CONCURRENT SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—The strategy required by subsection (b) and any updates of the strategy provided pursuant to subsection (c) shall be submitted concurrently with the report and updates required by section 304 of this Act (relating to progress toward security and stability in Afghanistan)."

Page 71, line 24, strike "who repatriate" and insert "to ensure orderly and voluntary repatriation".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the ranking Republican member, and myself.

Our amendment makes a number of technical, clarifying and clerical changes to several provisions in this bill as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been cleared by both the Republican and Democratic sides, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of and have no objection to this manager's amendment, which contains minor technical and conforming changes. I support this amendment's consideration by unanimous consent.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ACKERMAN

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-174.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. ACKERMAN:

Page 51, after line 7, insert the following new subparagraph:

(J) An assessment of the quality of governance in each province in Afghanistan, including an assessment of the following:

(i) The implementation of the rule of law, including the effects of any lack of such implementation on operations of the Afghan National Army, Afghan National Police, and other Afghan National Security Forces.

(ii) Whether and to what extent actions by Afghan National Security Forces have led to abuses of human rights and the extent to which such abuses, if any, undermine overall counterinsurgency efforts in such province and Afghanistan as a whole.

(iii) The ability of courts and the judicial system to provide an effective justice system to support the civil-military side of military and police operations.

Page 51, line 8, strike "(J)" and insert "(K)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to congratulate Chairman LANTOS and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for producing an excellent bipartisan bill. The Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act demonstrates yet again the depth of support in the Congress for our efforts in Afghanistan to defeat the Taliban and al Qaeda and sends a clear message to the Government of Afghanistan and the Afghan people that the United States is committed to the success of a stable, free and democratic Afghanistan.

As the bill also points out, we remain far from that goal, and it is not at all certain we will get there. The amendment I am offering today concerns a problem that if left unaddressed could undercut all of our efforts in Afghanistan, and that is the problem of corruption.

The Government Accountability Office in a recent report said the reform effort in the judicial sector is being "undermined by systemic corruption at key national and provincial justice institutions." The most recent report in Afghanistan from the U.N. Secretary General noted that because corruption influences government appointments, Afghans don't trust local government officials and have turned to making deals with the Taliban for protection of their property. The same report goes on to describe the popular alienation that many Afghans feel towards local governments and asserts that this alienation is a key factor in support for the insurgency.

My amendment adds language to section 302 of the bill to ensure that the Presidential report required by that section includes an assessment of the quality of governments in each province in Afghanistan, focusing in particular on the implementation of the rule of law and its impact on the operation of Afghan society, security forces and the impact of any human rights abuses by Afghan government forces on overall counterinsurgency efforts and the ability of the courts and judicial system to provide an effective justice system in support of Afghan military and police efforts.

Mr. Chairman, the question of corruption in Afghanistan may seem like a small matter when compared with the resurgence of the Taliban and the explosion of narcotics trafficking. But I believe for the Taliban to be defeated and for the narcotics traffickers to be imprisoned, ordinary Afghans must have confidence that their government actually works for them. If the citizens

of Afghanistan believe otherwise, then they will turn to local warlords, drug traffickers and the Taliban for protection. Under that scenario, Afghans can look forward to another generation of civil conflict.

I would urge all of our colleagues to support the amendment as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I would be delighted to yield to the chairman.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my friend from New York for his very thoughtful amendment, and I am extremely pleased to support it.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has a noble purpose, to enhance congressional oversight on the status of local governance in Afghanistan, including adherence to the rule of law, protection of human rights and operation of an effective justice system. Unfortunately, the amendment lacks specific criteria by which to measure these issues. It requires the administration to report, for example, on how the lack of implementation of the rule of law affects the operations of the Afghan National Army, the police and security forces. However, there are numerous factors that comprise the rule of law. How would this provision measure implementation of the rule of law?

Without a clear measure, how could any administration then state, with any degree of certainty, what effects the absence of such implementation had on the operations of Afghan security forces? It goes on to ask for an assessment on the ability of the Afghan judicial system to support the civil military side of military and police operations.

Again, a noble purpose, but there are no clear definitions, no guidelines to determine the information sought. Further, how could we establish a clear measure so that the administration can state how the actions of the Afghan security forces led to human rights abuses, and in turn, how much those abuses undermine counterinsurgency efforts? That is an extraordinary, complicated, causal chain, and some direction and clarification within the amendment itself, Mr. Chairman, would have been most useful.

We sought modifications to this amendment in an effort to arrive at an agreement on the text because I do support what my colleague from New York is trying to get at. We want to support the overarching goals of this bill, and his amendment is an attempt to do that.

I will continue to work closely with the gentleman from New York regard-

ing his particular amendment to preserve its intent, to make sure that it can be effective in its implementation, but as currently drafted, I will have to oppose the amendment. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that this might be a complicated and extraordinary and difficult thing for the President to do, we have every confidence in the President on this side that he will be able to come up at least with some criteria that he at least thinks is objective and report in his own language, using his own complicated or simplistic criteria, whether or not he thinks corruption is prevalent in the various provinces in Afghanistan. We are leaving that up to him. And we will fully understand that in any language that he presents it to us, it will come from him, and that will be his determination.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to defeat this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 110-174.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. SOUDER: Page 39, line 1, insert “, including force protection and in extremis support” after “logistical support”.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to withdraw this amendment because of the strong opposition of Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member DUNCAN HUNTER, but I appreciate the Rules Committee making this in order. I believe it is an important step.

I know I am going to rain a little bit on the general parade here. I think this is an important bill, it is an important step, but we have oversold the success of Afghanistan. Before my first trip, I knew then that our then Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, wanted to separate the military effort in Afghanistan from other challenges the country faced, just like in Iraq.

In Afghanistan, the question was heroin. On my first trip there, I heard our own soldiers reflect the Pentagon atti-

tude by mocking heroin and minimizing its efforts to get rid of it. I attended the briefings back here in Washington as the heroin problem began to pass anything we've ever seen under the Taliban by a factor of four to five times of anything we have ever seen under the Taliban. I asked the question, since we had not removed the regional drug lords from office, how many of the people who voted in that much heralded election could vote against their local drug lords.

State Department, Defense Department, DIA and CIA disagreed on the exact number. The highest was 30 percent, the lowest 20 percent. In other words, 70 to 80 percent of the people who voted in that election did not have a free vote because we did not remove the regional druglords from office, and we let the heroin poppy grow without controlling their sources of financing that had penetrated the early parts of the government.

This government has, in fact, started to act, as they attempted to assassinate President Karzai, who was clean, and he removed gradually some members of his cabinet. But by that time, the heroin, once again, four times world record, five times world record, four times world record, three times world record, approaching eight to 10 times the total cumulative effect that ever happened before the United States went into Afghanistan. We had sites that we could not hit because we were afraid they were going to shoot down our own planes.

What do we think they are buying the new IEDs with? What do we think they are buying the other equipment with? Of course they are getting it from profits from poppy.

I did a hearing in our subcommittee, because the British had this effort, “Afghanistan: Have the British Counter-Narcotics Efforts Gone Wildly?” On April 1, 2004. This is no new problem. Go arrest the druglords. Our military is afraid they are going to get exploded. How can you go arrest the drug lords?

My amendment was simply to say the military needs to support the antinarcotics efforts and the DEA to take down these. You can't send 10, 25 agents out and say go arrest and take down the Helman province. When I went with Congressman HOEKSTRA and Congressman RUPPERSBERGER and Congressman SHADEGG, the four of us went into the Helman province, possibly the only four Members that will ever get there. And when we got there in a Blackhawk ride for 45 minutes, heroin as far as the eye can see going at a high rate of speed. Dwarfed Columbia. This is an incredible problem. The military needs to engage.

I agree with Chairman SKELTON; we don't have enough troops in Afghanistan. And that makes it a problematic thing of how to support the DEA.

□ 1545

This bill is a first step. But we need the military engagement and support,

because you cannot get order, you cannot do alternative crops unless you eradicate the heroin and change a little bit of the market force. We can't subsidize the difference between other products and heroin. It is not possible.

We can't do those efforts, and INL and the State Department and DEA and the other agencies cannot do this without military support. This needs to be addressed in the defense bill. It needs to be addressed here in conference.

I hope that the chairman here can do it. I hope Chairman SKELTON can do it. I hope the administration can do it. But let's understand there is no terrorism funding in Afghanistan. There is no insurgency efforts. There is no corrupt government if you get rid of the heroin.

This is a difficult problem. It is multi-faceted. But you need real protection, with real guns, with real transport, with real time, saying that they are going to give logistical support rather than force protection and extremist support, means and effect. For most of the time, the DEA agents are on their own, go in. With 10,000 Taliban, good luck in taking them down. They need more than good luck. They need some help.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from Indiana for yielding, and I want to thank him for working with the committee. I understand the gentleman is going to withdraw his amendment, and I thank him for his courtesy.

I fully support his sentiment that is behind his amendment, and I will work with him on this issue as H.R. 2446 goes through the legislative process.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for his leadership for the start of this bill. I hope we can really tackle the underlying problems.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. COSTA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-174.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. COSTA:

Page 29, after line 23, insert the following new section (and redesignate subsequent sections and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 106. ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT THE OFFICES OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The President shall provide assistance to support the auditing, investigation, and oversight capacity and capability of the Offices of the Inspector General of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development in Afghanistan. The Offices of the Inspector General of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development are authorized to audit, investigate, and oversee the programs authorized in title I of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (as amended by this title).

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR IN-COUNTRY PRESENCE.—The Offices of the Inspector General of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development, shall permanently deploy not less than two staff from each of the Offices of the Inspector General in Afghanistan to carry out this section.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 110 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (as redesignated by this title) for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010, not less than \$1,500,000 for each such fiscal year is authorized to be made available to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of State and not less than \$3,000,000 for each such fiscal year is authorized to be made available to the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development to carry out this section.

(2) RELATION TO OTHER AVAILABLE FUNDS.—Amounts made available under paragraph (1) are in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think from many of the comments that have been made here this afternoon regarding the concerns that we have as it relates to the situation in Afghanistan, we come with the best of intentions to support H.R. 2446, which is the underlying bill, a strong bill; and I am, of course, among those who support this measure.

It affirms the United States' long-term commitment to support Afghanistan in the transition that has seen 30 years of civil war, violence and occupation by a brutal regime to a stable and prosperous democratic state at peace with its neighbors.

Having said that, though, it is easier said than done, as we all know, for Afghanistan faces many challenges. With the amount of funding that we have provided to the Afghani people for economic and security reasons, I believe that there is increased need to have the sort of oversight mechanisms in place to protect this investment, to ensure its success and, of course, to always

make sure that American taxpayers' dollars are well spent.

My amendment provides this opportunity in two ways: It provides oversight that includes the Office of Inspector General at the State Department as well as the United States Agency for International Development to provide the necessary oversight within this bill that many of us believe is necessary.

The amendment to H.R. 2446 provides such support in two ways: in-country presence and funding. Without in-country presence and without the necessary funding, it won't happen.

Currently, the staff of the Office of Inspector General of the United States AID are performing their duties in Manila. Now, you take out a map and Manila is a long ways from Kabul in Afghanistan, which is the capital. We need to have on-the-ground knowledge in Afghanistan and programs that they are implementing, and they cannot perform those duties from Manila, which is thousands of and thousands of miles away.

Many of us have visited Afghanistan, and we have on-the-ground knowledge of what is critical to this war on terrorism. We must remember this is where the war on terrorism began, which premeditated the attacks on 9/11.

The amendment mandates that at least two staff members will be permanently deployed in Afghanistan in the country. The amendment also increases the funding for both the Offices of Inspector General in accordance with their own plans to increase staffing over the coming years. The Offices of the Inspector General are our watchdog, and they provide vital efforts to ensure that money is well spent in Afghanistan. We need to ensure that these American taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and that waste and corruption, which was mentioned by the previous speaker, is kept at bay, to the degree that it is possible.

In conclusion, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that we had tremendous success in South Korea, but we have been there over 50 years and we still have 30,000 troops there. The initial two decades in South Korea will be, in my opinion, as difficult as it is today in Afghanistan. Therefore, we must be prepared to put the proper resources there and to stay the course. I strongly support this bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTA. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend for his extremely thoughtful and very necessary amendment, and I am very pleased to support it strongly.

With billions of dollars being poured into reconstruction and development assistance, justifiably so, we have a heavy responsibility to the American people to ensure that our taxpayer dollars are being spent in the manner in which they were intended.

As the gentleman knows, we just had a hearing with the Inspector General for Afghanistan which was singularly

instructive and illuminating and highlighted many of the problems in the spending of our tax dollars in Afghanistan. This function is the function of the Inspectors General at the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Your amendment requires that these officers be permanently deployed in Afghanistan, which they are not currently, so that on-the-ground assessments can be made in real time and with full continuity. Your amendment authorizes additional funds to help ensure that adequate resources are allocated to measure the effectiveness of our aid program without increasing the cost of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment both authorizes and requires oversight by the Inspectors General from the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development, and it does this in two main ways.

First, it requires the permanent deployment in Afghanistan of at least four IG staffers, two each from State and USAID, to audit, to investigate and to oversee economic and developmental assistance provided in Title I of the Act.

Secondly, it also earmarks a total of \$4.5 million per year for these IG activities.

We all share the goal of ensuring that our investment in Afghanistan's economic and democratic development is not squandered. Fiscal accountability is always in order, Mr. Chairman. As a proportion of the total amounts in the Act, the amount earmarked by this amendment is roughly in the ballpark of the amount that USAID usually spends on IG activities as compared to its total budget. Furthermore, the activities contemplated by this amendment are in keeping with the current responsibilities of the State and USAID Inspectors General.

Solid plans that help maximize the impact of the strategy embodied in the underlying bill are to be welcomed. In this spirit, I am pleased to support this well-thought-out amendment by the gentleman from California; and I also urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman, the ranking member, and the chairman of

the Committee on International Relations for their good work on this legislation and for their bipartisan effort to provide leadership in our committee and in all the hearings that we are holding and in the legislation that we are participating in.

The bipartisan spirit which I think surrounds the committee these days is welcomed and is truly a tribute to the chairman and the ranking member.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank Chairman LANTOS as well as his staff for having such a wonderful, cooperative spirit and for the working relationship between staff and Members.

I thank the gentleman from California for offering this amendment, because it gets at the heart of what we want to do: fiscal accountability; making sure that our tax dollars are being used in the wisest way, free of corruption, and making sure that we have folks on the ground to look at those dollars. We have our precious treasure, our men and women in uniform, shedding blood for freedom. Let's make sure that American taxpayer dollars are being used in the correct way as well.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110-174.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

Page 44, after line 5, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 2. REPORT ON THE SALE AND USE OF IRANIAN-MADE WEAPONS FOR THE TALIBAN IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDING.—United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan recently intercepted a shipment of Iranian-made weapons and explosives intended for the Taliban in Afghanistan.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the current Iranian-made weapons being sold to or used by the Taliban in Afghanistan. The report shall include any evidence of official Iranian Government endorsement of the sale of the Iranian-made weapons.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, according to Secretary of Defense Gates, Iranian weapons have begun to flow into Afghanistan in recent months. We know this much for certain. What we do not know is if indeed this is an official sanction of the Iranian government.

However, some in the intelligence community believe that this effort is on the part of a branch of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, which are responsible for shipping these deadly weapons to the Taliban. If this is true, Mr. Chairman, the implications must be realized by this Congress, because it means that Shiite Iran is disregarding sectarian differences with Sunni Taliban in order to unite with them in an effort to undermine U.S. efforts for peace in the nascent democratic Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, this means that the nation of Iran is determined to back non-state Muslim militants to terrorize countries who desire peace, tolerance and stability. We saw them do this last year in Lebanon through their proxy Hezbollah against the nation of Israel. We now see this happening in Iraq as well.

There are two major elements, Mr. Chairman, when we consider the danger of an enemy to this Nation. We first have to assess their intention or the will of an enemy to harm the U.S. or our allies. It is clear that the Taliban, Hamas, Hezbollah and groups like them hate governments like ours that uphold the rule of law and uphold the effort to protect freedom of action, thought and religion. They hate the United States because of this, Mr. Chairman. They hate a tolerant Europe, they hate the new democratic Afghanistan, they hate pluralistic Israel and they hate Lebanon. They have an insidious and determined will to tyrannize. They need only the means or the capacity to bring that hate to fruition.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second element. A true threat exists to this Nation's freedom when those who are committed to tyranny and to disrupt peace are met with the means and the capacity to do so. Iran is providing the means to non-state terrorist actors who possess the will to use them.

□ 1600

We must not let this continue. My amendment requires that the Secretary of Defense provide Congress with a semiannual report that informs us of the Iranian-made weapons being provided to the Taliban, and any evidence that the sale is endorsed by the government of Iran.

Mr. Chairman, it is vital that this body understands the intention of Iran

because they may some day very soon possess a very frightening capacity that threatens the potential future of the world and the peace of free people across the world.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I would now like to yield to the distinguished ranking member of the committee, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Franks amendment. Since last April, two arms shipment from Iran, including mortars, rocket-propelled grenades, C-4 explosives and small arms have reportedly been intercepted by U.S. and coalition troops.

Further, a NATO spokesman recently stated that an explosively formed projectile, EFP, which resembled the EFPs bearing Iranian manufacturing markings that have been found in Iraq, have been recently discovered in Kabul. This directly affects the safety and security of our men and women serving in Afghanistan. As I pointed out previously, my daughter-in-law is one of those wearing our Nation's uniform serving in Afghanistan. We want to make sure that we protect everyone in that country.

These disturbing developments may indicate that the Iranian regime has decided to also undermine the government of Afghanistan and U.S. efforts to deny Islamic militants a safe haven in Afghanistan.

While fighting in Afghanistan has thus far been concentrated near the Pakistani border, increased Iranian interference in Afghanistan may indicate an attempt to provoke the U.S. and our coalition partners into opening a second front. Iran's apparently increasing involvement in this central front of the global war against radical jihadists reflects the goal of the regime of pursuing regional dominance, spreading radical Islam, and counteracting western influence in the region. Such a goal is intolerable. As in Iraq, failure in Afghanistan is not an option.

Mr. Chairman, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act works to bolster our efforts, and I support the Franks amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. POMEROY). Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has long been concerned with events in Iran, including recent media reports of weapons crossing into Afghanistan from Iran destined for the Taliban. This can create the potential for Iran to contribute to the destabilization of Afghanistan, which we simply cannot

allow. Congress must have up-to-date information on Iran's influence in Afghanistan. And I, therefore, welcome the gentleman's amendment in this regard, and we are prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 110-174.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 25, line 20, strike "and".

Page 25, line 24, strike the first period, the closing quotation marks, and the second period and insert "; and".

Page 25, after line 24, insert the following new subparagraph:

"(I) providing technical assistance to train provincial and local governmental personnel, especially as it relates to—

"(i) healthcare;

"(ii) political participation;

"(iii) human rights, particularly as pertaining to women; and

"(iv) education, particularly to encourage girls to complete secondary education so they are prepared and able to attend post-secondary schools.".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this issue.

Earlier in the debate I mentioned the concept of building blocks of democracy. Frankly, I believe this amendment speaks to the building of capacity to ensure that democracy.

Having first started my elective political career in local government, I know that many times we say that is where the rubber hits the road.

The effort of my amendment is to ensure that those who are involved in local and State government would have the ability to build capacity through technical assistance that will train national, provincial and local government personnel for capacity-building purposes.

In order to govern, you must have information, information on education, health care, human rights, and political participation. This legislation globally speaks to those issues in a large manner.

I would like to technically emphasize the one-on-one training and influence

and information to those who have to govern. The more we can do that, the more we can build capacity. And the more of those who are in the leadership positions can establish confidence so that when they confront the emerging terror of the Taliban or the questioning face of a chieftain, they can have the response that this is, in fact, good government.

My amendment also goes to encourage girls in Afghanistan to finish secondary school. We realize this bill has a very strong focus on women and girls, but there has to be the added measure of incentive, not only to the earlier grades, but to say to a young woman that by finishing secondary school, you can go on to post-secondary education, building the blocks of democracy which would include women who would be enabled to be doctors, lawyers, scientists and teachers, building a society in Afghanistan that will need not only men but also women.

May I close by simply saying I point to a picture that points to this learning board that I mentioned earlier. These are the kinds of tools that would give young people and those without, if you will, various equipment to go to school the opportunity to do so. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to explain my amendment to H.R. 2446, the "Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007." I believe this is an extremely important piece of legislation, and I commend the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. LANTOS, for introducing it.

In the nearly 5 years since the 9/11 attacks, and the subsequent ouster of the Taliban and al-Qaeda from Afghanistan, we have made significant efforts to secure the nation from the Taliban. But we must do more; otherwise, a resurgent Taliban will continue to pose a very real threat to Afghanistan's stability.

This bill is an important step toward a more secure Afghanistan, and, ultimately, a more stable region. It authorizes \$1.7 billion in each of fiscal years 2008 through 2010 for economic and development assistance and provides additional support for other capacity building programs, such as assistance to women and girls (\$45 million per annum), energy development and counter-narcotics (\$75 million per annum). Additionally, the bill authorizes funding for counter-narcotics efforts and programs to increase the capacity of Afghan national, provincial, and local governments, and additional development programs.

In addition to authorizing assistance to address the continuing humanitarian needs, this legislation targets the ongoing opium trade, as well as persistent problems of corruption. The bill links these various sectors of policy together, integrating security, reconstruction, and development concerns with counter-narcotics and anti-corruption policies.

My amendment simply states that technical assistance should be provided to train national, provincial, and local governmental personnel for capacity-building purposes. In particular, this amendment emphasizes the need to build local capacity in the critical fields of

education, healthcare, human rights, and political participation. My amendment will also encourage girls in Afghanistan to finish secondary school, providing them with the ability to pursue post-secondary education.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is born from my strong belief that we must take a long-term view toward reconstruction in Afghanistan, and, in doing so, we must develop the capacity of Afghanistan's citizens. Under the Taliban regime, education, healthcare, human and women's rights, and political participation were seriously stunted by the government's oppressive policies. These sectors are absolutely crucial to the long-term stability and sustainability of Afghanistan.

My amendment specifically speaks to the need to combat the lingering societal barriers that may discourage girls from completing secondary education. According to UNICEF's 2005 estimates, 1 million primary school age girls in Afghanistan were not enrolled in school, and education of girls continues to be undervalued in many communities.

Girls and women were horribly oppressed under the Taliban, and we must take particular care to ensure that the lack of opportunities afforded to females under the previous leadership is not carried over into the current government. Encouraging girls to complete their education would be extremely beneficial for both the women and girls themselves, and for Afghan society as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, we have recognized the shortcomings of Afghanistan's infrastructure. Even as we express our commitment to continuing our programs in Afghanistan, we must look forward to the day we will ultimately leave that country to stand on its own. We must do everything we can to ensure that, sooner rather than later, Afghanistan will no longer need our ongoing assistance.

My amendment represents an important step toward that ultimate goal, while at the same time serving our short-term goals and increasing the effectiveness of the humanitarian programs outlined by this legislation.

To conclude, let me thank Chairman LANTOS for his leadership on this issue. I am confident that we can work together to craft legislation designed to ensure that Afghanistan can recover from the excesses and abuses of previous regimes, and become an active and prosperous member of the international community. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my friend from Texas for her thoughtful amendment, and I am very pleased to support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from

Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) stating that technical assistance should be provided to train national, provincial and local government personnel for capacity-building purposes as it relates to education, health care, human rights, and particularly in respect to women and political participation.

As we have heard this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, under the Taliban's brutal regime, their blatant disregard for the lives and the well-being of the Afghan people, was perhaps most clearly evident among half of their population, the women of Afghanistan. They have been made destitute, sick and marginalized. They were banned from receiving any education past the age of 8. They were denied proper medical treatment, and they were not allowed to work.

Today, the Afghan people are free with women enjoying the freedoms and opportunities previously denied to them under the Taliban. In order for our efforts in Afghanistan to be effective, it is critical that we continue to provide the Afghan people with the tools and the training necessary for the development and sustainability of educational institutions, protection of human rights, and implementation of political reforms.

It is imperative that our efforts focus on educating and training the officials of the Afghan government at the local level as local officials have a better understanding of the needs of their citizens and will be better prepared to address those needs.

This amendment also seeks to ensure that girls complete secondary education so they will be better suited to pursue their post-secondary education. Without proper education of its women and a society more open to women who holding jobs, Afghanistan's political and economic development is doomed to failure.

Providing Afghan girls with proper education will give rise to a new generation of confident and educated women with skills to pursue careers that will open unprecedented opportunities for them and enhance Afghanistan's economic sector. I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson-Lee amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for her support, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 110-174.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 35, after line 22, insert the following new subsection:

(c) ADDITIONAL SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) ADDITIONAL SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that assistance provided to eligible foreign countries and international organizations under subsection (a) should be used in part to protect women legislators when they return to the provinces that they represent in Afghanistan.”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to join Chairman LANTOS in applauding this legislation as being bipartisan, and all of us seemingly speaking from the same songbook about the need to build these blocks of democracy, but also to enhance the opportunities for women.

Might I just cite as a need for my amendment a report from the BBC that says an international women's rights group says guarantees given to Afghan women after the fall of the Taliban in 2001 have not translated into real change.

Another quote from an Afghan woman: “When I am at home, sometimes I feel as though someone is choking me.” And 57 percent of girls are married before the legal age of 16.

We know that we have made great strides, but there is much more for us to do. Former example, a controversial Afghan politician and former member of parliament, Jalalai Joya, reported in May 2006 that she was forced to sleep in a different house every night as a result of the numerous death threats they have received. She has been quoted as saying “women still live under the shadow of the gun. Women are still victims of violence.” Joya was subsequently ousted from parliament after she continuously voiced controversial criticisms of her fellow, mostly male, lawmakers.

Raazia Baloch was presented with a broken Kalashnikov firearm upon her election to the provincial assembly, which local authorities told her was for her protection. Ms. Baloch serves a particularly volatile province where, short after her election, an unknown gunman emptied his AK-47 into a van leaving the province's women's ministry.

The unfortunate truth is if these women are going to serve, they are going to need our special attention. And I do believe in the relationship that the United States has with Afghanistan. The leadership of President Karzai, speaking to him directly, I know he has a great concern for the viability of women elected officials. In

fact, might I say that in a direct, one-on-one conversation with any number of Afghan women parliamentarians during my visit to Afghanistan, talking to them face to face, eye to eye, sister to sister, if you will, they made it very clear when they do their work in the capital, and they have to go home to their district, just like any one of us, they fear for their lives. They are concerned about being able to fully represent their constituents by going home and coming back safely.

Might I just quote additionally, a female owner of a radio station was shot seven times while she slept at home with her 20-month-old son. She is the second female journalist to be murdered in Afghanistan in the past week.

So my amendment is very clear, and it is very straight. It allows us through this legislation to make a very pronounced statement, and that statement is that it is the sense of this Congress that assistance provided to foreign countries and international organizations under this provision should be used in part to protect these female legislators. I hope this is part of helping us help them build democracy.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to explain my amendment to H.R. 2446, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007. I believe this is an extremely important piece of legislation, and I commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. LANTOS, for introducing it. In the nearly 5 years since the 9/11 attacks, and the subsequent ouster of the Taliban and al-Qaeda from Afghanistan, we have made significant efforts to secure the nation from the Taliban; however, the Taliban continues to pose a very real threat to Afghanistan's stability.

This bill is an important step towards a more secure Afghanistan, and ultimately, a more stable region. It authorizes \$1.7 billion in each of fiscal years 2008 through 2010 for economic and development assistance and provides additional support for other capacity building programs, such as assistance to women and girls, \$45 million per annum, energy development and counter narcotics, \$75 million per annum. Additionally, the bill authorizes funding for counter-narcotics efforts and programs to increase the capacity of Afghan national, provincial, and local governments, and additional development programs.

In addition to authorizing assistance to address the continuing humanitarian needs, this legislation targets the ongoing opium trade, as well as persistent problems of corruption. The bill links these various sectors of policy together, integrating security, reconstruction, and development concerns with counter-narcotics and anti-corruption policies.

My amendment addresses the very serious issue of persecution of women legislators in Afghanistan. All women, but particularly those who demonstrate the courage to become national leaders, continue to face intimidation and violence. If we are to encourage political and civic participation among women, which I strongly advocate, we must ensure that those who bravely venture into the political arena are protected when they return home to the districts they represent.

After many years of oppressive Taliban control, women in Afghanistan are now beginning

to emerge from the shadows. For the first time in recent memory, they now have the opportunity to take an active role in their country's political destiny. As a female legislator myself, I believe that women should be strongly encouraged to become national leaders; I believe their involvement is extremely beneficial to the nation.

And yet, these women face specific dangers as a result of their gender. They may be exposed to vile threats and even physical violence. For example, controversial Afghan politician and former Member of Parliament Malalai Joya reported in May 2006 that she was forced to sleep in a different house every night as a result of the numerous death threats she received. She has been quoted as saying "women still live under the shadow of the gun. * * * women are still victims of violence." Joya was subsequently ousted from parliament after she continuously voiced controversial criticisms of her fellow, mostly male, law-makers.

In 2006, another legislator, Raazia Baloch, was presented with a broken Kalashnikov firearm upon her election to the provincial assembly, which local authorities told her was for her protection. Ms. Baloch serves a particularly volatile province, where, shortly after her election, an unknown gunman emptied his AK-47 into a van leaving the province's women's ministry.

The unfortunate truth is that women's rights are not yet enshrined in Afghanistan. Women who venture into other leadership roles are threatened as well. Only this morning, Zakia Zaki, the female owner of an Afghan radio station, was shot seven times while she slept at home with her 20 month-old son. She is the second female journalist to be murdered in Afghanistan in the past week.

This further illustrates the unfortunate truth: Women continue to face persecution and abuses, despite the fall of the Taliban. Until we have reached a point where the basic rights of women are protected by Afghanistan's government and cultural and social institutions, I believe that we need to make every effort to ensure that basic rights are respected.

I believe my amendment is absolutely crucial. With residual societal barriers against women and girls persisting even under the new government, I believe we must make every effort to protect women legislators from the persecution and violence they may face in their local communities.

[From the BBC News, Oct. 31, 2006]

NO "REAL CHANGE" FOR AFGHAN WOMEN
(By Pam O'Toole)

An international women's rights group says guarantees given to Afghan women after the fall of the Taleban in 2001 have not translated into real change.

Womankind Worldwide says millions of Afghan women and girls continue to face systematic discrimination and violence in their households and communities.

The report admits that there have been some legal, civil and constitutional gains for Afghan women.

But serious challenges remain and need to be addressed urgently, it states.

These include challenges to women's safety, realisation of civil and political rights and status.

Womankind Worldwide sent a film crew to Afghanistan to investigate the situation of women there.

They found a young Afghan woman crying in hospital who said she wanted to die. She was recovering after setting fire to herself.

Womankind Worldwide says there has been a dramatic rise in cases of self-immolation by Afghan women since 2003.

It believes many are the result of forced marriages, thought to account for about 60% to 80% of all Afghan marriages.

57% of girls are married before the legal marriage age of 16.

Domestic violence remains widespread.

At an Afghan women's shelter, a young woman told the film crew that she came to the shelter to target life's troubles.

"I come here so I can ease the pain a little. When I am at home sometimes I feel as though someone is choking me," she told the film crew.

Womankind Worldwide says the Afghan authorities rarely investigate women's complaints of violent attacks.

Women reporting rape run the risk of being imprisoned for having sexual intercourse outside marriage.

Although women now hold more than 25% of the seats in the Afghan parliament, female politicians and activists often face intimidation or even violence.

"Women who are standing up to defend women's rights are not being protected," says Brita Fernandes Schmidt of Womankind Worldwide.

"My message, really, to the international community is: you need to address specific security issues for women," she says.

"Women's rights activists are getting killed, women's NGO workers are getting killed, and that is not going to change unless some drastic action is taken," Ms Fernandes continues.

Womankind Worldwide says the international community needs to fulfil promises made after the fall of the Taleban to help protect Afghan women.

It says the international community should give women a greater voice in setting the aid and reconstruction agenda.

Until basic rights are granted to Afghan women in practice as well as on paper, the report says, it could not be said that the status of Afghan women had changed significantly in the past five years.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

□ 1615

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from Texas for offering another needed, thoughtful and carefully crafted amendment; and I'm very pleased to support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) supporting efforts to bolster women's political participation by protecting female legislators when they return to the provinces they represent.

This important amendment includes a sense of Congress stating that assistance provided to foreign countries and international organizations under this provision should be used in part to protect these female legislators.

It is no secret that Afghan women were brutalized under the Taliban rule. They were frequently beaten, raped, kidnapped and killed. They had no access to education nor health care and were routinely singled out for abuse simply because they were women. They lived in nightmarish conditions that few of us could even imagine.

Five years after the fall of the Taliban, the women of Afghanistan are making substantial progress in reclaiming their rightful place in society. They are working as doctors, lawyers, teachers, civil servants and in numerous other professions.

These women have overcome unimaginable obstacles, and they deserve our ongoing support as they work to build a new democracy. We must continue to work to ensure that they are not threatened, nor intimidated nor physically harmed by those who seek to bring Afghanistan back to the oppressive and brutal times experienced under the Taliban regime.

As part of the work that my daughter-in-law does in her military service in Afghanistan, Lindsay encounters many Afghan women and is impressed with the great progress they have made in such a brief time. Let us not go back in time.

Women legislators in Afghanistan are currently targets of attacks perpetrated by Islamic militant extremists. We must enhance the efforts in providing a safe and secure environment for these women to allow them to pursue their legislative duties and encourage future generations of women to seek leadership positions in Afghan society.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of our time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the ranking member for her support and eloquent words on this issue and as well the chairman of the committee for his support.

Let me conclude by simply reading the headline of an article: Female Afghan and Pakistani Politicians Forced from Office. This is as late as Wednesday, May 23, 2007.

Let me thank my colleagues. I believe my amendment will further enhance our goals, and that is to provide opportunities for all of those in public life, including women in Afghanistan seeking to build the building blocks of democracy, and I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time. The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 110-174.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. KIRK:

At the end of title III of the bill (relating to miscellaneous provisions), insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. ELIGIBILITY IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES FOR AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENTS OF AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN TO RECEIVE A REWARD UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE REWARDS PROGRAM.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (f) of section 36 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(f) INELIGIBILITY.—An officer” and inserting the following:

“(f) INELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An officer”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting “, except as provided in paragraph (2),” before “of a foreign government”; and

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

“(2) EXCEPTION IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary may pay a reward to an officer or employee of the government of Afghanistan or Pakistan (or any entity thereof) who, while in the performance of his or her official duties, furnishes information described in such subsection, if the Secretary determines that such payment satisfies the following conditions:

“(A) Such payment is appropriate in light of the exceptional or high-profile nature of the information furnished pursuant to such subsection and such information relates in any way to the commission of an act in Afghanistan.

“(B) Such payment may aid in furnishing further information described in such subsection.

“(C) Such payment is formally requested by such agency.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of such section (22 U.S.C. 2708(b)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “or to any officer or employee of a foreign government in accordance with subsection (f)(2)” after “individual”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the Chairman.

I also want to thank my partners in this effort, Chairman LANTOS and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN, because their support for this amendment was critical.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most successful counter-terror programs run by the United States is not managed by the Defense Department or the CIA. It is the State Department's Rewards for Justice Program run by Mrs. Rachel Schindel-Gombis.

By offering rewards, we have brought a number of criminals to justice who killed Americans both here and abroad. One of our proudest successes was the program's production of matchbook covers, like this one here. Tipped off by a face and a telephone number on a matchbook, a Pakistani citizen provided a key tip for the arrest of Mir Amal Kanshi, the man who murdered

two Americans outside the CIA's gate here in Virginia. Thanks to this program, Kanshi was arrested, extradited, convicted and executed for the cold-blooded murders he committed, as was the famous al Qaeda terrorist Ramsi Yousef.

As a congressional staff member, I drafted the amendments to this program that first opened this up to the arrest of United Nations war criminals, specifically people indicted for war crimes by the tribunals for Rwanda and Yugoslavia. The program has helped bring dozens of mass murderers to justice, fulfilling some of the highest and best ideals of the United States when we promised “never again” after liberating the Nazi death camps.

As a Member of Congress, I coauthored the legislation for this program that allowed varied rewards and mass media campaigns. I took action on this after conducting missions on the Afghan-Pakistan border where I learned that tribesmen in that region would not respond as strongly to a \$100,000 cash award but would respond more strongly to an offer of say one kilo of gold or a new motorcycle.

Using this new authority, the State Department launched an unprecedented multilingual campaign that yielded dozens of new contracts for the arrest of senior al Qaeda and Taliban leaders.

One target stands above all, and that is the arrest of Osama bin Laden for the murder of 3,000 Americans on September 11, 2001. By many accounts, bin Laden and the core leadership of al Qaeda and the Taliban are hiding in the frontier autonomous tribal areas of Pakistan or in the border provinces of Afghanistan. The Rewards for Justice Program has helped to arrest several senior Taliban and al Qaeda leaders but not bin Laden or his number two, Ayman Al Zawahiri.

The amendment before us builds on the extensive legislative tradition of this program, bipartisan, effective and flexible, to make it more likely that the world's most wanted men pay for the murder of thousands of Americans.

In this amendment, we authorize the State Department to pay rewards to anyone in Afghanistan or Pakistan, including government employees, if the information leads to the arrest of “exceptionally high-profile” targets.

Mr. Chairman, the support for Osama bin Laden, like this poster here which went out in English as well as many in Urdu and Dari, remains high. For us, we need to rely on sometimes the only assets we have in this region which are government employees in the service of Afghanistan or Pakistan; and if they can provide the information that leads to the arrest of Osama bin Laden or Ayman Al Zawahiri, then we should gladly pay for this justice.

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with senior officials in the White House who expressed their support. I will note the receipt of talking points from the State Department bureaucracy received this morning that

expressed concerns, and my reaction is that the officials who authored these points may work for someone, but they do not serve the American people. Their points are poorly written and disconnected and reflect strongly on a disappointing State Department tradition of sometimes serving an obscure academic point but not America's citizens or their future security.

If we can arrest bin Laden, we should. If reward money helps to lead to his arrest, we should pay it. This program should be run in the most flexible and effective manner possible so that the greatest mass murderers in American history should meet their final justice.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, one of my partners on this.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The search and the long hunt for Osama bin Laden and other major radical Islamic terrorists we want brought to justice in the Afghanistan-Pakistan region requires new ideas and new tools for law enforcement and those who are involved in this initiative. Mr. KIRK's amendment represents such an initiative, by improving our terrorist rewards program to reflect the reality of what we face on the ground.

Our terrorist rewards program has been a valuable and successful tool, and I urge my colleagues to adopt the Kirk amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I'm not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

As you well know, a version of this amendment has passed before on the floor of this House. I welcome any incentives that help to prevent elements of al Qaeda and the Taliban to engage in further international terrorist and criminal acts, and I strongly support this amendment in the hope that it might lead at long last to the capture of Osama bin Laden.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance our time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 110-174.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. KUCINICH: Page 43, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

(c) CONTRIBUTION TO POST-OPERATIONS HUMANITARIAN RELIEF FUND.—Of the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of section 110 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (as redesignated by title I of this Act), \$500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010 shall be available for a United States contribution to the Post-Operations Humanitarian Relief Fund of the International Security Assistance Force.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In Afghanistan, as is true of all wars, bombs have missed their targets, civilians have been maimed and killed, property's been destroyed. Both homes and families have been devastated and literally torn apart.

As the United States seeks to abate terrorists, we must also learn to avoid the unintended consequences related to our foreign policy. One approach is to accept responsibility when we harm innocent civilians and provide compensation for the impact that war has had on civilian lives that are accidentally caught in the crossfire.

The United States has a moral obligation to help the innocent civilians of Afghanistan, whose lives have been devastated by war, to rebuild their lives and their country. The United States must live up to this moral obligation by providing humanitarian assistance for innocent victims of war who are harmed by combat operations.

Currently, the U.S. military has two systems in place that provide monetary compensation to civilians who, as a consequence of U.S. military action, have been accidentally harmed.

The Foreign Claims Act provides for the compensation of civilians who have been injured, died or whose property's been damaged from noncombat activities and negligent or wrongful acts.

Alternatively, condolence payments can be paid by the U.S. military directly to victims, or their survivors, who suffer a physical injury, death or property damage in amounts not to exceed \$2,500.

Congress should support the Foreign Claims Act and condolence payment systems to the greatest extent possible as this money helps innocent people of Afghanistan rebuild their lives.

Today's bill, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007,

seeks to increase the maximum amount of condolence payments; and I commend this action and urge the President to heed the intent of Congress in this matter.

There's another avenue for the United States to make major gains. Brigadier Richard E. Nugee, chief spokesperson for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, recognized that NATO forces had killed dozens of civilians in Afghanistan in 2006, and here's what he had to say. "The single thing that we have done wrong and we are striving extremely hard to improve on is" the unfortunate killing of innocent civilians.

NATO, realizing their past mistakes and in an effort to advance goodwill and allay resentment among Afghans caused by innocent civilian casualties, established a post-operations humanitarian relief fund, placed under the ISAF's Commander's discretion, to compensate Afghans harmed by combat operations.

□ 1630

This NATO program is alike in its objective to both the Condolence Payment system and the Foreign Claims Act. This system is noble in its intent.

I urge the United States to show its commitment to the people of Afghanistan, to honor our promise to win their minds and hearts by increasing the functionality of the NATO humanitarian assistance program for innocent war victims.

This amendment shows the commitment of the U.S. people to Afghanistan by diverting \$500,000 to the Post-Operations Humanitarian Relief Fund of the U.N. International Security Assistance Force. The international fund has received contributions from the Czech Republic, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Sweden. By diverting this money the United States is sending a message to and joining with NATO and the international community to show our commitment to the people of Afghanistan.

The Campaign for Innocent Victims in Conflict, CIVIC, founded by Marla Ruzicka, who worked tirelessly in Afghanistan to win compensation for civilian war victims before she was killed by a car bomb in Baghdad in 2005, supports that commitment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter of endorsement from Campaign for Innocent Victims in Conflict.

CAMPAIGN FOR INNOCENT
VICTIMS IN CONFLICT,
June 5, 2007.

Hon. TOM LANTOS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Having recently returned from Kabul, I write in support of H.R. 2446, as offered by Mr. Kucinich on June 5, 2007.

The civilian death toll in Afghanistan has become alarming, with both sides responsible for civilian casualties. While NATO forces work hard to avoid harming civilians, we know that in war accidents happen and the families of those innocent people killed

and injured need—and, frankly, deserve—immediate assistance.

Several NATO countries recently created the Post-Operations Humanitarian Relief Fund (POHRF)—a compensation war chest under NATO's commander with the potential to give Afghan civilians much needed assistance. However, only four NATO countries have donated and the amount raised is not nearly enough to truly make a difference to the Afghan people.

As H.R. 2446 requests on page 43, line 7, the United States should lead the way by donating the relatively nominal amount of \$500,000 to POHRF. Showing—not merely telling—other NATO countries how to “win hearts and minds” demonstrates American leadership and humanity on behalf of innocent Afghans suffering losses.

NATO's mission in Afghanistan cannot succeed without the trust and support of the Afghan people, as you are seeing with civilian protests and discontent in the headlines. To win that trust, NATO—with the United States leading the way—should dignify civilians harmed by its forces with the help they deserve.

I hope you will join in urging NATO countries to support POHRF by supporting this amendment ensuring a United States contribution to this important fund. After all, Afghanistan will be won or lost 1 civilian at a time.

Sincerely,

SARAH HOLEWINSKI,
Executive Director.

CIVIC states that “The civilian death toll in Afghanistan has become alarming, with both sides responsible for civilian casualties. While NATO forces work hard to avoid harming civilians, we know that in war, accidents happen and the families of those innocent people are killed and injured need—and, frankly deserve—immediate assistance.

“NATO's mission in Afghanistan cannot succeed without the trust and support of the Afghan people, as you are seeing with civilian protests and discontent in the headlines. To win that trust, NATO—with the United States leading the way—should dignify civilians harmed by its forces with the help they deserve.”

If the United States truly desires to win the hearts and minds of people in Afghanistan, we must consider how the destruction and loss of life hurts those who are trying to resurrect their lives and their country. While no dollar amount can truly be equated to a human life, we can have a substantial impact on the rebuilding of the lives torn apart by the war.

War causes wreckage, pain and suffering for many innocent civilians who must endure life in a war zone. It's easy to understand how the innocent may become angry or disillusioned with combat forces. As such, it's in the interests of the United States to ensure proper levels of humanitarian assistance.

I am urging my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment to direct additional and much-needed assistance to the innocent citizens of Afghanistan who deserve our help to rebuild their lives and their countries.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. The issue of providing compensation to Afghan civilians is one whose efficacy is not questioned. Our brave troops on the ground offer such support through the allocation of the Commander's Emergency Response Program funding and other avenues that allow U.S. forces to compensate civilians for the damage caused due to ongoing U.S. operations.

However, the manner by which my esteemed colleague from Ohio, my good friend, Mr. KUCINICH, seeks to go about addressing this issue would establish an extremely troublesome precedent regarding our operations in and our policy toward Afghanistan.

Simply put, U.S. taxpayer funds, U.S. assistance for Afghanistan, should not be used to fund long-term compensation programs under the Post-Operations Humanitarian Relief Fund of the International Security Assistance Force for damage caused by foreign forces and not U.S. forces.

By contrast, the underlying bill acknowledges ongoing U.S. efforts to support war victims affected by U.S. operations and then calls for a feasibility study to be conducted in order to assess if there is a need to expand U.S. assistance to Afghan civilian war victims.

The Kucinich amendment, however, seeks to circumvent this necessary precursor, essentially prescribing a solution to this problem before the diagnosis is received, and, again, seeking to assign U.S. responsibility for the actions of others. The United States could work diplomatically with participant nations to ensure that they make proper and substantially greater contributions to this relief fund.

However, I find it to be outside of the parameters for the U.S. assistance to Afghanistan to cover the international forces where they have fallen short, thereby putting the onus on the United States to step up financially for damages that we have not created.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, winning the hearts and minds of the Afghan people is crucial to our success in Afghanistan.

This amendment seeks to bolster that support by providing more resources to a fund operated by the International Security Assistance Force, led by NATO, which seeks to assist those Afghan individuals and families who have suffered injuries due to unintended military operations.

Currently, there are a handful of NATO countries who contribute to this fund, and it is important for the United States to show leadership in this area. With our contribution, other NATO allies will also be encouraged to participate.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 110-174.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. TERRY:

Page 26, after line 12, insert the following new subsection:

(j) PRIORITY TO U.S. ORGANIZATIONS FOR GRANTS TO AID IN THE REVITALIZATION OF AFGHANISTAN.—In awarding grants to non-governmental organizations to aid in the revitalization of Afghanistan, including to assist the people of Afghanistan to create and sustain quality economic and educational systems, under section 103 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (as amended by this section), the United States Agency for International Development should give priority to organizations based in the United States that have an established and cost-effective record of developing and administering such programs of assistance in Afghanistan.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I come here today with the common sense and hopefully consensus amendment that directs USAID to give priority to organizations based in the United States when awarding grants to NGOs to rebuild Afghanistan.

The experience and expertise of U.S. organizations in public institutions to rebuild Afghanistan should be utilized and recognized by USAID. It's also a fact that when people of Afghanistan see Americans helping to rebuild their schools and providing teachers and helping their economy, that a true and positive perception of our Nation increases.

My straightforward amendment states that USAID should give priority consideration to U.S.-based organizations that have a proven track record of assisting young nations like Afghanistan to educate its children and teach them skills that will lead to economic growth and revitalization.

The Center for Afghanistan Studies at the University of Nebraska's Omaha campus is a great example of a proven institution, experienced institution, in providing cost-effective services to Afghanistan, as well as other nations,

that has experience in administering programs within Afghanistan, and teaching the people of Afghanistan, and yet were not considered to be a subcontractor with USAID.

There are undoubtedly many more examples of expertise and assistance from United States programs dedicated to the betterment of nations and their citizens. It seems only right that USAID give priority to U.S. organizations with established records of service and success.

I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the ranking member.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

This important amendment requires the U.S. Agency for International Development to give priority in awarding grants to nongovernmental organizations, to those based in the United States that have an established and cost-effective record in developing and administering such programs within Afghanistan.

In addition, it focuses on organizations that specialize in the teaching of the people of Afghanistan how to create and sustain quality economic and educational system. In this respect, U.S.-based organizations, with a proven track record of accountability and cost-effectiveness and the development and administration of such programs in Afghanistan, should be granted priority in the grant process.

This amendment is necessary, both as a means of ensuring accountability at all levels of the contracting process, and for proper oversight by Congress.

I thank my colleague and friend for introducing this important amendment, and I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I support the underlying premise of the gentleman's amendment that assistance should be provided through organizations that have a cost-effective record of administering programs in Afghanistan. I am also gratified that the gentleman made some modifications to the original version of his amendment.

As H.R. 2446 reflects, we must continue to assist the Afghan people in creating and sustaining economic and development systems for themselves. We must continue to endow the Afghan government, Afghan organizations and the Afghan people with the necessary know how, expertise and resources so they can lead a free, stable and prosperous Afghanistan.

I believe that this amendment strikes the right balance in calling for USAID to prioritize organizations that have a cost-effective record of administering programs in Afghanistan, while allowing for assistance to Afghan entities as well.

On that basis, the amendment is acceptable to our side.

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

Mr. TERRY. I thank the chairman for his instructive input, advice, counsel and kind words and acceptance of the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 110-174.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

Page 17, line 17, strike "and".

Page 17, line 19, strike the first period, the closing quotation marks, and the second period and insert "; and".

Page 17, after line 19, insert the following new clause:

"(ix) promoting the empowerment of citizens at the local level in the decision-making process, including reconstruction and economic development decisions."

Page 62, beginning on line 16, insert "create an environment conducive to Afghan small business development," after "opportunities".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 453, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Let me begin by congratulating the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. LANTOS, and the ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for their wonderful bipartisan work on this very important legislation, which sends a signal that the United States remains fully engaged in making sure we have a secure Afghanistan, and that we build on what has happened to date and make sure that we continue to have a situation that demonstrates a continuing investment by the United States.

I think if you look back over history, we made a big mistake, when we disengaged from Afghanistan, after the Soviet withdrawal. We had helped, of course, support the Mujahedin, the freedom fighters, that was the right thing to do.

But when the Soviets left Afghanistan, so did we. And that left a vacuum

that the Taliban exploited, Afghanistan became a failed state, al Qaeda found a home there, and we know the rest of the story, the terrible attacks of September 11, 2001. Even to this day, we have not yet finished the job in Afghanistan in terms of hunting down al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, and essentially destroying the network that caused those terrible attacks of September 11, 2001.

But even as we continue that action, we need to make sure we provide for stability in Afghanistan for the longer haul, so we do not create another situation where other terrorists can take advantage of a failed state.

That requires we work in partnership with the Afghan government and the international community to make a long-term investment in Afghanistan's stability. That involves, making sure, that in addition to large infrastructure projects and important investments that we make, that we also make sure that we empower the Afghan people and make sure that they understand that we continue to have a stake and they have a stake, obviously, in their future and in building their economy. That's what this amendment that I am offering today relates to.

According to a recent GAO report, despite the expenditure of billions of U.S. dollars, reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan still have lacked a strategic focus. I know that is the major thrust of this bill, and I, again, want to commend our leadership for putting this important piece together.

As you know, this bill requires, among other things, that the President design a comprehensive interagency strategy for long-term security and stability. But in addressing these issues, issues that will impact heavily on the lives of ordinary Afghan citizens, it's essential that we make sure that we leverage one of Afghanistan's greatest assets in that decision-making process. That is the Afghan people themselves.

□ 1645

And while it does support local-led development programs such as the National Solidarity Project, the bill, I think, would also benefit and be strengthened by additional focus on involving the Afghan people at the local level in decision making. And that is why I'm proposing this amendment that requires the President to include as any part of his Afghanistan strategy an emphasis on empowering Afghan citizens in that decision making.

Economic development is a major source of concern, obviously, to the Afghan people. The CSIS, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, recently released the second in a series of post-conflict assessments of progress in Afghanistan and reported that, despite a marked improvement in the economy, Afghans continue to suffer from unsteady employment and economic insecurity. So this amendment addresses those issues. Just, again, emphasizes what I know is the overall

thrust of this legislation, the importance of making sure we include the Afghan people at the grassroots level in decisions that affect their future.

Again, I want to thank the chairman, Mr. LANTOS, and the bipartisan support this overall effort has had; and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank the gentleman for his singularly thoughtful and carefully crafted amendment, and I'm very pleased to support it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague and my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

This amendment seeks to promote the empowerment of citizens at the local level in the decision-making process, including reconstruction and economic development.

One of the key elements necessary to achieve success in Afghanistan is enhancing and promoting citizen participation in the reconstruction and economic development efforts in that country.

Citizens making decisions is a critical part in a democratic society, and this will enhance Afghanistan's political and economic institutions. Local participation, local decision-making will allow the Afghan people to take charge of their own lives and make decisions based on the needs of their local communities.

In addition to ensuring security, fighting the illicit illegal narcotics trade, related terrorist activities, developing the infrastructure for a sustainable democratic central government, the economic situation must also improve if Afghans are to have confidence in their own future and if they are to build upon the progress they have achieved thus far.

A lack of success in the economic forum has the potential to undermine political developments. It could risk demoralizing the aspirations of Afghan citizens and could jeopardize their ability to actively shape their destiny.

The United States must work hard to ensure that Afghanistan is never again a haven for terrorists, a major source of narcotics, or a source of instability or oppression towards its citizens.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for introducing this important amendment. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

And before I yield the remainder of our time to my good friend and our fearless leader, Chairman LANTOS, I want to thank the excellent staff that

has been working on our Republican side with the Democratic side on forging this strong bill; and perhaps next time, Mr. LANTOS, we will come to the floor wearing tie-dyed T-shirts and love beads and singing Kumbaya.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of our time to Chairman LANTOS.

Mr. LANTOS. As we close discussion and debate, Mr. Chairman, let me first express my appreciation to my friend and colleague, the ranking Republican member of the committee, for her exceptional leadership on this matter. Let me thank all of my Republican and Democratic colleagues who have worked so hard on this matter.

But I particularly want to express my personal thanks to the committee staff on both sides, specifically, Matthew Zweig and John Mackey on the Republican side of the committee staff, as well as all other members of the Republican staff, and on our side, Manpreet Anand, Robin Roizman, David Fite and our extraordinary general counsel, David Abramowitz.

We have done good bipartisan work, and I think the Congress did some useful work today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. POMEROY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m.

□ 1717

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR) at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 5, STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privi-

leged report (Rept. No. 110-179) on the resolution (H. Res. 464) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 5) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 65, LUMBEE RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-180) on the resolution (H. Res. 465) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 65) to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM AND SECURITY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 453 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2446.

□ 1718

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. ANDREWS (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 110-174 by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. KIRK of Illinois.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. KUCINICH of Ohio.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

AYES—419

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

McNulty Ramstad Souder
Meehan Rangel Space
Meek (FL) Regula Spratt
Meeks (NY) Rehberg Stark
Melancon Reichert Stearns
Mica Renzi Stupak
Michaud Reyes Sullivan
Miller (FL) Reynolds Sutton
Miller (MI) Rodriguez Tanner
Miller (NC) Rogers (AL) Tauscher
Miller, Gary Rogers (KY) Taylor
Miller, George Rogers (MI) Terry
Mitchell Rohrabacher Thompson (CA)
Mollohan Ros-Lehtinen Thompson (MS)
Moore (KS) Roskam Thornberry
Moore (WI) Ross Tiahrt
Moran (KS) Rothman Tiberi
Moran (VA) Roybal-Allard Tierney
Murphy (CT) Royce Turner
Murphy, Patrick Ruppertsberger Udall (CO)
Murphy, Tim Rush Udall (NM)
Murtha Ryan (WI) Upton
Musgrave Salazar Vant
Norton Sali Van Hollen
Nadler Sánchez, Linda Velázquez
Napolitano T. Walberg
Neal (MA) Sanchez, Loretta Walden (OR)
Neugebauer Sarbanes Walsh (NY)
Nix Saxton Walz (MN)
Nunes Schakowsky Wamp
Oberstar Schiff Wasserman
Obey Schmidt Schultz
Oliver Schwartz Waters
Ortiz Scott (GA) Watson
Pascrell Scott (VA) Watt
Pastor Sensenbrenner Waxman
Paul Serrano Weiner
Payne Sessions Welch (VT)
Pearce Sestak Weldon (FL)
Pence Shadegg Weller
Perlmutter Shays Westmoreland
Peterson (MN) Shea-Porter Wexler
Peterson (PA) Sherman Whitfield
Petri Shimkus Wicker
Pitts Shuler Wilson (NM)
Platts Simpson Wilson (OH)
Poe Sires Wilson (SC)
Pomeroy Skelton Wolf
Porter Slaughter Woolsey
Price (GA) Smith (NE) Wu
Price (NC) Smith (NJ) Wynn
Pryce (OH) Smith (TX) Yarmuth
Putnam Smith (WA) Young (AK)
Radanovich Snyder Young (FL)
Rahall Solis

NOES—1

Kucinich

NOT VOTING—17

Becerra Holden Pickering
Cantor Hunter Ryan (OH)
Christensen Jefferson Shuster
Conyers Jones (OH) Tancredo
Faleomavaega Kaptur Towns
Hastings (FL) Pallone

□ 1745

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH
The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. POMEROY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 260, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

AYES—159

Abercrombie Hill Neal (MA)
Ackerman Hinchey Norton
Allen Hirono Oberstar
Baca Hodes Obey
Baldwin Holt Oliver
Bean Honda Pascrell
Berkley Hooley Pastor
Berman Hoyer Payne
Berry Inslee Perlmutter
Bishop (NY) Israel Pomeroy
Blumenauer Jackson (IL) Price (NC)
Bordallo Jackson-Lee Rahall
Boswell (TX) Rodriguez
Braley (IA) Johnson (GA) Rothman
Brown, Corrine Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard
Butterfield Kagen Rush
Capps Kaptur Sánchez, Linda
Capuano Kennedy T.
Carson Kildee Sanchez, Loretta
Castor Kilpatrick Sarbanes
Clarke Kind Schakowsky
Cleave Klein (FL) Schiff
Clyburn Kucinich Scott (VA)
Cohen Langevin Serrano
Costello Lantos Sestak
Courtney Larsen (WA) Shea-Porter
Crowley Larson (CT) Sherman
Cuellar Lee Sires
Cummings Levin Slaughter
Davis (IL) Lewis (GA) Solis
DeFazio Lipinski Space
DeGette Loeb sack Stark
Delahunt Lofgren, Zoe Sutton
DeLauro Lowey Thompson (CA)
Doggott Maloney (NY) Thompson (MS)
Doyle Markey Tierney
Ellison Matsui Udall (CO)
Emanuel McCollum (MN) Udall (NM)
Engel McDermott Van Hollen
Eshoo McGovern Velázquez
Farr McNeerney Visclosky
Filner McNulty Wasserman
Frank (MA) Meehan Schultz
Gillibrand Meek (FL) Waters
Gonzalez Meeks (NY) Watson
Gordon Melancon Watt
Green, Al Michaud Waxman
Green, Gene Miller (NC) Weiner
Grijalva Grijalva, George Welch (VT)
Gutierrez Moore (KS) Wexler
Hall (NY) Moore (WI) Woolsey
Hare Moran (VA) Wu
Herseth Sandlin Nadler Wynn
Higgins Napolitano Yarmuth

NOES—260

Campbell (CA) Ellsworth
Akin Cannon Emerson
Alexander Capito English (PA)
Altmire Cardoza Etheridge
Arcuri Carnahan Everrett
Bachmann Carney Fattah
Bachus Carter Feeney
Baird Castle Ferguson
Baker Chabot Flake
Barrett (SC) Chandler Forbes
Barrow Clay Fortenberry
Bartlett (MD) Coble Fortuño
Barton (TX) Cole (OK) Fossella
Biggert Conaway Foxx
Billbray Cooper Franks (AZ)
Bilirakis Costa Cramer
Bishop (GA) Crenshaw Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT) Cubin Garrett (NJ)
Blackburn Culberson Gerlach
Blunt Davis (AL) Giffords
Boehner Davis (CA) Gillmor
Bonner Davis (KY) Gingrey
Bono Davis, David Gohmert
Boozman Davis, Jo Ann Goode
Boucher Davis, Lincoln Goodlatte
Boustany Davis, Tom Granger
Boyd (FL) Deal (GA) Graves
Boyd (KS) Dent Hall (TX)
Brady (PA) Diaz-Balart, L. Harman
Brady (TX) Diaz-Balart, M. Hastings
Brown (SC) Dicks Hastert
Brown-Waite, Dingell Hastings (WA)
Ginny Donnelly Hayes
Buchanan Doolittle Heller
Burgess Drake Hensarling
Burton (IN) Dreier Herger
Buyer Duncan Hinchey
Calvert Edwards Hobson
Camp (MI) Ehlers Hoekstra

Hulshof	Miller (FL)	Saxton
Inglis (SC)	Miller (MI)	Schmidt
Issa	Miller, Gary	Schwartz
Jindal	Mitchell	Scott (GA)
Johnson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Johnson, Sam	Murphy (CT)	Sessions
Jones (NC)	Murphy, Patrick	Shadegg
Jordan	Murphy, Tim	Shays
Kanjorski	Murtha	Shimkus
Keller	Musgrave	Shuler
King (IA)	Myrick	Simpson
King (NY)	Neugebauer	Skelton
Kingston	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Kirk	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Kline (MN)	Paul	Smith (TX)
Knollenberg	Pearce	Smith (WA)
Kuhl (NY)	Pence	Snyder
LaHood	Peterson (MN)	Souder
Lamborn	Peterson (PA)	Spratt
Lampson	Petri	Stearns
Latham	Pitts	Stupak
LaTourette	Platts	Sullivan
Lewis (CA)	Poe	Tanner
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Tauscher
Linder	Price (GA)	Taylor
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Terry
Lucas	Putnam	Thornberry
Lungren, Daniel	Radanovich	Tiahrt
E.	Ramstad	Tiberi
Lynch	Rangel	Turner
Mack	Regula	Upton
Mahoney (FL)	Rehberg	Walberg
Manzullo	Reichert	Walden (OR)
Marchant	Renzi	Walsh (NY)
Marshall	Reyes	Walz (MN)
Matheson	Reynolds	Wamp
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Weldon (FL)
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Weller
McCauley (TX)	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland
McCotter	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
McHenry	Roskam	Wilson (NM)
McHugh	Ross	Wilson (OH)
McIntyre	Royce	Wilson (SC)
McKeon	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McMorris	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)
Rodgers	Salazar	Young (FL)
Mica	Sali	

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Becerra	Holden	Pickering
Cantor	Hunter	Ryan (OH)
Christensen	Jefferson	Shuster
Conyers	Jones (OH)	Tancredo
Faleomavaega	Mollohan	Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1753

Mr. HINOJOSA changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

The amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no other amendments before the House, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KIND) having assumed the chair, Mr. POMEROY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 453, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PENCE. Yes, I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pence moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2446 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title III of the bill (relating to miscellaneous provisions), insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 3 . UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD IRAN.

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

(1) It is of grave concern that General Peter Pace, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated in late April 2007 that United States and Coalition forces “have intercepted weapons in Afghanistan headed for the Taliban that were made in Iran”.

(2) Iran’s provision of weaponry and technological expertise to terrorist and criminal elements operating in Afghanistan have reportedly included—

(A) 107 mm mortars, rocket-propelled grenades, C-4 explosives, and small arms;

(B) surface-to-air missiles reportedly supplied by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard;

(C) explosively-formed projectiles, one of which was recently discovered in Kabul; and

(D) Iranian 240 mm rockets, with a range of up to 30 miles, which have been used recently by Shiite extremists against United States and British targets in Basra and Baghdad.

(3) An increase in both the quantity and quality of Iranian arms shipments and technological expertise to the Taliban, other terrorist organizations, and criminal elements has the potential to significantly change the battlefield in Afghanistan, and lead to a large increase in United States, International Security Assistance Force, Coalition, and Afghan casualties.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall be construed to limit the ability of the United States to respond to Iranian-supported or facilitated attacks against United States Armed Forces or interests in Afghanistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion to recommit with instructions. Part of my responsibilities here in the Congress are that I serve as the ranking Republican member on the Middle East Subcommittee on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As such, I have been intimately involved in the development of the underlying legislation and am strongly supportive of it.

But I think it is also imperative that we adopt this motion to recommit and add language that addresses an issue of

great concern to the United States of America, to Afghanistan, and to the free world.

Mr. Speaker, we are receiving numerous reports that Iranian-made arms are being shipped to Afghanistan and transferred to the Taliban and other radical Islamic forces that seek to kill U.S. troops and Afghan forces.

□ 1800

This past April, General Peter Pace, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, confirmed that, “We have intercepted weapons in Afghanistan headed for the Taliban that were made in Iran.”

This past Monday, on a visit to Kabul, Defense Secretary Robert Gates noted that the weapons are flowing not only to the Taliban but to drug traffickers as well. “There have been indications over the past few months of weapons coming in from Iran. Some weapons,” he said, “are coming into Afghanistan destined for the Taliban, but perhaps also for criminal elements involved in the drug trafficking coming from Iran.”

The arms transferred reportedly include mortars, rocket-propelled grenades, C-4 explosives, surface-to-air missiles reportedly supplied by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, and rockets with a 30-mile range.

Most disturbingly, an explosively formed projectile, an EFP, similar in characteristics to the Iranian-made ones that have killed our soldiers in Iraq, were recently discovered in Kabul.

Given Iran’s unceasingly hostile rhetoric and actions in opposition to the United States, our interests and our allies, and given that these weapons were made in Iran, it is very reasonable to draw the conclusion that the Iranian regime transferred these arms to the Taliban.

We cannot allow Iran to undermine U.S. efforts and kill our soldiers in Afghanistan or to return that country to the status of a failed State and pave the way for increased terrorism against the West.

What we must do, simply, is to confront and respond to any efforts to subvert our efforts and kill our troops in Afghanistan.

As General Pace noted, “I think we should continue to be aggressive inside of Iraq, and aggressive inside of Afghanistan, in attacking any element that’s attacking U.S. and coalition forces, regardless of where they come from.”

If we are to be vigilant in protecting the lives of our soldiers and our allies’ soldiers and security forces, we cannot tie the hands of our President and our commanders in the field. They need to have every option at their disposal and opportunity to combat an insidious threat from Iran that appears to be supplying weapons to our enemies.

Accordingly, we offer this motion to recommit which explicitly states that the Afghanistan Freedom and Security

Support Act does not limit America's ability to respond to attacks that Iran supports or facilitates against our forces or interests in Afghanistan.

As the United States begins to engage Iran diplomatically, we must also make it clear that we will defend our allies and our interests in Afghanistan with all the means at our disposal.

Mr. Speaker, our relationship with Iran should be described as follows: one hand extended in diplomatic negotiation and another hand resting lightly on the holster of the arsenal of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, in support of our troops, in support of freedom and stability in Afghanistan, I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strongly support this motion to recommit.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to this motion, although I'm not opposed to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this has been a bipartisan bill from the very beginning. We have incorporated ideas from both sides of the aisle into this legislation. The recommittal motion has no practical effect whatsoever.

Nothing in the legislation before the House would prohibit the United States from responding to an Iranian military attack on the United States forces or interests in Afghanistan. In fact, no statute prohibits the President from ordering a response to military attacks upon our Nation or upon our Armed Forces.

However, this motion does not provide for taking any military action outside Afghanistan, nor should it. Therefore, I will support this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes, if ordered, on further proceedings in recommittal; passage of the bill; and suspension of the rules with respect to H.R. 2560.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 345, noes 71, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

AYES—345

Ackerman	Akin	Allen
Aderholt	Alexander	Altmire

Arcuri	English (PA)	McCaul (TX)
Baca	Etheridge	McCotter
Bachmann	Everett	McCrery
Bachus	Fallin	McHenry
Baird	Farr	McHugh
Baker	Fattah	McIntyre
Barrett (SC)	Feeney	McKeon
Barrow	Ferguson	McMorris
Bartlett (MD)	Flake	Rodgers
Barton (TX)	Forbes	McNerney
Bean	Fortenberry	McNulty
Berkley	Fossella	Meek (FL)
Berman	Fox	Melancon
Biggart	Franks (AZ)	Mica
Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Gallely	Miller (MI)
Bishop (GA)	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Gerlach	Miller, Gary
Bishop (UT)	Giffords	Mitchell
Blackburn	Gillibrand	Mollohan
Blumenauer	Gillmor	Moore (KS)
Blunt	Gingrey	Moran (KS)
Boehner	Gohmert	Moran (VA)
Bonner	Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)
Bono	Goode	Murphy, Patrick
Boozman	Goodlatte	Murphy, Tim
Boren	Gordon	Musgrave
Boswell	Granger	Myrick
Boucher	Graves	Nadler
Boustany	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Boyd (FL)	Hall (NY)	Neugebauer
Boyd (KS)	Hall (TX)	Nunes
Brady (PA)	Hare	Oberstar
Brady (TX)	Harman	Obey
Brale (IA)	Hastert	Ortiz
Brown (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Pascrell
Brown, Corrine	Hayes	Pastor
Brown-Waite,	Heller	Pearce
Ginny	Hensarling	Pence
Buchanan	Herger	Perlmutter
Burgess	Herseth Sandlin	Peterson (PA)
Burton (IN)	Higgins	Petri
Butterfield	Hill	Pitts
Buyer	Hinojosa	Platts
Calvert	Hobson	Poe
Camp (MI)	Hodes	Pomeroy
Campbell (CA)	Hoekstra	Porter
Cannon	Hooley	Price (GA)
Capito	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Cardoza	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Carnahan	Inglis (SC)	Putnam
Carney	Inslie	Radanovich
Carter	Israel	Ramstad
Castle	Issa	Rangel
Castor	Jindal	Regula
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Chandler	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Clyburn	Jordan	Renzi
Coble	Kagen	Reyes
Cohen	Keller	Reynolds
Cole (OK)	Kennedy	Rodriguez
Conaway	Kildee	Rogers (AL)
Cooper	Kind	Rogers (KY)
Costa	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Costello	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Courtney	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	Kirk	Roskam
Crenshaw	Klein (FL)	Ross
Crowley	Kline (MN)	Rothman
Cubin	Knollenberg	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kuhl (NY)	Royce
Culberson	LaHood	Ruppersberger
Davis (AL)	Lamborn	Rush
Davis (CA)	Lampson	Ryan (WI)
Davis (KY)	Langevin	Salazar
Davis, David	Lantos	Sali
Davis, Jo Ann	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Lincoln	Latham	Sarbanes
Davis, Tom	LaTourette	Saxton
Deal (GA)	Levin	Schiff
DeGette	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
DeLauro	Lewis (KY)	Schwartz
Dent	Linder	Scott (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dicks	Lowe	Sessions
Dingell	Lucas	Sestak
Donnelly	Lungren, Daniel	Shadegg
Doolittle	E.	Shays
Doyle	Lynch	Shea-Porter
Drake	Mack	Sherman
Dreier	Mahoney (FL)	Shimkus
Duncan	Maloney (NY)	Shuler
Edwards	Manzullo	Simpson
Ehlers	Marchant	Sires
Ellsworth	Marshall	Skelton
Emanuel	Matheson	Slaughter
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)	Tiberi	Weiner
Smith (WA)	Turner	Weldon (FL)
Snyder	Udall (CO)	Weller
Souder	Udall (NM)	Westmoreland
Space	Upton	Wexler
Spratt	Van Hollen	Whitfield
Stearns	Visclosky	Wicker
Stupak	Walberg	Wilson (NM)
Sullivan	Walden (OR)	Wilson (OH)
Sutton	Walsh (NY)	Wilson (SC)
Tanner	Walz (MN)	Wolf
Tauscher	Wamp	Yarmuth
Taylor	Wasserman	Young (AK)
Terry	Schultz	Young (FL)
Thornberry	Watt	
Tiahrt	Waxman	

NOES—71

Abercrombie	Honda	Moore (WI)
Baldwin	Jackson (IL)	Murtha
Berry	Jackson-Lee	Neal (MA)
Capps	(TX)	Olver
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Paul
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Clarke	Jones (NC)	Rahall
Clay	Kanjorski	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kaptur	T.
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Serrano
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Solis
Delahunt	Lee	Stark
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Loeback	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe	Tierney
Filner	Markey	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Waters
Gilchrest	McCollum (MN)	Watson
Pastor	McDermott	Welch (VT)
Green, Al	Grijalva	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Meehan	Wu
Hinche	Meeks (NY)	Wynn
Hirono	Michaud	
Holt	Miller, George	

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Hunter	Ryan (OH)
Becerra	Jefferson	Shuster
Cantor	Jones (OH)	Tancredo
Conyers	Pallone	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)	
Holden	Pickering	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1821

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report H.R. 2446 back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENCE:
At the end of title III of the bill (relating to miscellaneous provisions), insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD IRAN.
(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) It is of grave concern that General Peter Pace, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated in late April 2007 that United States and Coalition forces “have intercepted weapons in Afghanistan headed for the Taliban that were made in Iran”.

(2) Iran's provision of weaponry and technological expertise to terrorist and criminal elements operating in Afghanistan have reportedly included—

(A) 107 mm mortars, rocket-propelled grenades, C-4 explosives, and small arms;

(B) surface-to-air missiles reportedly supplied by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard;

(C) explosively-formed projectiles, one of which was recently discovered in Kabul; and

(D) Iranian 240 mm rockets, with a range of up to 30 miles, which have been used recently by Shiite extremists against United States and British targets in Basra and Baghdad.

(3) An increase in both the quantity and quality of Iranian arms shipments and technological expertise to the Taliban, other terrorist organizations, and criminal elements has the potential to significantly change the battlefield in Afghanistan, and lead to a large increase in United States, International Security Assistance Force, Coalition, and Afghan casualties.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall be construed to limit the ability of the United States to respond to Iranian-supported or facilitated attacks against United States Armed Forces or interests in Afghanistan.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 10, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—406

Abercrombie	Boozman	Chabot
Ackerman	Boren	Chandler
Aderholt	Boswell	Clarke
Akin	Boucher	Clay
Alexander	Boustany	Cleaver
Allen	Boyd (FL)	Clyburn
Altmire	Boyd (KS)	Coble
Arcuri	Brady (PA)	Cohen
Baca	Brady (TX)	Cole (OK)
Bachmann	Braley (IA)	Conaway
Bachus	Brown (SC)	Cooper
Baird	Brown, Corrine	Costa
Baker	Brown-Waite,	Costello
Baldwin	Ginny	Courtney
Barrett (SC)	Buchanan	Cramer
Barrow	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bartlett (MD)	Burton (IN)	Crowley
Barton (TX)	Butterfield	Cubin
Bean	Buyer	Cuellar
Berkley	Calvert	Culberson
Berman	Camp (MI)	Cummings
Biggert	Campbell (CA)	Davis (AL)
Bilbray	Cannon	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Capito	Davis (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Davis (KY)
Bishop (NY)	Capuano	Davis, David
Bishop (UT)	Cardoza	Davis, Jo Ann
Blackburn	Carnahan	Davis, Lincoln
Blumenauer	Carney	Davis, Tom
Blunt	Carson	Deal (GA)
Boehner	Carter	DeFazio
Bonner	Castle	DeGette
Bono	Castor	Delahunt

DeLauro	King (NY)	Pomeroy
Dent	Kingston	Porter
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Price (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Klein (FL)	Price (NC)
Dicks	Kline (MN)	Pryce (OH)
Dingell	Knollenberg	Putnam
Doggett	Kuhl (NY)	Rahall
Donnelly	LaHood	Ramstad
Doolittle	Lamborn	Rangel
Doyle	Lampson	Regula
Drake	Langevin	Rehberg
Dreier	Lantos	Reichert
Edwards	Larsen (WA)	Renzi
Ehlers	Larson (CT)	Reyes
Ellison	Latham	Reynolds
Ellsworth	LaTourette	Rodriguez
Emanuel	Lee	Rogers (AL)
Emerson	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Engel	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
English (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Eshoo	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Etheridge	Linder	Roskam
Everett	Lipinski	Ross
Fallin	LoBiondo	Rothman
Farr	Loeb	Roybal-Allard
Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe	Royce
Feeney	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Ferguson	Lucas	Rush
Filner	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Forbes	E.	Salazar
Fortenberry	Lynch	Sali
Fossella	Mack	Sanchez, Linda
Fox	Mahoney (FL)	T.
Frank (MA)	Maloney (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Sarbanes
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Saxton
Galleghy	Markey	Schakowsky
Garrett (NJ)	Marshall	Schiff
Gerlach	Matheson	Schmidt
Giffords	Matsui	Schwartz
Gilchrest	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (GA)
Gillibrand	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Gillmor	McCall (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Gingrey	McCollum (MN)	Serrano
Gohmert	McCotter	Sessions
Gonzalez	McCreery	Sestak
Goodlatte	McGovern	Shadegg
Gordon	McHenry	Shays
Granger	McHugh	Shea-Porter
Graves	McIntyre	Sherman
Green, Al	McKeon	Shimkus
Green, Gene	McMorris	Shuler
Grijalva	Rodgers	Simpson
Gutierrez	McNerney	Sires
Hall (NY)	McNulty	Skelton
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Slaughter
Hare	Meek (FL)	Smith (NE)
Harman	Mees (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Hastert	Melancon	Smith (TX)
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (WA)
Hayes	Michaud	Snyder
Heller	Miller (FL)	Solis
Hensarling	Miller (MD)	Souder
Herger	Miller (NC)	Space
Herseth Sandlin	Miller, Gary	Spratt
Higgins	Miller, George	Stearns
Hill	Mitchell	Stupak
Hinojosa	Mollohan	Sullivan
Hirono	Moore (KS)	Sutton
Hobson	Moore (WI)	Tanner
Hodes	Moran (KS)	Tauscher
Hoekstra	Moran (VA)	Taylor
Holt	Murphy (CT)	Terry
Honda	Murphy, Patrick	Thompson (CA)
Hooley	Murphy, Tim	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Murtha	Thornberry
Hulshof	Musgrave	Tiahrt
Inglis (SC)	Myrick	Tiberi
Inslée	Nadler	Tierney
Israel	Napolitano	Turner
Issa	Neal (MA)	Udall (CO)
Jackson (IL)	Neugebauer	Udall (NM)
Jackson-Lee	Nunes	Upton
(TX)	Oberstar	Van Hollen
Jindal	Obey	Velázquez
Johnson (GA)	Olver	Visclosky
Johnson (IL)	Ortiz	Walberg
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell	Walden (OR)
Johnson, Sam	Pastor	Walsh (NY)
Jordan	Payne	Walz (MN)
Kagen	Pearce	Wamp
Kanjorski	Pence	Wasserman
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Schultz
Keller	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Kennedy	Peterson (PA)	Watson
Kildee	Petri	Watt
Kipatrick	Pitts	Waxman
Kind	Platts	Weiner
King (IA)	Poe	Welch (VT)

Weldon (FL)	Wilson (NM)	Wynn
Weller	Wilson (OH)	Yarmuth
Westmoreland	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Wexler	Wolf	Young (FL)
Whitfield	Woolsey	
Wicker	Wu	

NOES—10

Berry	Hinchee	Paul
Duncan	Jones (NC)	Stark
Flake	Kucinich	
Goode	McDermott	

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Hunter	Ryan (OH)
Becerra	Jefferson	Shuster
Cantor	Jones (OH)	Tancred
Conyers	Pallone	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Pickering	
Holden	Radanovich	

□ 1832

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2446, AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM AND SECURITY SUPPORT ACT OF 2007

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2446, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2560, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2560.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 213, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—204

Abercrombie	Barrow	Blumenauer
Ackerman	Bean	Bono
Allen	Berkley	Boswell
Arcuri	Berman	Boucher
Baca	Biggert	Boyd (FL)
Baird	Bilbray	Boyd (KS)
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Brady (PA)

Braley (IA) Honda
Brown, Corrine Hooley
Butterfield Hoyer
Capps Inslee
Capuano Israel
Cardoza Jackson (IL)
Carnahan Jackson-Lee
Carson (TX)
Castle Johnson (GA)
Castor Johnson, E. B.
Chandler Kagen
Clarke Kennedy
Clay Kilpatrick
Cleaver Kind
Clyburn Kirk
Cohen Klein (FL)
Cooper Kucinich
Costa Lampson
Courtney Langevin
Crowley Lantos
Cummins Larsen (WA)
Davis (AL) Larson (CT)
Davis (CA) Lee
Davis (IL) Levin
DeFazio Lewis (CA)
DeGette Lewis (GA)
Delahunt Loeb sack
DeLauro Loggren, Zoe
Dent Lowey
Dicks Lynch
Dingell Mahoney (FL)
Doggett Maloney (NY)
Edwards Markey
Ellison Matheson
Emanuel Matsui
Engel McCarthy (NY)
Eshoo McCollum (MN)
Etheridge McDermott
Farr McGovern
Fattah McNerney
Filner McNulty
Frank (MA) Meehan
Giffords Meek (FL)
Gilchrest Meeks (NY)
Gillibrand Michaud
Gonzalez Miller (NC)
Gordon Miller, George
Granger Mitchell
Green, Al Moore (KS)
Green, Gene Moore (WI)
Grijalva Moran (VA)
Gutierrez Murphy (CT)
Hall (NY) Murphy, Patrick
Hare Nadler
Harman Napolitano
Herseth Sandlin Neal (MA)
Higgins Obey
Hinchey Olver
Hinojosa Ortiz
Hirono Pascrell
Hodes Pastor
Holt Payne

NAYS—213

Aderholt Carter
Akin Chabot
Alexander Coble
Altmire Cole (OK)
Bachmann Conaway
Bachus Costello
Baker Cramer
Barrett (SC) Crenshaw
Bartlett (MD) Cubin
Barton (TX) Cuellar
Berry Culberson
Billirakis Davis (KY)
Bishop (GA) Davis, David
Bishop (UT) Davis, Jo Ann
Blackburn Davis, Lincoln
Blunt Davis, Tom
Boehner Deal (GA)
Bonner Diaz-Balart, L.
Boozman Diaz-Balart, M.
Boren Donnelly
Boustany Doolittle
Brady (TX) Doyle
Brown (SC) Drake
Brown-Waite, Dreier
Ginny Duncan
Buchanan Ehlers
Burgess Ellsworth
Burton (IN) Emerson
Buyer English (PA)
Calvert Everett
Camp (MI) Fallin
Campbell (CA) Feeney
Cannon Ferguson
Capito Flake
Carney Forbes

Perlmutter Kildee
Price (NC) King (IA)
Ramstad King (NY)
Rangel Kingston
Reichert Kline (MN)
Reyes Knollenberg
Rodriguez Kuhl (NY)
Ross LaHood
Rothman Lamborn
Roybal-Allard Paul
Ruppersberger LaTourette
Rush Lewis (KY)
Salazar Linder
Sánchez, Linda Peterson (MN)
T. Peterson (PA)
Sanchez, Loretta T. Petri
Sarbanes Lucas
Lungren, Daniel Pitts
E. Platts
Schakowsky Poe
Schiff Mack
Schwartz Pomeroy
Scott (GA) Porter
Scott (VA) Price (GA)
Serrano Pryce (OH)
Sestak McCarthy (CA)
Shays McCaul (TX)
Shea-Porter McCotter
Sherman McCreery
Sires McHenry
Slaughter McHugh
Smith (WA) McIntyre
Snyder McKeon
Solis McMorris
Space Rodgers
Spratt Melancon
Stark Mica
Sutton Miller (FL)
Tanner Miller (MI)
Tauscher Miller, Gary
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

Mollohan Sali
Moran (KS) Saxton
Murphy, Tim Schmidt
Murtha Sensenbrenner
Musgrave Sessions
Myrick Shadegg
Neugebauer Shimkus
Nunes Shuler
Oberstar Simpson
Paul Skelton
Pearce Smith (NE)
Pence Smith (NJ)
Peterson (MN) Smith (TX)
Peterson (PA) Souder
Petri Stearns
Pitts Stupak
Platts Sullivan
Poe Taylor
Pomeroy Terry
Porter Thornberry
Price (GA) Tiahrt
Pryce (OH) Tiberi
Putnam Turner
Radanovich Walberg
Rahall Walden (OR)
Regula Walsh (NY)
Rehberg Wamp
Renzi Weldon (FL)
Reynolds Weller
Rogers (AL) Westmoreland
Rogers (KY) Whitfield
Rogers (MI) Wicker
Rohrabacher Wilson (OH)
Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (SC)
Roskam Wolf
Royce Young (AK)
Ryan (WI) Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews Holden
Beccerra Ryan (OH)
Hunter
Cantor Jefferson
Conyers Jones (OH)
Hastings (FL) Pallone

Pickering
Ryan (OH)
Shuster
Tancred
Townes

□ 1841

Mr. SAXTON changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DALLAS-FORT WORTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT'S “WELCOME HOME A HERO” PROGRAM

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 391, recognizing the employees of the Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport, the North Texas Commission, the USO, and the people and businesses of North Texas for their dedication to the “Welcome Home a Hero” program.

The “Welcome Home a Hero” program is a daily gathering of volunteers to celebrate the homecoming of soldiers returning from Iraq, Afghanistan and Kuwait.

The tremendous effort has made the “Welcome Home a Hero” program one of the largest ongoing community service efforts in North Texas; and these committed employees have given of their time so that our troops, as well as their families, can be welcomed.

On June 12, the 500,000th soldier will come home for a well-deserved 2 weeks of rest and recuperation, and I'm proud to share that the “Welcome Home a Hero” program in the Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport has been selected by the U.S. military to host

this celebration; and, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for support when this resolution comes up. I know we couldn't do it today, but I extend my personal gratitude to the program's volunteers for their efforts in supporting our dedicated men and women in uniform who are proudly serving our Nation.

HONORING THE VALUABLE WORK OF THE “WELCOME HOME A HERO” PROGRAM

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 391) recognizing the employees of Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport, the North Texas Commission, USO, and the people and businesses of North Texas for their dedication to the “Welcome Home a Hero” program, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 391

Whereas the residents of North Texas have greeted thousands of troops returning to the United States from Iraq and Afghanistan for Rest and Recuperation since the program's inception in June of 2004;

Whereas volunteers from North Texas welcome over 200 troops each day who travel through Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport on their way home;

Whereas these are the first people the troops see upon their return to the United States, and the support they give the troops on behalf of all Americans is invaluable and inspirational;

Whereas citizens like Bert Brady, a veteran, spend 300 days a year at the airport thanking troops for their service and giving them a well deserved homecoming;

Whereas thousands of young men from the Boy Scouts of America's Circle Ten Council have also selflessly contributed to one of the largest and most respected community initiatives in North Texas; and

Whereas these dedicated and selfless volunteers positively impact the morale and spirit of the men and women serving our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and demonstrate our appreciation for their sacrifice to the Country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors the valuable work of the “Welcome Home a Hero” program and its volunteers and expresses gratitude for their efforts to support our troops proudly serving in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1845

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 391.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

OIL PRODUCTION

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, everybody in America is concerned about gas and oil prices. We all remember the long gas lines during the Carter administration, and the government made a commitment that we would be independent as far as energy needs were concerned at some point in the not too distant future, and we were supposed to work toward that end. I would like to give a report on where we stand because the American people are very, very concerned about high gas prices right now and the lack of oil.

On May 29, the United States consumed as much oil as it will produce domestically all year. All the oil that we produce in the United States has been used up by May 29. That means from that date until January, 2008, next year, we are now completely dependent upon politically unstable regions of the world such as the Persian Gulf, Nigeria, and Venezuela for our energy needs. Why is that? Because year after year, decade after decade, this country throws up more roadblocks, usually because of some environmental reason, to exploring for and utilizing domestic supplies of oil and natural gas.

In the ANWR, for instance, it holds the single largest deposit of oil in the entire United States, and that is 10.4 billion barrels of oil, and it is more than double the proven reserves in the entire State of Texas, and almost half of the total proven reserves in the United States, which is 22 billion barrels.

To put it more simply, opening the ANWR could increase U.S. reserves by nearly 50 percent.

And I have been up to the ANWR, and I can tell you there is no environmental damage that is going to take place if we drill in that area. And we could get between 1½ to 2 million barrels of oil a day. That would help a tre-

mendous amount the needs of the American people.

On the outer continental shelf, another example, as required by the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the Department of the Interior recently conducted a comprehensive inventory of oil and natural gas resources located off of our coastlines. According to the Department of Interior, there is an estimated 8.5 billion barrels of known oil reserves and 29.3 trillion cubic feet of known natural gas reserves along our coastlines; with 82 percent of the oil and 95 percent of the gas located in the Gulf of Mexico.

However, even more importantly, the Department of the Interior estimates there are untapped resources of about 86 billion barrels, 51 percent in the Gulf of Mexico; and 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, 55 percent in the Gulf of Mexico, that is out there.

In July, 2004, a Spanish oil company, Repsol-YPF, in partnership with communist Cuba's state oil company, CUPET, identified five oil fields it classified as "high quality" in the deep water of the Florida Straits right off the coast of Florida, 20 miles northeast of Havana and within Cuba's Exclusive Economic Zone.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, the North Cuba Basin holds an estimated 4.6 billion to 9.3 billion barrels of crude oil and 9.8 trillion to 21.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Unfortunately, since the 1980s, the U.S. has prohibited oil and gas drilling on most of the outer continental shelf except for limited areas of the western Gulf of Mexico, not the Florida Straits or around Florida, and limited parts of Alaska.

Oil shale: There is enough oil shale in Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming to create the equivalent of 1.8 trillion barrels of oil and potentially as much as 8 trillion barrels of oil. In comparison, Saudi Arabia reportedly holds proven reserves of 267 billion barrels, which is less than about one-eighth of what we have in the United States in shale.

Unfortunately, oil shale is roughly equivalent to diesel fuel and a number of Clean Air Act regulations, such as low-sulphur diesel, and Federal motor fuel taxes, which favor gasoline over diesel fuels, have created a strong financial disincentive regarding the production and use of oil shale fuels.

I don't want to belabor this point, but we have enough oil that we could move very closely to energy independence if we didn't have environmental radicals stopping us from drilling where we have the oil and we have those known oil reserves.

It is tragic that we have to continue to rely on Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and other countries that are very unstable in various parts of the world when we really know that at some point in the future we are going to need more and more of their oil.

We need to move toward energy independence. We have been talking about it since the 1980s. Nothing has been

done, and now gas prices are going up because we aren't producing enough oil and gas in the United States. And we have the reserves there to do it. We haven't even built any new oil refineries for 30 years. We can't even refine the oil that we do get here in the United States to take care of all the needs of the American people.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, as I close, on both sides of the aisle, that we need to start moving toward energy independence. We need to start thinking about economic concerns as well as environmental concerns and have a balance there. We can do it in an environmentally safe way, and the American people want us to do it, and we need to listen to them as well as the environment lobby here in Congress.

END THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning of the war, which is now an occupation, in Iraq, the Bush administration has not kept faith with our troops. Whether it was sending them into combat without the proper body armor or failing to provide wounded veterans with proper care at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, this administration has turned its back on our brave men and women time and time again.

Another example of this outrageous mistreatment is the Pentagon's "stop loss" policy. A very disturbing article about "stop loss" appeared 3 days ago in the Chicago Tribune. Actually, it should be required reading for every single Member of this House. The article says:

"As the United States moves into its 5th year in Iraq and escalates troop levels there, the Pentagon has kept combat units manned by forcing as many as 80,000 soldiers to stay in uniform in war zones even after their enlistment obligations have been met or their retirement dates have passed.

"The policy, known as "stop loss" . . . has sparked . . . a spate of lawsuits and in backlash in the ranks.

" . . . The vast majority of troops find that stop loss means one thing: Instead of beginning new lives in the civilian world, they are headed back to Iraq for their second, third, or even fourth combat tour, a practice critics say amounts to nothing less than an involuntary draft.

" . . . Suzanne Miller, a Jacksonville lawyer whose son expects to be stop-lossed this summer, said, 'I like . . . to call it indentured servitude . . . you have no control over your own destiny and are being forced, under threat of prison, to work for an employer you no longer want to work for.'"

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop mistreating our troops and the families who wait so patiently for their return.

We need bold action to bring our troops home.

Last month this House had the opportunity to take such bold action. We had a bill before us that would have fully funded a safe withdrawal of our troops and defense contractors starting within 90 days. This bill also would have provided for the social and economic reconstruction of Iraq so that the Iraqi people could look to their future with hope. And it would have supported diplomatic efforts and multinational efforts to restore security in Iraq. That plan of action made sense.

But instead of taking bold action, the Congress took the same old action and gave the President every single thing he wanted in the supplemental spending bill. There is no timetable for withdrawal, and the President doesn't even have to hold the Iraqi government accountable for failing to meet the benchmarks in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, every third grader in America is being held accountable for meeting his or her reading and math benchmarks under No Child Left Behind. We are demanding more from our 8-year-olds than the Iraqi government.

Mr. Speaker, the American people didn't send us here to go all wobbly in the knees and weak in the stomach when the moment of truth arrived. They sent us here to stand up to the President to end this war, and that is what we must do.

So let us begin to restore the good name of the Congress by overturning the original authority for the war. Congress didn't authorize this President to use U.S. troops to police a civil war, which is what Iraq has come to.

From here on, there must be one benchmark and one benchmark only. The orderly, fully funded, and fully protected withdrawal of our troops. They have done their duty. Now it is our time to do our duty for them.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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.)

IN COMMEMORATION OF D-DAY AND HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES: PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT'S PRAYER

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for those who question the

role of religious expression and religious faith in our national history and in our public square, I rise tonight to read a nationally broadcast prayer that was read on D-Day, June 6, 1944, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as our troops landed at Normandy. I am reading this prayer in the House tonight to both commemorate this event and to honor the men and women of our Armed Forces.

"Almighty God, our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity.

"Lead them straight and true. Give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith.

"They will need Thy blessings. Their road will be long and hard. For the enemy is strong. He may hurl back our forces. Success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again; and we know that by Thy grace and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph.

"They will be sore tried, by night and by day, without rest until the victory is won. The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken with the violences of war.

"For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not for the lust of conquest. They fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise and tolerance and good will among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home.

□ 1900

"Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants, into Thy kingdom.

"And for us at home, fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters and brothers of brave men overseas, whose thoughts and prayers are ever with them, help us, Almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this hour of great sacrifice.

"Many people have urged that I call the Nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and the desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in a continuance of prayer. As we rise to each new day, and again when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips, invoking Thy help to our efforts.

"Give us strength, too, strength in our daily tasks, to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and the material support of our Armed Forces.

"And let our hearts be stout, to wait out the long travail, to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage unto our sons wheresoever they may be.

"And, O Lord, give us faith. Give us faith in thee; faith in our sons, faith in each other, faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever

be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters of but fleeting moment, let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose.

"With Thy blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogancies. Lead us to the saving of our country, and with our sister nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace, a peace invulnerable to the schemings of unworthy men, and a peace that will let all of men live in freedom, reaping the just rewards of their honest toil.

"Thy will be done, Almighty God. Amen."

HAROLD "HAL" HART

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and passing of a great man and a gentleman, Harold "Hal" Hart. He was a teacher, a father figure, a mentor and friend to thousands across Oregon and thousands scattered indeed around the world whose lives go on as a testament to the goodness that Hal instilled in others.

A resident of Portland, Oregon, for most of his life, Mr. Hart lived a life that others could only dream of. Married to his high school sweetheart, Sally, and blessed with five daughters and eleven grandchildren, he never missed an opportunity to see the good in others. Nor did he miss an opportunity to bring out the best in others.

An attorney with an unabashed respect for the law, Mr. Hart worked tirelessly to mend the shattered lives of young people. He was seen by judges as the "go to" lawyer when a child was in need of help, working pro bono to aid countless adoptions, custody cases and child support cases. When asked why he cared so much and gave so much in this cause, he would say that everyone has the right to a happy childhood.

Outside of his professional life, Mr. Hart continued to give of himself. The founder and coach of Lincoln High School's Constitution program that won 13 consecutive Oregon State championships, including three national championships, and eight top 10 national finishes, he not only pioneered law-related education programs in the Portland metropolitan area, indeed, in that endeavor he was the Johnny Wooden of his field. One of his proudest moments, it was said, was when his students were given the opportunity to present their winning remarks to the U.S. Supreme Court, Members of the Senate, and to then Vice President Al Gore. Hundreds of his students have moved into the legal, teaching, government and service professions.

A noted softball coach who established girls' softball at Ainsworth Grade School and Lincoln High School, Hal Hart was coaching a women's team up to the last week of his life. He was

also a lifelong musician who supported himself through high school, college and law school playing clarinet and saxophone. As an adult, he played countless fundraisers with his jazz combo and the Providence Hospital Stage Band.

While Mr. Hart quietly went about helping others, never asking for anything in return except that those that he helped be good people, he was recognized by countless organizations for the works that he did. The effect of Hal Hart on his community and on the lives of those who knew him cannot be overstated. He was loved by his teams and beneficiaries, respected by his adversaries, and he will be universally missed.

While we have lost this great Oregonian, we find solace that so many others have been spurred on by his example. Throughout his years of teaching, he kept framed on his desk a few lines from Ralph Waldo Emerson, and they sum up his philosophy as follows:

To laugh often and love much; to win the respect of intelligent persons and the affection of children; to earn the approbation of honest citizens and endure the betrayal of false friends; to appreciate beauty; to find the best in others; to give of oneself; to leave the world a bit better, whether by a healthy child, a garden patch or a redeemed social position; to have played and laughed with enthusiasm and sung with exaltation; to know that one life has breathed easier because you have lived, this is to have succeeded.

Mr. Speaker, Hal Hart was a success by any measure and in so many different ways.

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

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

UNANTICIPATED GOOD RESULTS (WHEN WE LEAVE)

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, good intentions frequently lead to unintended bad consequences. Tough choices, doing what is right, often leads to unanticipated good results.

The growing demand by the American people for us to leave Iraq prompts the naysayers to predict disaster in the Middle East if we do. Of course, these merchants of fear are the same ones who predicted invading and occupying Iraq would be a slam-dunk operation, that we would be welcomed as liberators and oil revenues would pay the bills with minimum loss of American lives. All this hyperbole, while ignoring the precise warnings by our intelligence community of the great difficulties that would lie ahead.

The chaos that this pre-emptive undeclared war has created in Iraq has allowed the al Qaeda to establish a foothold in Iraq and the strategic interests of Iran to be served. The unintended consequences have been numerous. A well-intentioned but flawed policy that ignored credible warnings of how things could go awry has produced conditions that have led to a war dominated by procrastination without victory or resolution in sight.

Those who want a total military victory, which no one has yet defined, don't have the troops, the money, the equipment, or the support of a large majority of the American people to do so. Those in Congress who have heard the cry of the electorate to end the war refuse to do so out of fear the demagogues will challenge their patriotism and their support for the troops. So nothing happens except more of the same. The result is continued stalemate with the current policy and the daily sacrifice of American lives.

This wait-and-see attitude and a promised reassessment of events in Iraq late this summer strongly motivates the insurgents to accelerate the killing of Americans to influence the coming decision in 3 months. In contrast, a clear decision to leave would prompt a wait-and-see attitude, a de facto cease fire, in anticipation of our leaving; a perfect time for Iraqi factions to hold their fire on each and on our troops and just possibly start talking with each other.

Most Americans do not anticipate a military victory in Iraq, yet the Washington politicians remain frozen in their unwillingness to change our policy there, fearful of the dire predictions that conditions can only get worse if they leave. They refuse to admit the conditions of foreign occupation is the key ingredient that unleashed the civil war now raging in Iraq and serves as a recruiting device for al Qaeda. It is time for a change in American foreign policy.

But what if those who were so wrong in their predictions as to the outcome of their invasion are equally wrong about what might happen if we leave? Unanticipated good results may well occur. There is room for optimism. The naysayers have been wrong before and are probably going to be wrong again.

The truth is, no one knows exactly what would happen if we leave. Civil strife may last for a while longer, but one thing is certain, no longer will American lives be lost. That in itself would be a blessing and reason enough for doing so.

After we left Vietnam under dire circumstances, chaos continued, but no more American lives were lost. But, subsequently, we and the Vietnamese have achieved in peace what could not be achieved in war. We now are friends. We trade with each other, and we invest in Vietnam. The result proves the sound advice of the Founders: Trade in friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none. Example and per-

suasion is far superior to force of arms for promoting America's goodness.

It is claimed that we cannot leave until a new military faction is trained to fill the vacuum. But the question is, will there really be a vacuum, or are we talking about our proxy army being trained well enough to continue to do battle with the very strong militias already in place? Lack of training for the local militias has never been a problem for them.

The real problem with our plans to train a faction of Iraqis to carry out our plans for the Middle East is that the majority of Iraqis object and the army trainees are not as motivated as are the members of the various militias. The Kurds have a militia capable of maintaining order in their region. Sadr has a huge militia that is anxious to restore order and have us gone. The Badr brigade is trained to defend its interests. And the Sunnis are armed and determined. Our presence only serves to stir the pot by our troops being a target of nearly all the groups who are positioning themselves for our anticipated departure.

After we leave, just maybe the Shiites and the Sunnis will develop an alliance based on nationalism. They already talk of this possibility, and it could include the Badr brigade and the Sadr militias. A coalition like this could serve as an efficient deterrent to al Qaeda and Iran since they all share this goal.

Al Qaeda and Iran were not influential in Iraq before the invasion and would not be welcomed after we leave. There is cooperation now, motivated by the shared desire of the Sunnis and the Shiites to oppose our occupation. There's definitely a potential that the Iraqis may do much better in dealing with their own problems than anyone can imagine once we leave. Already there are developing coalitions of Sunni and Shiites in the Iraqi parliament that seek this resolve.

It is claimed by some that leaving the Middle East would not serve the interests of Israel. Israel with its nuclear arsenal is quite capable of defending itself under all circumstances. Its dependency on us frequently prevents it from taking action that otherwise may be in its best interests because we do not approve of such actions. Israel's overtures to Syria and other neighbors would not be road blocked by U.S. policy if we left the Middle East. With us gone Israel would have greater motivation to talk with other Arab countries as they did with Egypt. It just may be that Israel would accept the overtures made by the Arab League for a comprehensive peace. The Arab League might be an acceptable alternative to the U.S. influencing policy in the region.

We're told we can't let this happen or we'll lose control of the oil and gasoline prices will soar—exactly what has happened with our invasion. And if the neo-conservatives have their way there will be an attack on Iran. If that occurs, then watch what happens to the price of oil.

No matter who ends up controlling the oil they will always have a need for western markets. Instead of oil prices soaring with our leaving, production may go up and prices fall. A change in our foreign policy is overdue.

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

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

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

WAR IS UGLY BUT TYRANNY IS UGLIER

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

Mr. WAMP. I thank the speaker.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I come to the floor with several of my colleagues over the next hour to recognize that while even tonight we've heard these divisions on the floor from both parties and Members in each party that have differences of opinion about Iraq and the war, we come tonight to talk about the threats around the world that continue to emerge, that are real.

But before we get to the discussion about those threats and global security and the need for our country to be the leader of all of civilization, civilized countries versus, frankly, uncivilized, organizations, factions, even countries around the world who actually believe that blowing themselves up somehow is right or just. This is the struggle, and I do not think we can afford to deny the threats. I want to start first, though, by honoring the people who are volunteering to this very day to put themselves between the threat in our civilian population and serve in the uniform of our Armed Forces, first and foremost, the ones that have actually given their life for us.

Last week, over the Memorial Day district work period, I joined the families of two heroic East Tennesseans, one here in Washington at Arlington National Cemetery as I left. Sergeant First Class James David Tiger Connell, Jr., of Lake City, Tennessee, was laid to rest here in Arlington a week ago Friday for answering the Scriptural call that "no greater love hath any man than to lay down his life for a friend." And then on Memorial Day, in Chattanooga, Tennessee, I joined the family of Private First Class Travis Haslip from Ooltewah, Tennessee, to lay his body to rest. Two great American heroes who joined six other heroes from my district who have given their life for us. And contrary to what some people say, they not only did not die in vain, they joined the ranks of the

greatest Americans ever who were willing to give their life for the cause of freedom.

□ 1915

They were willing to lay it all on the line for the principles that this country holds so dear, knowing that every generation sooner or later has to face threats like this and somebody has to go and answer the call.

If you believe they died in vain, then many, many, many others through other wars throughout the history of our country also did, and I don't believe it for a second, because I know that it is those patriotic Americans that have paid the price.

I want to honor tonight Sergeant Paul Thompson III of Jefferson City, Tennessee; Sergeant First Class Stephen Curtis Kennedy of Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Sergeant David Thomas Weir of Cleveland, Tennessee, and I want to talk about his mom in a minute; Staff Sergeant Daniel M. Morris of Clinton, Tennessee; Sergeant John Michael Sullivan of Hixon, Tennessee; and Sergeant Terrance W. Prater of Speedwell, Tennessee.

I want to say that Jackie Weir, Sergeant David Weir's mom, wrote me a letter which I received over the Memorial Day weekend. This incredible mom has on the bottom of her letterhead a quote from General George S. Patton. It says, "It is foolish and wrong to mourn the men who died. Rather, we should thank God that such men lived." This is on her letterhead. She gave her son for our country and its future.

This coming Monday, I will be privileged to join my nephew with the 181st Field Artillery Brigade as they deploy for Iraq from Chattanooga. Jeffrey Watts is my nephew, so a member of our family is going as well. May God be with all of them, protect them and strengthen them.

Because, as John Stuart Mill once said, "War is an ugly thing, but it is not the ugliest of things." He said, "The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse." He said, "A person who has nothing for which they are willing to fight, nothing they care more about than their own personal safety, is a miserable creature who has no chance of ever being free unless those very freedoms are made and kept by better persons than himself."

That is etched in my memory, because I don't believe everything John Stewart Miller ever wrote, but I agree with that, that the alternative to war sometimes is complete loss of freedom, and it is tyranny, and it is terror all the time, and it is oppression. Without the courage to fight and stand up, that is where we may end up.

It is easy to forget the timeline. I want to go through it. Then I want to recognize the gentleman from Michigan. The timeline though goes back a long time.

Twenty-five years ago, April, 1983: A suicide car bombing against the U.S. Embassy in Beirut killed 63, 17 Americans.

October, 1983: A suicide car bomb attack against the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut kills 241 servicemen. A simultaneous attack on a French base kills paratroopers.

November, 1984: A bomb attack on the U.S. Embassy in Bogota, Colombia, kills a passerby. The attack was preceded by death threats against U.S. official by drug traffickers.

April, 1985: A bomb explodes in a restaurant near a U.S. air base in Madrid killing 18, wounding 82, including 15 Americans.

June, 1985: San Salvador, El Salvador, 13 people are killed in a machine gun attack in an outdoor cafe. Four U.S. Marines and two American businessmen.

June, 1985: A TWA airliner is hijacked over the Mediterranean, the start of a 2-week hostage ordeal. The last 39 passengers are eventually released in Damascus after being held in various locations in Beirut.

August, 1985: A car bomb at a U.S. military base in Frankfurt, Germany, kills two and injures 20. A U.S. soldier murdered for identity papers is found the day after the explosion.

October, 1985: Palestinian terrorists hijacked a cruise liner, the Achille Lauro, in response to the Israeli attack on PLO headquarters in Tunisia. Leon Klinghoffer, an elderly, wheelchair-bound American is killed and thrown overboard.

November, 1985: Hijackers aboard an Egypt Air flight killed one American. Egyptian commandoes later stormed the aircraft on the island. Sixty people are killed.

December, 1985: Simultaneous suicide attacks are carried out against U.S. and Israeli check-in desks at Rome and Vienna international airports. Twenty people are killed in the two attacks, including four terrorists.

I am going on and on. There are 44 incidents in 25 years by the Islamic radicals. You can deny it if you want to. You can say this is all about Iraq if you want to. But I continue.

April, 1986: A bomb destroys a West Berlin disco frequented by U.S. servicemen, killing one American and one German woman and wounding 150, including 44 Americans.

An explosion in April, 1986, damages a TWA flight as it prepares to land in Athens, Greece. Four people are killed when they are sucked out of the aircraft.

December 21, 1988: A bomb destroys Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland. All 259 people aboard the Boeing 747 are killed, including 189 Americans, as are 11 people on the ground.

February, 1993: A bomb in a van explodes in an underground parking garage in New York's World Trade Center killing six people and wounding over 1,000, 1993.

April, 19, 1995: A car bomb destroyed the Murrah Federal building in Oklahoma City. This was not al Qaeda. We know what that was.

November 13, 1995: A car bomb in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, killed seven people, five of them American military and civilian advisers for the National Guard training center.

June 25, 1996: A bomb aboard a fuel truck explodes outside a U.S. Air Force installation in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. Nineteen U.S. military personnel are killed.

July 27, 1996: A pipe bomb explodes during the Olympic games in Atlanta. That was also not them.

June, 1998: Rocket propelled grenades explode near the U.S. Embassy in Beirut.

August, 1998: Terrorist bombs destroyed the U.S. Embassy in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

October 12, 2000: A terrorist bomb damages the destroyer USS Cole in the Port of Yemen, killing 17 sailors and injuring 39.

September 11, 2001: It is all I need to say.

April 11, 2002: Explosions at ancient synagogue in Tunisia leaves 17 dead.

May of 2002: Car explodes outside hotel in Pakistan, killing 14.

June of 2002: Bomb explodes outside American consulate in Pakistan, killing 12.

October of 2002: Nightclubs bombed in Bali, Indonesia, killing 202, mostly Australians.

October suicide attack on a hotel in Mombasa, Kenya, killed 16.

May 4, 2003: Suicide bombers kill 34, including eight Americans, in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

May of 2003: Four bombs kill 33 people, targeting Jewish, Spanish and Belgian sites in Casablanca.

August, 2003: Suicide car bomb kills 12, injures 150 at Marriott Hotel in Jakarta.

November, 2003: Explosions rock Riyadh Saudi Arabia, killing 17.

November, 2003: Suicide car bombers simultaneously attack two synagogues in Istanbul, Turkey, killing 25 and injuring hundreds.

March, 2004: Ten terrorist bombs explode almost simultaneously during the morning rush hour in Madrid, Spain, killing 202 and injuring more than 1,400.

May 29 through 31, 2004: Terrorists attacked the offices of a Saudi oil company in Khobar, Saudi Arabia, taking foreign oil workers hostage in nearby residential compound. Twenty-two people dead.

June, 2004: Terrorists kidnap and execute Paul Johnson, Jr., an American in Riyadh. Nearly a week after his capture, photos of his body are posted on an Islamic website.

December, 2004: Militants believed to be linked to al Qaeda drive up to U.S. Embassy consulate in Saudi Arabia, storm the gates and kill five.

July, 2005: Bombs explode on three trains in London, England, killing 52.

October, 2005: Twenty-two killed by three suicide bombers in Bali.

November, 2005: Fifty-seven killed at three American hotels in Jordan.

March, 2006: Two residents arrested in this country, one a Georgia Tech student.

June, 2006: Canadian plot to behead the Prime Minister and bomb the Canadian Parliament. Seventeen arrested.

June, 2006: Florida-based plot to attack the Sears Tower in Chicago, seven arrested.

December, 2006: Chicago area Muslim convert arrested for plotting to attack a local mall and government buildings using grenades.

May, 2007: New Jersey-based plot to attack soldiers in Fort Dix, New Jersey.

Last week, another huge plot exposed to cause unbelievable damage at JFK Airport on an energy system that runs between New Jersey and New York.

We sure better not ignore these threats. We better stand in the gap for the next generation and quit denying that these threats are mounting against us. I don't want our country to be the last country in the world willing to face this reality.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the Chairman of the Policy Committee here among Republican Members of the House, THADDEUS McCOTTER, an expert on these issues.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, amidst these tumultuous times, it is often difficult to make sense of the stakes and the situations which confront us. But let us be clear: America in Iraq faces the prospect of a defeat, with consequences not only for this present generation of Americans but for future generations of Americans as well. Unlike Vietnam, the enemy will follow us home; and this is an enemy that is bent upon our destruction and the death not only of ourselves but of everything we hold dear.

In similar times, as my colleague PHIL ENGLISH, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, earlier read, it was the moral clarity of individuals like President Roosevelt, who helped guide the greatest generation to their triumph over abject evil.

This generation of Americans must retain their moral clarity to understand what needs to be done in the perilous present to get us to a better tomorrow. First, we need to step back and assess the situation in Iraq. The reality in Iraq is that we have one thing left to do as a Nation, and that job has been entrusted to our troops, who have done everything and more that has been asked of them.

To date, Iraq is free, Iraq is sovereign, Iraq has a democratically elected government. The people of Iraq within the government are fighting side by side with United States forces to kill and capture al Qaeda and other terrorists and insurgents.

And today we find ourselves struggling to attain the last goal before our

troops accomplish the mission, and that is to give the new democracy a chance to survive in our absence. I say a chance to survive in our absence, because no free people, including ourselves, can ever be guaranteed that their liberty will last in perpetuity.

Did not Benjamin Franklin tell us this when he said to his fellow patriots at the founding of our Nation, we will give you a republic, if you can keep it.

The price of keeping that republic, or of any free nation, is eternal vigilance, to make sure that your rights are not eroded and you are not enslaved.

At another time in our Nation's history, when we were sorely tried through the conflagration of war, it was President Lincoln who understood that a war for secession had become a war for the emancipation of an entire race so that our Nation could have a new birth of freedom.

What we find in the Middle East today as we struggle to accomplish the last task in this mission is that our war for terror has been transformed into the war for the emancipation of millions of Muslims, so that the Middle East and our world can have a new birth of freedom.

If we, as a nation conceived in liberty, who have seen the sorrowful sacrifice of so many of our sons and daughters throughout our history to retain that liberty, determine to turn our backs upon people we have given a cruel sip of freedom to before we abandon them, we must ask ourselves two questions: What do we as a nation believe anymore about ourselves and the inalienable truths upon which we were founded; and what manner of dedication can we portray to the world and to ourselves as to its preservation?

□ 1930

And then we must ask ourselves a very cruel question: What other nascent democracies under terrorist attack will the United States abandon? Because that is the question that the enemy wants us to confront in what they are doing in Iraq.

If the United States is defeated in Iraq, and make no mistake, with the euphemisms that are bandied about, if we leave we lose, and the terrorists will remind us of this. The gutter snipe, Osama bin Laden, will be more than happy to proclaim it through every Internet site and every broadcast media available to him and his ilk for domestic American consumption.

If we leave and are defeated in Iraq, everything that the enemy has done in Iraq will be transferred to Afghanistan. Already, as we found out earlier today, we have seen the hand of the Iranians in putting exploding devices and other material to support the Taliban insurgents against the NATO forces and our own U.S. troops who are part of that coalition.

Let us not forget that it was in Afghanistan that al Qaeda, and especially bin Laden and others, learned to kill as they chased the Soviets out through

measures that they are now applying in Iraq and Afghanistan. And let us not forget that an emboldened enemy will then, on much more familiar ground where the al Qaeda was housed before the attacks of September 11, it will prove a much more fertile ground for their incipient brand of insurgency, which we will have already been unable to quell in Iraq, which will now devolve into chaos and prove a safe haven for those who wish to kill us.

But let us not forget, we have one thing left to do in Iraq. That is why it is so bloody, that is why it is so bitter, and that is why it is so frustrating to the vast majority of Americans. But if we maintain our prudence and perseverance and clarity, we can see this through until the mission is accomplished. We can see that the United States, which is a revolutionary experiment in human freedom, can remember the lesson that Lincoln taught us: When we extend liberty to the enslaved, we ensure liberty for ourselves. President Lincoln understood that liberty is not static. It does not remain in a perpetual stasis where we can enjoy our liberty while others have it denied unto them.

If freedom is advancing or eroding in the course of human events, let us rededicate ourselves not only to accomplishing the mission in Iraq and Afghanistan so that our world can experience a new birth of freedom, let us rededicate ourselves to the proposition that we who are born into freedom also bear the responsibility where we can to extend liberty to those who also yearn to breathe free, as do all of God's creatures.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman.

We all desire a better course in Iraq. We all desire changes, not just General Petraeus' leadership and the increase in security forces from our country necessary to prevail in Iraq, but even more regional cooperation, and some of the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group so that people in this country will truly recognize, especially in the Congress, that this is not our President's war. This is our country's war. This is our country's fight.

Now a very prominent person from my State wrote a book called "The Inconvenient Truth." He wrote it about the environment, but I have to say tonight on the floor of the House that a bigger inconvenient truth than the one he wrote about is the inconvenient truth that is lost around here a lot, that over half of the Democratic Members of the United States Senate and almost half of the United States House of Representatives voted to remove Saddam Hussein by force. Now, many people are running from that commitment and decision, but it is an inconvenient truth that they said it needed to be done and they committed us to doing it. And we went as a nation and there was not that much criticism as there is now, but it is convenient to blame or cast aspersions or to say that intelligence went wrong instead of ac-

cepting the responsibility that we removed a genocidal mass murderer from the world stage in an important time in the history of the Middle East and an important time in the history of the world.

I have two pages, and I am not going to go through these quotes like I did the time line, but two pages of quotes from the most prominent leaders in the Democratic Party in this country saying why Saddam Hussein had to be removed by force.

The quotes I will go through tonight, though, are from the terrorists themselves because I think they must be quoted so we understand what they are doing.

Zawahiri, al Qaeda's top leader in the region now, we don't know where Osama bin Laden is, but Zawahiri said, "The jihad movement is growing and rising. It reached its peak with the two blessed raids on New York and Washington. And now it is waging a great heroic battle in Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine, and even the crusaders' own homes."

Al Manar said, "Let the entire world hear me. Our hostility to the Great Satan, America, is absolute. Regardless of how the world has changed after September 11, death to America will remain our reverberating and powerful slogan: Death to America."

Zarqawi said, "They are aware that if this Islamic giant wakes up, it will not be satisfied with less than the gates of Rome, Washington, Paris, and London."

Bin Laden's top lieutenant said, "The fire has not and will not be put out, and our swords, which have been colored with your blood, are thirsty for more of your rotting heads."

The leader of Hezbollah said, "We have discovered how to hit the Jews where they are most vulnerable. The Jews love life; so that is what we shall take from them. We are going to win because they love life and we love death."

Zawahiri said, "Knights under the prophet's banner, al Qaeda's most important short-term strategic goal is to seize control of the state, or part of a state, somewhere in the Muslim world." He wrote, "Confronting the enemies of Islam and launching jihad against them require a Muslim authority established on Muslim land. Without achieving this, our actions will mean nothing."

Osama bin Laden said, "The whole world is watching this war and the two adversaries. It is either victory and glory or misery and humiliation."

Osama bin Laden has said, "The most important and serious issue today for the world is this Third World War." That's what he said. "It is raging in the land of the two rivers, Iraq. The world's millstone and pillar is in Baghdad, the capital of the caliphate."

These are the words of jihad.

Before yielding to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, I would like to encourage people to open a book called

"America Alone" by Mark Steyn. The gentlewoman has just finished the book. It is on our reading list as we are trying to educate Members of the House on the threats. We all know you can't believe everything you read. But if you do your homework and you follow people who do their research, reading is the best way to understand this threat.

Let me say first, I am for pluralism. Every religious view is welcomed in this country, period. We are tolerant. It is a tenet of our foundation, religious pluralism is the American way. We do not believe in theocracy. It doesn't come with freedom, not our way. But let me say tonight, and this may not be popular in some quarters, that is not the Muslim way today. It is not.

The Islamists, the radicals, are insulated within Islam and they are not being challenged by the rest of Islam. And they call for a global sharia. That is Islamic rule. There were challenges all around the world right now about whether Islamic law, their law, a theocratic system, trumps the laws of any country, including this country. And if you don't think this is infiltrating most of the countries around the world, you are not paying any attention. This threat is growing and rising.

All you have to do is study the demographics that are articulated in this book and you realize that countries like our and Japan and Russia, they are actually declining in population. Our country is barely growing. The most rapid growth in the world is among the Muslim countries. Sheer demographics overtake us if the radicals continue to be insulated within Islam and not challenged because the numbers are exponential in terms of how many people are now willing to kill themselves for a cause. I could spend the rest of the night going through the latest statistics which ought to shock every American, that 26 or 30 percent, depending on two different questions, of Muslims in this country, many of whom are citizens, believe it is acceptable, this is scientific polling 2 weeks ago, it is acceptable to blow yourself up for a cause. That's a problem. I have to tell you, that is not acceptable in this country.

It is not acceptable that jihadism is fashionable or a way of life. How many people in the Muslim world now think that 9/11 was justified. I have to tell you, America is not perfect, we have made mistakes; but anybody in the world who apologizes for our country is wrong.

And these apologists who somehow blame us for what happened are wrong. Many others are here to speak. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman WAMP for organizing this hour tonight and bringing together a group of folks who have similar feelings to his. I see several of my colleagues have joined us and so I

won't take a lot of time. It is always hard to follow such eloquent speakers as Congressman MCCOTTER and Congressman WAMP. They are both eloquent people, and I am pleased to be with them to add my few comments.

As Congressman WAMP has said, I have been reading "America Alone." I want to recommend it. It is written by Mark Steyn, S-T-E-Y-N. It is an excellent book. It is very, very readable, and it is very, very frightening.

As Congressman WAMP said, if you don't do anything but pay attention to the demographics, you will have your attention gotten by this book. As he indicated, the United States of America is the only western country that is replacing itself in terms of population. It takes a birth rate of 2.1 to replace the population. What is happening in Canada, which I wasn't aware of, Canada has a birth rate of about 1.3 right now, 1.4. All of the European countries have birth rates of 1.3, 1.4, 1.2. Their populations are going to be cut in half within 35 years. That is something that has never happened in the history of humanity. Their populations are going to be cut in half; and yet the Muslim populations are growing anywhere from 4.7 percent to over 7 percent which means their populations are going to double in a very short period of time. And fairly soon, all of Europe is going to be predominantly Muslim.

The title of the book, "America Alone," we are going to be the only country in the free world that is increasing our population of people with western ideals, western religions and western thought. That is something we really have to be thinking about.

I have been troubled, and I have spoken about this before, about statements that have been made by Democrats in this body when we talk about the war that we are in. They talk about failure. They talk about it being an impossible situation. Well, I want to try to tie this in to what Congressman MCCOTTER was saying.

When I meet with people and they ask me about the, quote, "war in Iraq," I quickly say to them as kindly and as nicely as I can, we are not in a war in Iraq, we are in a war for the freedom of this country and the freedom of the world. If we lose this war, we are losing to radical jihadists who see that we have only two choices. We either convert to becoming Muslims or we should be killed.

Now as Congressman WAMP says, we believe in pluralism in this country. We believe in inviting people to come to this country, worship as they please, but not to come here and try to impose their idea, their radical idea of the world on us. So I think it is very important that we all do that. We understand this is a war for freedom.

□ 1945

This country is the beacon of freedom in the world, and failure is simply not possible.

I am very troubled again by the talk by Senators in the Democratic party

who say the war is lost. It cannot be lost again. If it is, then we will go out of existence as a society and as a culture. We can't do that.

We know that we're fighting against extremists. There's Sunnis, there's Shias and there's al Qaeda and their intent to fortify their influence in the Middle East and expand beyond it.

The Democrats have claimed that a recently declassified National Intelligence Estimate concluded that the war in Iraq has made the war on terror more difficult to win, even though the terrorists see the war in Iraq and the war against terrorists as one and the same. They see it that way. We do not.

But the NIE actually concluded that, should Jihadists be perceived to have failed in their efforts to undermine democracy in Iraq, "fewer fighters will be inspired to carry on the fight."

So we have to defeat the terrorists. We have to defeat them not only in Iraq but in Afghanistan, in New York City, in New Jersey, anywhere that we find them. Because that is our mission, and that is what we're here for. If we don't want to see freedom and our way of life destroyed, then it's our responsibility to do that.

And I will tell you that I am not going to allow the brave men and women who are fighting to maintain our freedom to think that all Members of Congress have no backbone and are weak-kneed and look only to political advantage. I want them to know that there's some Members of Congress who appreciate what they're doing, who understand the sacrifice that they're making and understand the consequences of our winning or losing.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

One of the most articulate and knowledgeable Members of the U.S. House of Representatives on radical Islam is Representative TRENT FRANKS from Arizona, and I yield to him.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As usual, he's always more kind than he should be.

Mr. Speaker, today, as we embrace the grave responsibility of discussing an issue that will have a profound impact on future American generations, it seems very appropriate to remind ourselves of the ideal that gave birth to the United States in the very first place. We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It puts us all on even ground, Mr. Speaker, but, whether we realize it or not, most of the important discussions in this Chamber, including the one in this moment, center around whether we still believe those words.

In these hours, America finds herself at war with an inexpressibly dangerous ideology that is the antithesis of those words and everything that is the American ideal. What concerns me most, Mr.

Speaker, is that this is a war between an ideology that is committed to the death and destruction of freedom and the subjugation of the entire world and is one waged against the world's free people who still remain primarily asleep.

Mr. Speaker, this ideological war did not begin on 9/11. It began many years ago when certain Muslim extremists embraced a divergent Islamist dogma that dictates that all infidels must die. It was called then, as it should be now, Jihad.

This is the same Jihadist ideology that murdered Israeli athletes in 1972; that took American hostages in Iran; that murdered Marines in their barracks in 1983; that bombed the World Trade Center in 1993, Riyadh in 1995, the Khobar towers in 1996, the embassy in 1998, the U.S.S. Cole in 2000; and that brutally murdered scores of little children on their opening day of school in Beslan, Russia. And then, Mr. Speaker, this same dark ideology massacred nearly 3,000 Americans on September 11.

The ideology of Islamist Jihad leads to the practice of decapitating humanitarians with hacksaws on television while the victims scream for mercy. Just last month, one of those most recent videos on the Internet showed a member of the Taliban beheading a man accused of spying. That member of the Taliban was 12 years old.

Mr. Speaker, that is a wake-up call to this planet if we will only listen. This same hatred causes Islamic Jihadists to cowardly hide behind women and children while launching rockets deliberately targeting innocent civilians, and continually breaking treaties of peace, and forcing children to blow themselves to pieces to effect the murder of other innocents, and all this while their mothers scream for joy.

As we anticipate future actions of the Jihadists, we should consider, as Mr. WAMP has so eloquently said earlier today, the words of the terrorists themselves. And at the risk of repeating some of the things that Congressman WAMP said, I believe that these kinds of words are so important for America and for the people in this body to hear.

Al Qaeda's Al-Zawahiri said this. He said, "The Jihad movement is growing and rising. It reached its peak with the two blessed raids on New York and Washington. And now it is waging a great heroic battle in Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine, and even within the Crusaders' own homes."

Al-Manar said on BBC, "Let the entire world hear me. Our hostility to the Great Satan, America, is absolute. Regardless of how the world has changed after 11 September, Death to America will remain our reverberating and powerful slogan: Death to America."

Al-Zarqawi said this of America's leaders, "They are aware that if the Islamic giant wakes up it will not be satisfied with less than the gates of Rome, Washington, Paris, and London."

Al-Muhajir, Osama bin Laden's latest lieutenant in Iraq, said this. He said, "The fire has not and will not be put out and our swords, which have been colored with your blood, are thirsty for more of your rotting heads."

Sheik Hassan Nasrallah, the leader of Hezbollah, said this, "We have discovered how to hit the Jews where they are the most vulnerable. The Jews love life, so that is what we shall take away from them. We are going to win because they love life and we love death."

Mr. Speaker, then we hear Democrats in this body say things like, "The savagery of the terrorists is not relevant," or even the most senior Democrat in this House is quoted as saying, "I don't take sides for or against Hezbollah, or for or against Israel." The senior Democrat in the other body said, "This war is lost."

Mr. Speaker, that kind of blind relativism that deliberately ignores all truth and equates merciless terrorism with free nations defending themselves and their innocent citizens is more dangerous to humanity than terrorism itself, and it is proof that liberals completely misunderstand the enemy that we face.

Osama bin Laden's deputy, Al-Zawahiri, said this. He made it clear in his book, *Knights Under the Prophet's Banner*, al Qaeda's most important short-term strategic goal is to seize control of a state, or part of a state, somewhere in the Muslim world. He wrote, "Confronting the enemies of Islam and launching Jihad against them require a Muslim authority, established on Muslim land. Without achieving this goal, our actions will mean nothing."

For God's sake, I hope we're listening to people like that. Mr. Speaker, such a Jihadist state would be the ideal launching pad for future attacks on the West.

Bin Laden himself has stated, "The whole world is watching this war and the two adversaries. It's either victory and glory, or misery and humiliation."

Mr. Speaker, the terrorists regard Iraq as their central front in their war against humanity; and if we're to understand our enemy and this war, we must recognize Iraq as the central front in our war against Jihad. Our courageous and noble soldiers understand that, and our enemy certainly understands that.

Osama bin Laden himself said, "The most important and serious issue today for the whole world is this Third World War. It is raging in the land of the two rivers, Iraq. The world's millstone and pillar is in Baghdad, the capital of the caliphate."

Mr. Speaker, if Democrats are correct that this struggle in Iraq is not crucial to winning the war against Islamist Jihad, then for God's sake I wish they would explain that to the terrorists, because they don't understand it.

Brink Lindsey put this all succinctly. He said, "Here is the grim truth: We

are only one act of madness away from a social cataclysm unlike anything our country has ever known. After a handful of such acts, who knows what kind of civilizational breakdown might be in store?"

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot deny that we are fighting a war against an insidiously dangerous and evil ideology that is bent on the destruction of the Western World, and they would like nothing better than to decapitate this country by detonating a nuclear blast 100 yards from here. To allow Jihadists to declare victory in Iraq will serve only to hasten such a day.

The free nations of the world once had opportunity to address the insidious rise of the Nazi ideology in its formative years when it could have been dispatched without great cost. But they delayed, and the result was atomic bombs falling on cities in the world, 50 million people dead worldwide, and the swastika's shadow nearly plunging the planet into Cimmerian night.

Mr. Speaker, Jihadists believe they have a critical advantage over the free world. They believe their will is stronger than ours and that they need only to persevere; and, Mr. Speaker, the words of neutrality and retreat have only encouraged them in that belief.

We must realize that this is a war that is fundamentally a battle between good and evil, between light and darkness, between individual freedom and totalitarian repression; and we must realize that our enemy is absolutely blinded with an absolute hate for all the Western World.

They also recognize that America is the flagship of human freedom, and if America allows terrorists to conquer us both on the battlefield and in our will to fight the result will be that humanity will be left to face a future that is dark beyond expression.

Mr. Speaker, I think that probably Ronald Reagan could close this in the best way. He said to our soldiers who nobly fought in Vietnam, "Let us tell those who fought in that war that we will never again ask young men to fight and possibly die in a war our government is afraid to win."

And I'm afraid sometimes that we forget the heroism of the past. So let me just close with a prayer that one of our great Presidents, Franklin Roosevelt, said many years ago, as today we mark the 63rd anniversary of the D-Day invasion to liberate Europe from Hitler's fascism. U.S. forces alone sustained over 6,500 casualties in that 1 day, twice what we've endured in 5 years in Iraq. Knowing the gravity of the operation, Franklin Roosevelt, one of the Nation's most liberal Presidents, said and allow me to close in those words:

"Almighty God: Our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity. They fight not for the

lust of conquest. They fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and goodwill among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home. Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants, into Thy kingdom. And for us at home, fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters, and brothers of brave men overseas, help us, Almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this hour of great sacrifice. And, O Lord, give us faith. Give us faith in Thee; faith in our sons; faith in each other; faith in our united crusade. Thy will be done, Almighty God. Amen."

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Every Member of this body has an obligation to do their best to share their beliefs in what they think we face with the American people and their constituents. I believe that this problem in Iraq that we've got to do better with is not the end of this at all.

For some reason, God spared us again with the JFK plot and allowed us to actually interdict that before another September 11 or even worse happened. For some reason, He granted us grace, but it is a matter of time, given the conflicts that we face.

To the people, this Iraq conflict is a chapter in the war that is mounted against us, and it's not the end, anymore than the first bombing in 1993 of the World Trade Center was the end. We denied that it happened, but we weren't willing to address it, and September 11 happened. But Iraq is no different in the long-term conflict which is a generational struggle with radical Islam.

□ 2000

HISTORY AND THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) will control the remaining 12 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that, and I appreciate the gentleman from Tennessee for organizing this special order tonight. As I had the privilege to sit here on the floor and listen to each of the speakers, it was a good education for me to listen to the eloquent voices that stand up so well and speak for defending our freedom.

To take us towards the to the point towards conclusion of this hour, it is hard to pick up on that tone that was left by Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, the understanding of over 6,000 casualties on that first day. I presume that they were those killed in action on that day, and on D-Day landing on Omaha Beach and on Utah Beach and on other points there in Europe. That is a place and a location that will always live in the history of this country. It is a place of glory. It is a place where freedom was begun to spread back across Europe.

As I look at that, and I see these 60-some years hence the D-Day landing, I can't help but think that those countries in Europe that have experienced freedom the longest seems to hang on to that freedom the least, and those countries in Europe, particularly eastern Europe, that have lived under tyranny the most recently, seem to want to grasp that freedom and hang on to it and fight for it and defend it more aggressively.

That is reflected, I think, in the troops that are part of our coalition troops in Iraq. In one of my trips over there, I found myself standing with a British general down in Basra. I looked around his headquarters there, and I exempt the Brits from that definition, because they have been tenacious and stood with us in Iraq and other places around the world, but as I looked around, the uniforms and the national flags that were on the shoulders of the coalition groups, Great Britain there, Australia there, Romanians there, there were Danish soldiers there, Bulgarian soldiers there, as I recall, and the list went on.

If I remember right, it was eight different countries represented at those headquarters. I just gathered them together at random, lined them up and stood there and had their picture taken so that I could go back and reference which countries were represented.

But it surely appeared to me that the nations that had lived most recently behind the iron curtain, the one that had the least experience with freedom, were the ones that were the most likely to be there serving with and defending us and defending the freedoms of the people of Iraq and helping with the liberation that is there. That does not take away from the commitments that we have seen on the part of the British, and especially the Australians. They will let me know always that they have been with us in every war, and sometimes they beat us there. So I count them among our best friends and our best allies.

But here we are, with a debate that is going on continually here on the floor of this Congress. The questions that come to mind, as I listen to this discussion, I have to ask this question, what do liberals think? What are they thinking about? How can they draw a conclusion that somehow, even though Iraq is the central front in the war on terror, and that al Qaeda has streamed into Iraq to fight us there, in a way, a lot like the bug light. It is attractive, millions of them have been killed. They were captured and taken out on the field of battle there in Iraq. I would a lot rather have it there than here, and so would the American people.

But how can one argue that the war against terror is not in Iraq, it is anywhere else where they might be. We listened to the gentleman from Tennessee go through a long place of places around the world where the Islamic terrorists have attacked, a lot of times, free people. With that list, you have to

know that this is a global war. These jihadists are attacking people, not like them, and their belief that they could expand, they should expand the caliphate at least around Western Europe and to the United States and presumably to the rest of the world, how can one conclude then that you would take a place off the map that has been paid for with the blood of American patriots, coalition force patriots and the blood of Iraqis, and the treasure, and say we are going to give it up.

We have liberated it. We have earned it, we have paid for it, and, now, we are going to give it up and hand it over to the terrorists because the war on terror is not in Iraq, even though Osama bin Laden believed it was there, and al Zarqawi believed it was there and al Zawahiri believes it is there.

It is obvious, General Petraeus has told us over and over again, that's where the central front is. In fact, Speaker PELOSI conceded that same point in one of her remarks here in a failed attempt to override one of the President's vetoes on one of their unconstitutional appropriations bills, but Iraq is the central front in the war on terror.

To argue that we should pull out of there and let that country become whatever it would become, and that would be the off limits, safe ground and territory for al Qaeda to set up shop, because, politically, it was a good argument to make.

All right, I can't follow that rationale, I can't follow that. If it is logical, someone has got to explain that to me. So we have a liberal approach to this. It is a law enforcement problem. Yes, we should go after Osama bin Laden in the mountains between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and we should do that.

But we can fight this war on many fronts. We are a nation that can do that. Before this is over, we will have to do it in many places simultaneously. But we dare not walk away from this country that we pitched our future with. It was the right decision to go in there. I regret we had to.

The President didn't have a choice, and honest historians will write that into the history books. But if we should walk away from there now, under any kind of ruse or under any kind of an excuse, they will claim victory, and, you would see, not just sectarian violence and the devastating bloodshed that would come from that until such time a dictator emerges, it can rule that part of the world, that's not the worst of things. It is a bad thing, but it's not the worst of things.

What I believe you would see happen is the Sunni triangle would become the haven for the al Qaeda terrorists. They would set up shop there, unchallenged. We wouldn't have a way to go in and challenge them, because if we're not willing to take them out and keep them out of there now, why would we ever have the will to go in and take them out later. You know that the price would be higher, but the will wouldn't be materialized.

So I believe al Qaeda takes over the Sunni triangle, and that would be the base of their operations, and they would seek to expand that base of operations. But, worse than that, as you have right now, you have Iranians fighting a proxy war against the United States in Iraq, and in Afghanistan.

In fact, the motion to recommit with instructions that Mr. PENCE offered today illustrated how Iran is engaging themselves into the operations and in the support of the Taliban and Afghanistan. But they have been engaged in this proxy war against the United States in Iraq for 2½ or perhaps 3 years.

So if we were to pull out of there, you would see the hegemony of the Iranians go into the Shi'a regions and the influence of that, get entrenched further in the Shi'a regions of Iraq. Those regions control 70 to 80 percent of Iraq's oil. That would put Iran in control of the oil in that region, and the Strait of Hormuz, through which 42.6 percent of the world's export oil supply flows.

They would be in a position to decide when their treasure chest is full of oil money, when they have purchased enough scientists and enough nuclear capability and when they have developed enough delivery capability to terrorize the rest of the world and attack the rest of the world with their nuclear capability, pick their time, shut down or shut off, I call it the valve at the Strait of Hormuz, the place where the oil has to flow through. Through that strait, they can control the economy of the world.

If that valve is shut down, that sends the United States, the effect of the cost of our oil price is going through the roof, \$3 a gallon gas would be cheap if that would happen. That would put the United States into at least a recession, probably a depression.

China would follow us. They are starved for the energy the same way, and their economy is linked to ours. If we catch a cold, they sneeze, because they sell so much product to us. The biggest losers in this would be the United States, China. The biggest winners, Iran in their hegemony; and the Russians who have more oil than they know what to do with.

That's why Putin is opposed to our operations there, and that's why we are getting a lot of grief out of Putin. This outfit over here says somehow says we shouldn't fight this in Iraq. The worst scenarios are the ones that I have talked about, and I anticipate a nuclear Iran, an Iran that is committed to annihilating Israel, and an Iran that is committed to annihilating the United States.

That's the rationale that we are dealing with here. I wonder if they can actually think through this. But I also wonder why anyone would think that the voters have hired 535 liberal generals to micromanage a global war on terror. In fact, I'd ask anyone in this

Chamber, come down, and I will yield time to you, and you tell me, name me a single general that was a liberal, a successful liberal general throughout all the history of the world.

I defy you to name one, there isn't one. One has never existed. One will never exist. Liberal generals don't succeed, 535 micromanaging liberal generals certainly don't succeed. It's not Congress' business to micro manage war. It's our job to fund them and support them and equip our troops, field an Army and a Navy, and declare a war if the situation calls for it. We haven't done so since World War II.

That's our job in this Congress, and that's our constitutional limitations. We need to live by those limitations and not be busting our buttons believing that we can do something here that isn't getting done, maybe, to the satisfaction of the people on that side of the aisle or mine, for that matter.

But there is a tremendous amount at stake, and it is more than the lives that have been invested so far, those that have been lost so far. God bless them for that. Zach Wamp spoke well to that, but the destiny of America and the destiny of the free world and the destiny of western civilization are all on the line matched up against a belief that they are going to restore a caliphate and renew a 100 year-old conflict that has been taking place here in the war, here in the world for hundreds of years.

We have a western civilization belief, we believe in freedom, this has been a country that has been founded on Judeo-Christian principles. That's some of the foundation of our strength, free enterprise market economy is another one, belief in the rule of law, and the foundational principles that we have in this Constitution, all tied together, all at risk, all matched up against people that don't believe in freedom, people that believe in death, people that execute homosexuals and female adulteresses, by the way.

Many people on this side of the aisle have a different belief system. I don't know why they would want to ally themselves with the interests of those who want to restore the caliphate, stone women and execute homosexuals and destroy your freedom and your freedom of religion. All of that is tied up in the risk of this.

FIND WAYS TO COME TOGETHER ON IRAQ

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, tonight we do something different. Tonight we may do something that may even be unprecedented. Tonight I am joined on the floor of the House by my distinguished gentleman and my partner from Long Island, the gentleman from

New York (Mr. BISHOP) and we will be joined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and perhaps others.

Tonight, for the first time that I know of, Republicans and Democrats take to the floor of the House to discuss Iraq, but not to criticize one another about Iraq, not to beat each other up about Iraq, not to cast aspersions and blame about Iraq, not to talk about what divides us on Iraq, but to find ways to come together on Iraq.

I don't think that's happened before on this floor, but I do believe that the American people have an unquenchable thirst for Democrats and Republicans not to take the time of this Congress for sloganeering and name calling and the impugning of motives, but to take the time of this Congress to have an intellectual debate over those issues, to take the time of Congress to really honor those troops and our veterans, and to discuss not what is left and what is right, but to discuss the way forward.

The gentleman from New York knows that every time the people from our districts and the American people tune into C-SPAN, what they see are Republicans and Democrats arguing and fighting and criticizing, attacking each other's ideas, impugning each other's patriotism, impugning each other's motives. Tonight is different, because we are not going to discuss what separates us and divides us, but we are going to discuss what, in fact, can unite us.

War in Iraq has caused an outbreak of war on floor of the House of Representatives, and tonight we declare a ceasefire. For me, this is not just a professional obligation, but, for me, it is personal, for two reasons.

The first is that several days ago I made a phone call to the father of Matthew Baylis. He was killed in Iraq last week. It was small arms fire in Baghdad. I have no idea whether Matthew Baylis or Matthew Baylis himself was a Democrat or a Republican or an independent or perhaps not registered to vote.

□ 2015

I don't care. I do believe that Matthew Baylis would want Republicans and Democrats to come together to talk about the way forward; that Matthew Baylis and those like him, who died in the service of his country, would want us to spend more of our time talking about moving our country forward than moving our country to the left or the right.

And the second reason that this is personal for me, Mr. Speaker, is because it's being organized by the House Center Aisle Caucus, which is a bipartisan group of 50 Democrats and Republicans who have come together, based on certain propositions. The first proposition is, we can disagree agreeably; that we can state our differences with-

out calling each other names; that we can debate the issues without having this Chamber sound like a fourth grade elementary school auditorium that's run amok.

And the other premise of the Center Aisle Caucus, Mr. Speaker, is that Democrats and Republicans will disagree on perhaps as much as 70 percent of the issues, which means we have a fundamental obligation to agree on the 30 percent that's left.

The problem is that even when we agree we haven't moved forward, because we've allowed our disagreements to paralyze areas where we, in fact, have consensus. And so the Center Aisle Caucus, which was sponsored, actually which was founded by the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman TIM JOHNSON, and me and the gentlewoman from Missouri, Congresswoman JO ANN EMERSON, and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), the Center Aisle Caucus has been meeting on an ongoing basis to find areas of agreement. We recently met with the ambassador from Iraq to the United States, and he gave us some ideas.

Before I yield time to my friend from New York, I just want to focus on some of the principles that we do agree on.

If you would listen to the debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, you would think that there are actually Members of Congress who want us to lose in Iraq. There's not a single Member of Congress who wants us to lose in Iraq.

If you listen to the debate on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, you would think that there are actually Members of Congress who do not care about the lives lost in Iraq. There is not a single Member of Congress who has a callous disregard for the lives lost in Iraq.

You would think that there are two types of Members of Congress, either Members of Congress who want defeat or Members of Congress who want to be in Iraq forever. I don't know of a single Member of Congress who supports either option.

The fact of the matter is we are not the enemies, Democrats and Republicans. Americans aren't the enemies. The enemies are the people that we're fighting, and we need to focus on this.

And the Center Aisle Caucus has gathered and has endorsed several principles that we're going to discuss tonight, and I'll run through them quickly and then yield my time to the gentleman from New York.

Here are the shared principles that Democrats and Republicans who are interested in finding common ground have articulated:

Number one, we support our Armed Forces. We want to make sure they have adequate force protection. We want to make sure they have everything they need to keep them safe and keep them sound, and we want to bring them home as fast as possible.

Number two, we want to take care of our veterans. And I am so proud to announce on this floor tonight that earlier today the Appropriations Committee, which I have the privilege of serving on, unanimously, Republicans and Democrats, Democrats and Republicans, passed a \$109.2 billion package that addresses the critical health care and housing needs for our veterans. \$18 billion above last year's level and \$4 billion more than the President requested, and I hope that he will not veto that bill.

Our bill includes \$87.7 billion in crucial funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs, which is a \$6.7 billion increase in discretionary funding over last year's level. That is the largest single increase in the 77-year history of the Veterans Administration.

Our bill addresses the backlog in claims by adding 1,000 new claims processors, and that's going to help veterans who now wait an average of 177 days for the benefits they deserve. I am very proud that Democrats and Republicans today in the Appropriations Committee voted to take care of our veterans.

We agree that we need to secure Iraq's borders because there are too many reports that Syria and Iran are sending fighters and equipment and technology over those borders to make the situation in Iraq even worse, not resisting Iraq's sovereignty, and threatening our troops and Iraqi civilians.

We agree that we need to stand up Iraqi security forces because we cannot be there for a prolonged period of time. I would imagine that we all agree that we've all been there too long already, and so we need to find ways to stand up Iraq security forces, and we're going to discuss that tonight.

We agree that there's a need for regional change. We agree that the Middle East is a very dangerous place in the world, and we need to transform it, using all the tools in our toolbox, from a place where children are taught how to blow things up to a place where children are taught how to put things together.

We agree that Iran needs to be responsible, and we need to engage Iran with the carrot and the stick. And we're pleased that the administration, which had resisted having any talks with Iran with respect to what is happening in Iraq, in fact, held those talks recently.

And, finally, we want to defeat al Qaeda, and we are prepared to use all the tools in our toolbox to do that. Because it was al Qaeda in Afghanistan that launched the attacks on the United States which killed hundreds of Long Islanders, those represented by myself and those represented by the distinguished gentleman from Long Island, from New York's First Congressional District, Mr. BISHOP.

And on that I would be privileged to yield time to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank Congressman ISRAEL for yielding, and I also thank him for organizing this special order, something I think that is long overdue. And let me also thank my friend and colleague from New York's Second Congressional District for his leadership role in the Center Aisle Caucus.

In a Congress that is, at times, bitterly divided along partisan lines, and that partisanship obscures the kind of discussion that we need to have on this issue as well as so many other issues, the Center Aisle Caucus stands for civility. It stands for honest and reasoned debate, and it stands for shared decision making. I say qualities that are often in short supply in this Chamber but qualities that are desperately needed, both in this Chamber and in our country.

Let me also start by offering my deepest sympathy and condolences to the family of Specialist James Lundin of Bellport in the First Congressional District, who also gave his life last week in Iraq. He represents, as you know, the 26th Long Islander to lose his or her life in the service of our great country in Iraq. His wake was today, and he will be buried tomorrow in Calverton National Cemetery.

And like you, Congressman ISRAEL, I called his father on Monday, and I spoke with his father. And one of the things that struck me was the remarkable dignity with which he and his family were dealing with what has to be unspeakable pain. It is that kind of dignity that we need to honor in the way we do our jobs, and it is that kind of dignity that we need to bring to what will hopefully be a fruitful discussion of how we move forward in Iraq.

And, as I say, this kind of debate is a debate that must take place. It must be an honest debate; and it must be a debate that, above all, is absent in the often inflammatory and pejorative characterizations of those who offer differing views. And we all engage, at one time or another, in these inflammatory characterizations.

As you said, Congressman ISRAEL, there is not a soul in this Chamber that does not support our troops. And, in fact, the evidence of that is over the course, the 4½ year course of this conflict, the fact that with overwhelming bipartisan majorities we have consistently given the troops each and every dime that this administration has asked for them and in some cases increased the amounts of money that we will make available to them.

We all want us to succeed in Iraq, in Afghanistan. We may have differing versions or different interpretations of what constitutes success, but that, again, is the kind of debate that ought to take place in a healthy and vibrant democracy.

But the debate thus far has been compromised, as you and others well know, when those of us who think that a time line is something that we ought to seriously consider. When that time

line is characterized as a surrender date, that obscures the kind of discussion that we need to have.

When those of us who believe that we must change course in Iraq, when that is characterized by the questioning of our patriotism, that obscures the kind of debate that we need to have.

When looking for time lines or looking for benchmarks or talking about the way in which we fund our troops is characterized as abandoning our troops, that's the kind of thing that obscures the kind of reasonable debate that we need to have.

And with respect to supporting our troops, my own view, and I think this view is shared by a great many in this Chamber, that the best way to support our troops is to put them in positions where they can succeed and get them out of positions in which they cannot succeed. And I think we all agree on both sides of the aisle that what has taken place thus far has put our troops in positions in which it has been very, very difficult for them to succeed. So that, if nothing else, motivates an impetus on the part of a great many of us to urge a change of course in Iraq.

I want to speak just for a second, Congressman ISRAEL, about one of the shared principles. And, by the way, those shared principles are the kind of principles that all reasonable people should be able to embrace and support. But one is the issue of standing up the Iraqi security forces. It is a subject about which we have spoken in the past, and I'm proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation that you have introduced, along with Chairman SKELTON, that would create, in effect, a one-for-one exchange; that for each Iraqi brigade or battalion that we stand up, we would withdraw one of our own.

I think that that kind of approach has several advantages. One, it would be true to the goal that the President himself has set out, and I believe set it out as going as far back as January of 2004, that as the Iraqi stand up we will stand down.

Since January of '04, we have spent about \$15 billion to train and equip and outfit Iraqi troops, and we have several hundred Iraqi troops right now in uniform under arms, and yet we continue to increase our own complement of troops.

I think it is a perfectly reasonable, sane, rational proposition that we impose obligations on the Iraqi troops; and as they step up to those obligations, we relieve our own troops of those obligations.

As I say, I think the legislation that you and Chairman SKELTON have filed and that, as I say, I am proud to cosponsor, I think that that is very reasonable legislation. I hope to see that legislation receive the kind of debate and discussion and attention that it ought to.

We're not done yet. As you know, we have a report coming to us in September; and at that point the Congress is going to need to make another set of

decisions. Hopefully, that kind of reasoned response to a situation that none of us can support in terms of how it has gone thus far is the kind of direction in which we need to head.

So, with that, I'm happy to yield back to you.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his raising this issue of one for one, because I think it's a perfect example of Members of this body having different ideas that may make sense, trying to offer those ideas in the spirit of some compromise and reasonableness. Let's go into the basis of that one for one and explore it as a possible, not a way out, because Iraq is certainly complex and complicated, but at least one measure of improvement.

The President has said that, in the past, and has stated this publicly, that for every Iraqi that stands up, an American will come home or be redeployed. And he has said that on several occasions. On other occasions, we've heard that there are between 250,000 and 300,000 Iraqis that have been stood up. Well, the gentleman can help me do the math. If in fact there are between 250,000 and 300,000 Iraqis that have been stood up and if for every one that stands up an American is going to redeploy, how come 250,000 to 300,000 have not redeployed?

□ 2030

The answer is in how you define "training" and what it means to say "stand up." In fact, go you take a look at the textbook definition of "training" in military terms, combat proficiency is what is important, and there are different levels of combat proficiency. If you are trained at level one combat proficiency, you are capable of fighting and winning convincingly anywhere in the world and you don't need any U.S. support. If you are trained at level two combat proficiency, you can fight and win almost anywhere in the world, but you need some measure of U.S. support, maybe some intel, maybe some reconnaissance assistance, maybe some logistics support. So if you take a look at the numbers of Iraqi forces that are actually trained at level one or level two combat proficiency, you will find that it is not 250,000 to 300,000 but far less. And the numbers ought not be repeated in a public forum, but far less than 250,000 to 300,000.

So the idea that we came up with was why don't we ask the President to report to the Congress on a monthly basis how many Iraqis have actually been trained at level one or level two combat proficiency, certify that to the Congress, and then we will redeploy an equivalent amount. Now, I am not suggesting that we withdraw that number necessarily. We might redeploy them to the borders so we can prevent Iran and Syria from inflaming the situation in Iraq.

The point is, Congressman BISHOP, that I don't claim to have all the an-

swers and I know that this isn't the perfect answer, but it is an idea that we have tried to set forward.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I think it is, as I said before, a perfectly reasonable idea but also one that represents, I believe, an imperative. I think even the most ardent supporters of our presence in Iraq must recognize the enormous strain that a prolonged presence in Iraq has placed on our Armed Forces, and I believe the most ardent supporter must recognize that it will be enormously difficult, if not impossible, for us to maintain that presence at the current level or even at the presurge level. And thus if there is a chance of bringing order to Iraq, it must in the long term rest with Iraqi security forces as opposed to our own forces.

And as I say, we have spent \$15 billion thus far, and I won't say we have little to show for it but we certainly don't have as much to show for it as I believe everyone in this Chamber would agree. So I think that of the shared principles, and I think they are all crucial and important, but I think this perhaps take prominence over all the others because if for no other reason, just the simple logistics of maintaining the troop presence we have given our current end strength is going to be enormously difficult, if not debilitating, on our Armed Forces.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. And, again, this was just one idea.

And the true value of the Center Aisle Caucus and this kind of dialogue, this unprecedented dialogue, and civil dialogue between Members on both sides is that we all have good ideas and we have all been trying to advance those ideas. And it is so refreshing to be joined by three members of the other side of the Center Aisle Caucus who have been extremely constructive, who have been true leaders in trying to forge bipartisan alliances in order to move the country and the debate not to the left, not to the right, but forward. And I am very proud that we are joined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and I know the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) has joined us as well.

And I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, a leader in the Center Aisle Caucus (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Thank you so much, Congressman ISRAEL and Congressman BISHOP, for helping to organize this Special Order tonight. I think the American people expect this much of us, that they like to see this type of civil, controlled dialogue where we are trying to rally around, I think, some shared principles that we can pretty much agree to, that we are talking about this in a proper tone, keeping the temperature down, so to speak.

And I think that that is what the public expects instead of all the sometimes hot air and noise and at times excessive partisanship that seems to be the public perception of how this institution operates far too often.

And I just want to take a couple of moments to commend you, Congressman ISRAEL, on something that you have shared with many of us who participate in the Center Aisle Caucus, and that is the idea of a Status of Forces Agreement and how such an agreement might be of benefit to us in Iraq.

And for purposes of this discussion, that Status of Forces Agreement is an agreement that is worked out between our government and the foreign country that delineates the legal partnership between the troops who are deployed to that country and the host government. And that is a very significant issue.

In the civil side of the law, for example, a Status of Forces Agreement can spell out proceedings under which nationals of the host country may file claims against the United States for damage to property of these nationals that has been inadvertently caused by the United States Armed Forces. An agreement is also important because it can be used to spell out jurisdictional issues with regard to criminal offenses. For example, these agreements are often used to make sure that American servicemembers who commit offenses overseas and are tried by U.S. military courts-martial rather than local courts. They can also delineate the conditions under which U.S. servicemembers charged with crimes within the boundaries of the host country are treated. A Status of Forces Agreement can specify, for example, that a servicemember accused of a crime in violation of local laws must be detained on board a ship or some other U.S. installation rather than await trial in a local jail.

We have never had a Status of Forces Agreement with the Iraqi government. I know that is something that you have been strongly advocating, and I believe it is high time that we implement one for a few reasons. First, a Status of Forces Agreement is an agreement between two sovereign nations. By executing such an agreement, we would be affirming sovereignty of the Maliki government and the right, as well as the obligation, of that government to exercise control over its own territory.

Second, a Status of Forces Agreement would send a clear message both to the Iraqis and to other countries in the region that we do not intend to establish permanent bases in Iraq. I think something that many of us on both sides of the aisle agree. And this agreement is usually negotiated for a fixed period of time, and it can be renewed or not, as was the case with the old Subic Bay naval base in the Republic of the Philippines.

The Philippines example is instructive, I think, in this instance. There

the Aquino government asserted its sovereign rights over Subic Bay by refusing to renew a prior agreement and other related treaties with our government in 1992. Thus the world was made to know that even though the U.S. had a presence in Subic Bay and a neighboring city for more than 90 years prior to that time, that presence was not permanent and was subject to an agreement that had to be agreed to by both nations. And third, as described a few moments ago, this agreement, if properly negotiated, can protect U.S. forces from being tried by foreign courts or prevent them from being detained in Iraqi facilities if charged with a crime under foreign law. This kind of measure is necessary to make sure that Americans operating overseas have the fullest protections afforded to them by Federal jurisprudence.

I also really want to thank you again for organizing this, and I think these shared principles you have outlined here are really a basis upon which we can have further dialogue. And a little later in this Special Order, I might want to talk about the Iraq Study Group recommendations, the Baker-Hamilton report, that I think many of us on both sides of the aisle have a good feeling about, and there is legislation that has been proposed and recently introduced, and I will get into that a little later.

At this time I would like to yield to one of our other colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), who has been to Iraq 17 times now.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank all four of my colleagues, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. DENT, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. ISRAEL. I wanted to be here simply for the novelty of Republicans and Democrats trying to talk about where we could find common ground.

My basic view is that we made a mistake going in given that we didn't find weapons of mass destruction. But I tend to think it would be a mistake to leave precipitously. I think we went in on a bipartisan basis, and I think we could leave on a bipartisan basis. I just don't think we are as far apart in some ways as some may think.

I do think there should be a Status of Forces Agreement instead of a U.N. resolution as an occupying nation. If the Iraqis don't want us there, we will leave. I feel we attacked them; they didn't attack us. And we have an obligation before we leave to replace their army, their police, and their border patrol. That is really one of your shared principles. But if they want us to leave before, then they are a sovereign nation. They could ask us to leave and we would.

I will also close with this because I think it would be nice to have more of a dialogue rather than just speeches from us, but I think the Iraq Study Group is something that Democrats agreed to in principle and so did Republicans. And I agree that they left a little bit of discretion as to what they

meant and we could each view it in the way that we want to, and so that would have to be worked out. But the basic principles of the Iraq Study Group, to my mind, should be voted on and supported by both sides of the aisle, specifically getting the Americans and the coalition forces out of doing police work.

Secondly, getting the Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds to work out their differences. They said with consequence if they didn't. I think there should be a timeline. I just think it should be not by 2/08. And, thirdly, to get the nations around Iraq to dialogue and we should be dialoguing with them, including Iran and Syria.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Before yielding to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, just to clarify on the issue of Status of Forces Agreement, Mr. DENT was kind enough to join the Iraqi ambassador to the United States, Ambassador Sumaydi, and me and other members of the Center Aisle Caucus for a dinner where the ambassador himself talked about the importance of a Status of Forces Agreement.

Will it end the war tomorrow? Absolutely not. Will it end it next week? No. Is it one good, reasonable idea that will lower the temperature in Iraq, that will reduce the animosities that are flaming out of control there? I believe it will. And I am appreciative that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has cosponsored a bipartisan resolution that asks the President to submit a Status of Forces Agreement to the Iraqi government, not conclude one because it has got to be negotiated, but at least submit one to send a signal and a message that we don't want to own the place; that we are there and we will leave when the Iraqi government wishes us to.

With that, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his bipartisan leadership and his great measure of thoughtfulness on issues with respect to Iraq, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. SHAYS. And I might add a former Marine, and I guess always a Marine, who was wounded in battle in Vietnam and was left on the battlefield for 3 hours before he was brought to safety, and we will always be grateful for that service.

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I also want to thank all of you for coming down here this evening for a thoughtful dialogue on the issues of war and peace that confront this country and literally the rest of the world.

I would just like to speak to the issue of Iraq in the context of where we are in the world today. This is not our grandfathers' world. This is not our parents' world. This is a new configuration that can't be compared to World War II or even the Cold War. This is a world that is now filled with tiny splin-

tering, struggling countries and cultures. The Soviet Union is gone. Southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, we see a great deal of struggling third world countries, cultures, people trying to find their place, their niche.

One of the countries, the United States, has a golden opportunity to integrate ourselves with the rest of the world to encourage peace and security. And if we notice around the world, the world is integrated right now. The world is integrated globally. It is integrated economically with trade. It is integrated politically. It is integrated when there are disasters. We saw what happened with the tsunami to countries like Sri Lanka and Thailand and India and Indonesia when the world responded. The integrity of the world's compassion for these people was extraordinary.

The world is also integrated with disease. Whether it is Ebola, malaria, bird flu, TB, you name it, the world is integrated.

And one of the ways I think to solve the problem, besides solving the problem of Iraq on the House floor the way we are doing it tonight with a discussion, is to integrate our integrity with the great land mass that is around this great globe. The integration of integrity.

□ 2045

I want to make a quick quote by a former artist, media person, diplomat named Norman Cousins, who wrote a fabulous book called "Human Options." In the book is one extraordinary quote, "History is the vast early warning system." And if we look at how we dealt with the Soviet Union over decades of time, it was step by step with dialogue. What did we do with China over decades, even after China said that they would like to destroy the United States, even if it wiped off half the population of China? It was step by step by step of dialogue. What did we do with the Cuban Missile Crisis? It was dialogue. Unfortunately, we never had a dialogue with Ho Chi Minh. We lost probably a million people on both sides of that conflict.

What is the issue here with Iraq? It's a dialogue with the Iraqis, it's a dialogue with the Sunnis, the Shi'as, the Kurds. It's a dialogue with the Syrians, the Iranians. It's a dialogue with the Middle East. It's a dialogue with the international community to integrate ourselves to make a commitment to the politics, to the economics, to the security of all the peoples of the world.

So, there is hope. There is movement. And the way to solve one conflict is to understand the nature of the culture. Talk first, for as long as is necessary. And that dialogue got us out of the Cold War with the Soviet Union. Nixon went to China. Kennedy did not bomb Castro in Cuba. That can work today.

I will close with this comment from a book I recently read by Anthony Zinni called "The Battle For Peace." And Anthony Zinni described the Cold War

where one man is in a room with a cobra alone for decades, and the man wakes up one morning and the cobra is gone, but the room then is filled with bees; a whole different set of circumstances. And you don't deal with the bees the way you dealt with the cobra.

I thank all you gentlemen for coming here tonight for this integrated dialogue so our integrity can mesh a little bit better and we will find a solution.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman. Before recognizing Mr. BISHOP, I want to follow up on a very important point that the gentleman made about the lessons that history teaches us with respect to the importance of having a dialogue with our adversaries. I wish we understood those lessons here in the United States Congress. Because if you take a look at those lessons of history, the Cold War, The Space Raid, World War II, all of the great challenges that confronted Congresses in the past have been solved with bipartisan dialogue. Think about the Cold War. It was the bipartisanship, the bipartisan approach of a John F. Kennedy and a Richard Nixon and that helped end the Cold War. Think about World War II. It was the political leadership of FDR and Harry Truman and the military leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower. There was always great bipartisanship with respect to enormous foreign policy challenges in our country. Democrats and Republicans found ways to talk to one another. I guess there was a saying that "politics stops at the water's edge." One of the concerns I have is that we have kind of lost that sense, that we have made foreign policy and made issues of war and peace partisan issues. And what we are trying to do here in the Center Aisle Caucus, with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is bring Democrats and Republicans back to the water's edge in the Center Aisle.

And with that, I will yield to Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank Mr. ISRAEL for yielding.

I want to pick up on a comment that my friend from Connecticut just made with respect to how we should deal with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. You suggested that we bring those recommendations here and we discuss them and endorse them. And I think that the model is the 9/11 Commission. It was a bipartisan commission that issued a unanimous set of recommendations, which in the main we have acted upon here in this Chamber. The Iraq Study Group was a bipartisan group that issued a unanimous set of recommendations. And I believe that they are ones that we can galvanize around, and I believe that they make good sense. They perhaps don't give all of us everything that we would want on either side of the aisle, but they do represent a way to move for-

ward. And I believe that if we were to bring those recommendations here, I believe they would attract majority support in this Chamber, and perhaps that could then be used as a means to moving with the administration, who I think now has also endorsed the recommendations of the Study Group.

Initially they seemed to reject them, or at least dismiss them, but I think now, as time has passed and as the situation on the ground has continued to evolve, they now recognize that they do have merit, that they do have legitimacy. And they also speak to several, if not all, of the shared principles that we are discussing here this evening that come out of the Center Aisle Caucus. So I thank you for making that suggestion, and hopefully we can carry forward with that.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KENT. Thank you, Congressman ISRAEL.

I wanted to make a comment. You had mentioned our dinner engagement between the Center Aisle Caucus and Iraq's ambassador to the United States, and we had a wonderful dialogue. And I was struck by something that the Iraqi ambassador had said to us. Of course we, often, in the United States, talk about the tribalism that we see within Iraq, Sunni and Shia and Kurd. And it is sort of hard for us to understand the complexities of those tribal relationships and interactions. And the Iraqi ambassador, obviously a very well educated man, made a comment back to us about what he more or less termed "American tribalism." I think referring to Republicans and Democrats. It's hard for them to understand how we operate. It was a point that I think was well intended and well understood. And I think that we have to think about that from time to time, that they see us, they see our bickering, too, from where they sit. We had a lot of comments about their behavior. Well, they have observed ours as well. And certainly our political dynamics are very difficult for them to comprehend. And I appreciated his insights.

I did want to make a few other comments about this recommendation, these 79 recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. I think many of us on both sides of the aisle realize that the beauty of this report maybe is not necessarily in every one of the 79 recommendations, but the process they adopted to make those recommendations. And I do want to give a little bit of credit tonight to the two prime sponsors of the legislation that was introduced just yesterday, that was Congressman MARK UDALL, a Democrat of Colorado, and on the Republican side, the father of the Iraq Study Group report, legislatively, FRANK WOLF, a Republican of Virginia.

And I think they have really gone out of their way to secure probably close to 50 cosponsors by now, fairly

evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats. And again, I just think there is so much in this report that we can rally around and need to. I think we all agree, when you look at those shared principles up there, from defeating al Qaeda, I think every American, regardless of how they label themselves politically, agree that the defeat of al Qaeda is a primary and principal interest of all of us, whether in Iraq, or anywhere throughout the world. Containing Iran. Another issue we all agree, that the regime of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is a menace, a threat, and we all I think agree that his potential acquisition of nuclear capability would be a very destabilizing influence on the world and something that none of us can tolerate.

And regional change; standing up for Iraqi Security Forces; secure Iraq's borders; take care of our veterans; and support our Armed Forces, I think those are great principles. I think this report, in many respects, addresses these issues.

So with that, I just again wanted to share those thoughts with you about the dinner with the Iraqi ambassador.

At this time I would like to yield back to Mr. ISRAEL.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman.

I would pose a question, if I may, to the gentleman from Connecticut, who as Congressman DENT said has been to Iraq 17 times and chaired the Subcommittee on Terror. I know he was consulted with respect to the Iraq Study Group report or at least I believe was consulted with respect to the Iraq Study Group report and see if he would share his perspectives on the value of the Iraq Study Group report in terms of generating some bipartisan cooperation and moving us in the right direction in Iraq.

I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank you for your question.

What was stunning about the 9/11 Commission was it was Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives all trying to find common ground for addressing what was really a frightening sea change in our society, and that was the recognition that there was a real threat. And they called it "Islamist terrorism," which the Islamist community needs to deal with as well. I mean, it is not Islamists, it is these radical Islamist terrorists. But the Iraqi Study Group had that same approach, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives making an assessment of the problem, and then recommending what needed to happen.

I would like to suggest something. And I would be interested, Mr. ISRAEL, how you would react to this, and that is, Mr. Petraeus and our ambassador are going to make a report in September. And I was thinking, you know, there could be a view they have a vested interest.

So one of the things that I would like to promote is that this same Iraqi Study Group go back to Iraq and say,

okay, this is what we found then, this is what we recommended. This is what General Petraeus is recommending and our ambassador. We either verify it or don't, or have subtle changes to it or maybe significant changes. But in other words, bring this third party back in to make an analysis since they already have credibility, and clearly General Petraeus does and our ambassador does as well. But I would be curious to know if any of you think there is merit to that idea.

Mr. ISRAEL. Well, I thank the gentleman. I think it is a very sound idea. The Iraq Study Group proved its value as an independent entity. And I have the highest regard for General Petraeus. In fact, he was in my office the day that the President announced the surge. And I was skeptical about the surge, personally I did not support the surge, but I thought it was important to reach out to General Petraeus and at least give him an opportunity to explain it to me.

I think he is the best we have. I have a very high regard for him. I think his report is going to be indispensable. I think it would be extremely useful to send the Iraqi Study Group back to take a look so that, like President Reagan said, "trust but verify." I think that verification would be extremely useful.

And I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I would certainly agree. And I think we all await General Petraeus' report. And I don't know General Petraeus, but I have been told that he is a man of absolutely rigorous and unimpeachable intellectual honesty and he will give us an honest, spin-free report, which I think is something that we all need and would value. But I also think sending that coalition of people, as you say, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, back to see on the ground conditions 9, 10 months after they wrote their report or 11 months after they wrote their report, I think would be enormously valuable and again perhaps would spur both the Congress and the administration to take their recommendations more seriously or give greater weight to them than we have thus far.

Mr. ISRAEL. Before yielding to the gentleman from Maryland, I want to again remind my colleagues and those viewing that what you've heard here on the floor of the House is different. You've actually heard Members from both sides generating ideas and agreeing to them rather than impugning each other's integrity. And that is exactly the purpose of this Special Order.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. I think when you generate ideas like we're having tonight with this decision, people are free to have an enthusiastic conversation where we can see each other's individual ingenuity. And then it is that collective ingenuity, that individual

collective ingenuity that spawns these kinds of ideas that solve problems.

I couldn't agree more that the Iraq Study Group reassemble to evaluate where they were just 6 months ago in their recommendations to where we might want to be in September or sometime this fall is an excellent idea. And I am pretty sure that those men and women would come together to do this second reevaluation.

The other thing is, I think we, as members of our group here, Members of Congress, we need to do some preparation ourselves prior to whatever that announcement, whatever that assessment is going to be in September, we have to have some preparation for what we think the status of the conflict in Iraq needs to be.

And the third thing, while we are preparing for this report by General Petraeus, while we are encouraging the Iraq Study Group to reevaluate the status, as General Petraeus will, I really think it's important for us to continue to pursue a dialogue with all of Iraq's neighbors, including Iran and Syria.

Now, we all know that the Ahmadinejad administration, if I can say that, has said some pretty pointed, scary, threatened things. But it is my understanding that the Iranian people do not see the world, do not see the United States through Ahmadinejad's eyes. The Syrian people, the parents, the fathers, the people who want good lives for their children, the Chamber of Commerce in Damascus wants to have a relationship with the United States. There are many, many business people, many, many people in Iran that want a relationship with the United States.

So as we are preparing for this discussion in September, where we are with the surge and where we are with the conflict, let's get the Iraq Study Group together. Let's prepare for that statement so we understand where we think we should be. And then let's continue to pursue, however difficult it is, this dialogue.

Mr. ISRAEL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 2100

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I also want to endorse the gentleman from Connecticut's idea about reconstituting the Iraq Study Group and sending them back over to Iraq at some point to help give us an update of this very useful report. I think we all can agree that many of us in this country, and I suspect in Iraq too, are frustrated by this slow pace of reconciliation that is ongoing in Iraq.

But, again, another point about this report, and I think this gathering tonight, I think this helps us as Americans try to reconcile our differences. We talk about Iraqi reconciliation, but I think in many respects we need a little reconciliation of our own.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman will yield, when I was there this last time, what I found for the first time was that

when the Iraqis got together to form a government last year, they were like someone described a sixth grade dance. The guys were there, the girls were there. Maybe once or twice there would be a little interaction, and they would go back. But nobody was dancing.

Now you are starting to see Sunnis, Shias and Kurds trying to see some common ground, and they are coming back to us and saying, don't rush us. But one of them said to me, I thought it was interesting, he said, "You are complaining about the fact that we may take a break in the summer. What about your monthly break?" They said, "You are asking Sunnis, Shias and Kurds to work together. How come you guys aren't working together?" They are starting to come back and throw that at us.

The difference is they are in an environment where they can get killed any day of the week, and yet we are telling them, find common ground. If they found common ground, probably some of that killing would talk.

But I am sorry to take so much of the time. I am just trying to add to your point that they are saying why don't we practice what we preach?

Mr. DENT. Well, it is a very fair point in many respects. I just want to point out something. When I first read this report back in December when it was first released, I had some concerns too, like many people, about some of the recommendations, particularly the recommendation about directly engaging Iran, for all the reasons we have identified. Ahmadinejad is a virulent anti-Semite. He has made such inflammatory comments. I think we all agree he is a menace.

After listening to Jim Baker and Lee Hamilton talk about the issue, I don't think any of us expect there to be any real process in a dialogue with Iran at a sub-cabinet level, but I think we also realize that you need to have that kind of a conversation initially and let the Iranians be an obstruction themselves, so we can then isolate them internationally and also perhaps drive a wedge between the Iranian Government and the Syrian Government.

I think it makes absolutely no sense for the Syrians to be engaged in destructive behavior in Iraq, given the fact that they have more than 1 million refugees, primarily Sunni, who are in Syria. Of course, Syria is ruled by Allawites, who represent about 10 percent of that country. So it is clearly not in Syria's interest to have protracted instability in Iraq.

So, again, I just wanted to thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his thoughtful idea about getting the Iraq Study Group back over there, perhaps hearing what General Petraeus says and make some recommendations on what he has said, and maybe give us a bipartisan way for us to move forward.

I think Americans want a solution. They don't want an issue in Iraq, but they want a solution. I think that is one of the great things about this dialogue tonight.

I yield back to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Connecticut whether he is proposing any specific initiative to formally request that the Iraq Study Group reconvene and make an assessment in Iraq in the near future. If he is, I would be pleased to join with him on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. SHAYS. To guarantee it would actually come to the floor of the House, maybe we could put your name first and mine second. But I would love to work with you on that.

Mr. ISRAEL. I would welcome that partnership.

I am going to yield to my friend from New York, Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I just want to make two points. One, on the question of engaging Iran and others that we see as enemies or adversaries, you are quite right, Mr. DENT, that there is no guarantee of success if we do engage, but we can virtually guarantee no success if we don't engage. So it just seems to me that engagement is absolutely crucial.

I think I am quoting former Secretary of State Baker correctly when I quote him as saying that engaging in dialogue with our enemies is not appeasement. It is diplomacy and negotiation and dialogue, something I think we have had too little of. Hopefully we are moving in that direction now, and signs recently are that we are.

The second point I would make is that Iran has an awful lot at stake here. If, in fact, as a great many fear, Iraq becomes a haven for al Qaeda, I cannot imagine that Iran views an al Qaeda-Sunni dominated state on their borders as something that is in their best interests. So I think that they clearly do have in effect common interests with us in terms of bringing some order, some stability, to Iraq.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. If my colleagues have any final comments, I would be happy to recognize them, and then I am prepared to close.

The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. GILCHREST.

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman.

Just very quickly on the comment from the gentleman from New York, Syria is basically a secular country. It is not an Islamic state. It is secular. They feared al Qaeda and the Taliban, and they don't want al Qaeda in Iraq creating chaos. Al Qaeda was basically the enemy of the Iranians. It was the enemy of Iraq. It was a disruptive factor in the Middle East.

So careful analysis of each country, using the best diplomats in the world that the United States has, has the potential for unraveling this very difficult, chaotic situation. We know we need a military presence in the Middle East, we know we need a political presence in the Middle East, and we know we need an economic presence in the Middle East. With the emphasis on the

politics and the economics with the Middle Eastern countries, I think we can back our way out of this chaos.

Mr. SHAYS. I would just like to thank you again for getting us together. This has really been a pleasure. I just admire all of you here tonight, and thank you for including me.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DENT. I too want to commend the gentleman from New York for organizing this event tonight, this special order. We need to see a little bit more of this type of activity in this Congress, and I hope the American people who are watching this exercise tonight maybe find this a little bit different or maybe a little bit more refreshing than what they are accustomed to during special orders. I just want to thank you for putting this together.

One final point. I think Mr. GILCHREST made the point about interaction with Syria on a commercial basis in this country. A constituent called just the other day who imports various food products from Syria, because I have a large Middle Eastern community in my district. And just some of the challenges, they just want to go about life as they normally would.

I thought it was interesting. It kind of brings back home the point that people want to coexist peacefully. That the challenges and the stakes are very high in Iraq, and I think all of us want to make sure that whatever policy is pursued, particularly after September, it is one that is responsible and one that will make us all safer and hopefully the region more stable.

So, again, thank you, Mr. ISRAEL, for putting this on. It is much appreciated.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman.

I will close by thanking each of our colleagues to join with us this evening. Of the American people are accustomed to tuning into these so-called special orders and seeing a Democratic hour, which is usually spent beating up Republicans, and a Republican hour, which is usually spent beating up Democrats.

Tonight they saw something different. They saw Mr. DENT talk about a status of forces agreement, which Democrats can agree with. They saw Mr. BISHOP talk about the one-for-one agreement, which has bipartisan support. They saw Mr. SHAYS discuss an idea to have the Iraq Study Group reassess conditions, which has Democratic support. And they heard the historic perspective of Mr. GILCHREST, a perspective that only a Marine that was wounded in Vietnam can properly give to the United States Congress.

The point is that I believe that without sounding overly enthusiastic, that in the past hour there was more bipartisan, reasoned, rational discussion of ideas to move us forward rather than left or right than has happened on the floor of this House over the past 4 years. That is precisely what the Center Aisle Caucus was created to generate.

Tonight we close by sharing our principles: That we support our Armed Forces. We will take care of our veterans. More assistance passed in today's appropriations bill to veterans than at any time in the 77-year history of the Veterans Administration, passed unanimously by the Appropriations Committee today. We will secure Iraq's border. We want to stand up Iraq's security forces. We understand the need for regional change. We will push for that. We understand the threat of Iran. And we want to defeat al Qaeda.

Today's discussion was not about left or right, it was about moving forward. I know the gentleman talked about the servicemember that he represents who was lost in Iraq. Again, I would ask the American people to continue to support our Armed Forces.

I can think of no better evening and no better person to inspire this special order than Matthew Baylis, who we lost in Iraq last week, and I believe he would be very proud of what we are doing this evening. As I said before, I don't know whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. I have no idea whether his family are Republicans or Democrats. I do know that they would be proud that this evening, Democrats and Republicans joined together to talk about a way forward, without a single one of us calling another one a name.

IMMIGRATION ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have defended President Bush throughout most of his administration: From the war in Iraq; to those tragic mistakes that were made at Abu Ghraib, realizing they were just mistakes, but not at the heart of the policy; from the tax cuts to the preparation of the prescription drug bill.

I feel that I have been a loyal soldier to this administration, to the President, and, yes, to the country, especially on the country's war on terror. I have been four-square behind the President's successful efforts in that war and some of these efforts that we have been talking about today that are straining the public morale.

I have been very supportive of the President's tax efforts, fundamental economic efforts in the tax area to keep our economy humming.

So after all of this support, last week it was personally offensive to me to hear that I and millions of people like me were being described by the President as not wanting to do what is right for America because we refused to support the Kennedy-Bush immigration bill currently being examined and going through the Senate.

The President also suggested that those of us who oppose the type of legalization of status and those of us who

are opposed to the type of legislation that we believe will promote more illegal immigration into our country, that we are just trying to frighten people by using the word "amnesty."

The President, of course, insists on defining amnesty in a way that is independent and contrary to the way everyone else defines that word, and every time he does that, he loses credibility. Every time he follows his inclination to try to obfuscate this issue of illegal immigration, rather than to deal with it and to debate it four-square, he loses credibility.

The President also suggests if we know the details of the bill, the legislation, I call it, the Bush-Kennedy legislation, that we will support it. Well, the more we find out about that legislation going through the Senate, the more vigorously we should oppose that bill.

There are literally hundreds of loopholes in that legislation. I believe the very basis of the legislation is flawed in its intent. The fact there are so many terrible aspects of this bill, one has to suggest that the bill's intent was not the right intent to begin with. It was not a bill aimed at stemming illegal immigration, but instead this bill has some other intent, obviously.

The American people, however, can decide for themselves. The President says we need to get to know what is in the bill. Well, let's take a look at what is in the bill.

Problem number one: This legislation is an amnesty bill. I am sorry if that doesn't go by the definition that is handed down by the White House, which obviously has the ability to define or redefine words, but it is an amnesty bill. This bill grants immediate legal status to illegal aliens, and that legal status happens immediately, before any of the enhancements. They will have what they call "enforcement enhancements" in the bill that will help us "enforce our immigration laws."

□ 2115

But before any of those enhancements are activated, and they are called the triggers, before they are activated, every person who is here illegally will be able to be granted legal status, a temporary visa. It is called a Z visa.

So 24 hours after an illegal immigrant files an application, they will be granted a probationary visa, the so-called Z visa. It will be issued, and with that legal status, that visa, comes the right to live and work in the United States: Immediate legalization for everyone who is here.

The President tries to suggest it is not amnesty because we are not granting citizenship. And then a big cloud of smoke comes up for people to try to understand what's going on here.

Amnesty doesn't mean granting citizenship; amnesty means somebody is doing something illegal and you have now made it legal. All of them get this

amnesty, this legalization, within 24 hours of applying the minute this legislation passes. That is whether or not the triggers, the enforcement mechanisms that are also in the bill, if they are never activated, these so-called probationary visas will never expire. They will continue on. Every 8 years or so they will have to be reapplied for, but they can be reapplied for and granted further extensions forever.

And the Social Security cards which come with that can be issued. These people when they have Z visas, these probationary visas, they are now eligible for all of our government programs with the Social Security cards and all of the other things that people who are here legally, people who immigrated to this country legally, people who waited for years to come here, who obeyed our rules, these other people are going to get it immediately.

Of course, U.S. citizens, what does U.S. citizenship get? The only difference is a right to vote. So how is this not amnesty? Obviously it is.

Word games aside, the Senate bill not only grants amnesty, but it also provides things that will do great damage other than just the amnesty to our country.

The much-touted fines of this bill, and there are fines that are required, and we have heard this, another cloud of smoke comes in during that discussion on this bill. We hear this idea there is going to be a \$5,000 fine for those people who want to be serviced by this legislation. No, that \$5,000 fine is not required before someone gets a legal status. That is what happens before someone becomes a citizen. This legislation that is passing through the Senate does not require \$5,000 to legalize status. You cannot buy a used car in this country for \$1,000; but \$1,000 will give you the right to live in the United States and obtain government benefits, including Social Security, that goes with that legalization.

The Z visa fine, which is a requirement, it is just a payoff, that \$1,000, is not the \$5,000 that everybody hears about. It is about \$1,000. Unfortunately, ignorant and lazy mainstream media people have been using the \$5,000 figure, and even that I think would be a very questionable thing to give all of these benefits and rights to people here illegally for \$5,000. No, we are going to give it to them for \$1,000. And by the way, it can be paid on the installment plan. You can buy the right to live, work and receive benefits in the United States of America for \$1,000. And it can be renewed every few years, it can be renewed every few years forever.

If a government official misuses information, according to this legislation, if there is information on an illegal amnesty application, and that information is misused by a government employee, there is a \$10,000 fine for that government employee who would misuse information on an illegal immigrant's amnesty application.

So breaking into our country, entering the United States illegally, using

false documents, which almost all of them have, identity theft to hold a job, and they are holding of course jobs that they are not entitled to have in the first place, this is somehow less onerous, we are only going to charge them \$1,000 to legalize their entire status, but we are charging \$10,000 for a paperwork mistake by a government official who might misuse the information or get it wrong on the application.

It should be noted that the amnesty of the Senate bill treats illegal immigrants better than they treat legal immigrants into the United States. Illegal aliens who snuck into the United States 5 months ago are given immediate legal status while legal immigrants who applied to come to the United States after May 1, 2005, must start the application process all over again.

Now these are people who have been waiting overseas. They applied after May 2005. They are overseas waiting. Those people who are not the law breakers, they must start the process over again.

So the illegals can cut in line, go around everybody around the world where there are millions and millions of people who are waiting to come here legally, who respect our laws, those people who cut in line in front of those who would be U.S. citizens and come here legally are the ones given the benefit. Those waiting in line have to, in fact, go to the end of the line, in some cases, according to this legislation, while the others scoot ahead.

This, of course, is a serious blow to those waiting in line who would like to come here legally, and that has not escaped the notice of the foreign press. People overseas are taking very close note of this. The foreign press is making it very clear what this legislation is doing to people who respect the laws of the United States.

This legislation is now being touted overseas by people suggesting that anyone who stands in line and waits and respects our laws is a fool. And, of course, we are making them fools by rewarding those who don't obey the rules and punishing those who do.

By the way, in the Senate bill a note from a friend, a note, a letter from a friend, is considered evidence that one has lived in the United States before. When an illegal alien applies to live in the United States, if this legislation passes, he can literally provide a sworn declaration from someone, as long as it is not a relative, as proof that he lived in the United States and now is eligible for this legalization of his status.

Is there anyone outside the White House who does not understand that this will cause a massive influx of new illegal immigrants into our country? Because if they want to get legal status, all they have to do is find someone to write a letter for them, and as far as they are concerned, that is a get-into-America-free card that one of their friends will write for them. Does anyone think that we are not going to

have a massive flow of people? That all of the people waiting in line will not hear about this? And what about all of the people not waiting in line hearing about this?

Between 12 and 15 million people are expected to apply for amnesty if the legislation now going through the Senate passes. Now how can the Department of Homeland Security possibly verify the letters that are going to be presented by people to prove that they have immigrated to this country or lived in this country for a given period of time; and thus, then they have legal status if they have lived here. Even if it is illegally being here, they still will be legalized if they have a note from their friend. Does anyone not understand the jeopardy that this rule puts us in in America? Yet it is in the bill. I mean, it is bizarre but it is in the bill. Who wrote this bill? Whoever did let this provision be in the bill.

And as for the much-publicized background checks that amnesty seekers are supposed to have, the background checks are going to happen on those people applying for citizenship. The background checks are going to happen after legal status has already been granted as a temporary status, a legal status that can be again renewed. Background checks are not required before the probationary visas are issued.

And yes, you heard it correctly, legal status must be granted to an illegal alien within 24 hours of that illegal alien making application. Even if the alien has not passed all of the appropriate background checks, within 24 hours, the Department of Homeland Security has to grant him legal status, a "probationary visa" which can go on forever. Can you imagine the criminals, the carriers of communicable diseases, the dregs of other societies, who will obtain a legal right to live and work in the United States because of this loophole?

How about the gang who flew planes into the World Trade Center? How about the terrorists, would they have been granted legal status immediately by this bill? Many of them of course were here illegally. They had overstayed their visas. The answer is yes, they would have made legal status almost immediately. It is insanity.

And a final burst of insanity, illegals who have been ordered deported by a United States court already, and the court has ordered them to be deported because they are not here legally, those people already under court order to be deported, will be eligible for this amnesty, for this legalization of their status.

Now listen to this carefully. Illegals who have been through the courts and are under court order to leave the United States, can apply for amnesty. Almost 636,000 aliens are in this country in defiance of a court order to leave. All of them can now apply to stay here under this bill. They will be given a temporary visa, a "probationary visa," that can be renewed.

Talk about teaching a disrespect for law. Does a court order mean nothing? How can we simply allow people who have openly defied our laws; and, yes, also defied a court order from a judge in the United States of America, how can we simply ignore that? That is what the Senate legislation would have us do. That is the Bush-Kennedy legislation making its way through the Senate.

Problem number two with the bill, the enforcement triggers in the bill are actually weaker than the current law. What is a trigger? What we have are the enforcement mechanisms that are in this bill that are supposed to be activated. They will supposedly help us enforce the laws, like fences and more beds in detention centers and stronger border patrol.

The provisions of this bill, these triggers, these enforcement mechanisms, are actually weaker than current law. This bill does not require, for example, one more detention center bed. It does not require one more mile of fence. It does not require one more agent than is currently required by law. In fact, the bill cuts the fencing requirements in half so the bill actually, when they talk about to get the fence, we have to have this bill, although there is already legislation requiring the fence, this bill requires actually one-half the fencing that is already required by law.

It requires 11,500 fewer detention spaces and fewer border patrol agents than the Congress has already authorized in other legislation. So we are supposed to support the legalization of status for illegals in order to get the trigger mechanisms to work, in order to get the enhancement of enforcement when this bill weakens the enforcement that is already in place.

□ 2130

To think you can weaken an enforcement provision and then pretend that legislation somehow strengthens border enforcement is an insult to the American people.

Wake up, America. Our country is being stolen from us. Our country is being invaded, and the Senate legislation will accelerate this invasion.

And it is not just Mexican Americans who are crossing the border, nor South Americans and others who are crossing the border from Mexico. We also, of course, have a huge problem with illegal immigration of people who are coming into our country and overstaying their visas. They're just as much a part of the illegal immigration problem as those people crossing our Canadian and our Mexican border. Yet this bill does nothing, absolutely nothing, to strengthen the system to try to reform the U.S. visa system. They call it the U.S. visit exit system which, right now, when someone comes into our country with a visa, we don't know if they have left.

It was mandated back in 1996 that that system would be fixed and that we would track visitors to our country so

we would know if they had come and if they'd gone home, and so then we would know at least who is here illegally. That hasn't even been fixed by this legislation. Of course, not knowing who is left or who stays in the United States, it makes it impossible for us to track who has overstayed their visa.

May I remind you that somewhere between a third and half of our illegal alien population, that's between 4 and 5 million people, are people who are here who have overstayed their visas. So I think it's misportrayed when we only look to our southern border, and too many people, too many people talk about this as something to do with Mexico. Well, it has something to do with Mexico, because a large number of illegals are from Mexico, but this problem is way beyond that, and there are many, many other illegals in this country, from Asia and elsewhere, that need to be brought to justice and to be returned to their country.

Now why is this such an important component of this bill? Because it's already been mandated by Congress, and what is important, in actually looking at the legislation going through the Senate, is that legislation doesn't even touch on this provision of trying to get control of this huge wedge into our system, this road on which people are invading like bacteria into our country.

The Bush-Kennedy legislation in the Senate, of course, does not touch on it, because that legislation is not aimed at stemming the flow of illegals into our country. It is, indeed, pro-invasion legislation.

Problem number three, a great many criminals are eligible for amnesty under the bill going through the Senate. Again, this is a simple statement of fact, and this is very bizarre.

Under the bill going through the Senate, some child molesters are eligible for legal status. I'm not making this up. A child molester in this legislation, a child molester who committed his crime before the bill was enacted, is not barred from amnesty if their conviction omitted the age of their victim. This is a bizarre loophole.

Who wrote this bill? Who included that in this bill? This is a nutty provision. The people who put that provision in the bill are working with those people who wrote the legislation.

Also, we have gang members who are eligible for amnesty. As long as a gang member signs a piece of paper renouncing their gang membership, they can apply for the probationary status and must be granted it within 24 hours. Now, I'm certain that signing a piece of paper will mean that the gang members will change their drug dealing and violent ways and become positive members of our society.

This bill will cost American taxpayers billions and billions, yes, trillions of dollars. Just one example. The earned income tax credit which now provides help for financially low-income Americans, we actually are providing them through this tax credit

some stipend, some money, it is currently done at a cost of \$20 billion. It's a \$20 billion expenditure that we're trying to help out low-income Americans.

Illegal aliens on Z visas and guest workers will be eligible to apply for the earned income tax credit immediately. They are now legally in this country, so they can have that income tax credit. The Congressional Budget Office says this will cost \$20 billion more of our money.

Now the 1996 welfare reform bill demanded that persons be a legal resident of the United States for 5 years before they can receive any benefits that are eligible to people in the United States. Why are we granting illegal aliens and guest workers benefits that we do not give to legal aliens? How can this possibly be right that we treat illegal aliens better than law-abiding immigrants, much less treating them better than the poor people who are waiting in line, trying to emigrate to this country legally, who respect us and want to become U.S. citizens the right way?

Well, also in the Senate legislation is, of course, the old issue of State tuition and loans. Yes, in this legislation, State tuition and loans will be granted to illegal immigrants once they get their probationary visa. That means anybody who's come here illegally will automatically be eligible for all these educational benefits that our children are eligible for.

Actually, it's worse. Our children can't get in-State tuition. If we're 100 miles away over your State's border, we can't go to the other State and go in that facility, but someone who has snuck into this country from thousands of miles away or from the other side of the world can get a tuition break, and it is paid for by us, the taxpayers. They get in-State tuition, even though they come from a far-off country and have come here illegally, while if we try to go to another State we have to pay higher rates.

Now the legislation does ban some illegal aliens from being able to collect Social Security, and that's true. But we know that the President of the United States, for example, has actually already made an agreement with Mexico, although it was a secret agreement in order to provide what they call a totalization agreement, which will permit illegals from Mexico who have been working in the United States to obtain Social Security benefits for the work that they did here illegally, but that's just for the people from Mexico.

Now this bill says that others outside of the totalization agreement won't get Social Security benefits for the work they did while they were here illegally, but there's a big loophole in the bill. Any illegal who overstayed a visa but was issued a Social Security number will be allowed to obtain credit for the work they did illegally.

In other words, if someone was here illegally, overstayed a visa, while they were here on the visa, if they got their Social Security number, they will then be permitted to get credit for what

they did when they were working here illegally because they then had their Social Security card.

We know that between, as I said, 4 and 5 million illegal aliens are people who entered here on a visa and then did not go home. This loophole would allow these millions of people who broke the law to work in this country to collect Social Security. At the very time when we are rightfully worried about the future solvency of Social Security, we will allow those who violated their visas to obtain the fruit of their illegal labors. They will be permitted to have Social Security. This is an incredible injustice to our seniors who depend on that system and should not worry about what amounts to basically this theft of Social Security benefits.

Now, let us note that there are many people trying to suggest that illegal immigrants actually help Social Security. People actually said this here in Washington.

Well, let's note this. More than half of the illegal immigrants in our country work for cash under the table. Now, of those people who are working for cash, are they helping our Social Security system? We're being told that illegals working here help our Social Security system. So these illegal immigrants, because they're being paid under the table, half of them are paid under the table, they do not pay into the Social Security system. And since they are paid cash, the employers do not pay. Not only does the worker not pay his contributions to the Social Security system, but the employer isn't paying his portion into the Social Security system.

So a negative effect is this job, if you look at it even beyond that, is that this job is a job that could be filled by an American citizen or a legal immigrant, but now that job's been taken by an illegal who is not doing anything to pay into the Social Security system. The legal immigrant or the American citizen, whose job that would be if that person wasn't there, would be paying into the system.

So Americans are losing jobs to illegals who aren't paying their fair share into the Social Security system. How does that help the Social Security system?

Corresponding to this, a flow of illegal labor into our country brings down wages in general. So employers might have paid \$10 to \$12 an hour, they're now paying much lower wages which then results, of course, in lower contributions to the Social Security system.

Don't tell me that illegal immigration or that huge amounts of immigration to our country will help the Social Security system. It's a grave threat to the Social Security system.

Of course, there are those who say, well, actually the way to make this right is to legalize all those immigrants who are here illegally and then they will be paying Social Security. Well, let me note this. Legalizing the status of those who are here illegally will make the Social Security chal-

lenge we now face dramatically worse in the future than it is now. Any plan that specifically gives Social Security to those who have been working in this country is an invitation to fraud on a massive scale.

What would stop anyone from claiming that they worked here under a false Social Security number? Hundreds of thousands of people pay into Social Security under various numbers. Hundreds of thousands, millions work here under false Social Security numbers. So how can you prove who used those fraudulent numbers? Who were they? You can't prove who they were. If they make that claim, how are we going to prove that that's not them?

We already have a huge problem with identity theft and fraudulent identification. Allowing those who work here illegally, who have worked here illegally to participate in Social Security, exponentially increases the incentive for fraud. Because now they were using false papers to begin with, now they will claim that they were here and they could claim they worked for any number of people, even if they didn't.

Another overlooked consequence is the survivor's benefits and disability benefits of the Social Security system. What would stop anyone from claiming my spouse worked in the United States under this false number, I am his widow, these are his children, please start sending me survivor's benefits now that we are entitled to them? Remember, billions of people around the world have no retirement whatsoever. Why assume that only younger immigrants will come to the United States? Why wouldn't someone in their 50s think, gee, if I come to the United States and work for a few years, maybe 10 years, the Social Security that I will get will let me live very well at home; I'll get it sent to me at home. Why wouldn't they think that?

If you had no retirement benefits and you knew that we were legalizing the status of millions upon millions of people who have come here, why wouldn't you do anything, including commit fraud, which they already do to get jobs anyway with their fraudulent documents, why wouldn't they do anything to get their hands on that Social Security? The bill going through the Senate would facilitate that.

Furthermore, many people who would be legalized under the several different proposals that are going around, including these ones that we are hearing in the Senate, the people that are coming here already and will come here under the system because it will attract many more illegals, these are mainly poor and unskilled workers.

The fact is over half the illegal immigrants in this country do not have a high school education. The inconvenient fact is that Social Security pays out more benefits proportionately to lower-wage workers than to higher-wage workers.

A projection I've seen from Social Security assumes that immigrants have the same general earning potential as native-born Americans. Well, that's obviously not true.

So to bring in people with low education or little education, what we're going to do in the long run is place the burden of about \$100,000 per person in the long term on our Social Security system because they will collect that much more than they put in, especially if they come here when they are in their 50s, in the late 40s or 50s. In the long run, this will be a catastrophe for the Social Security system.

And last and foremost in terms of Social Security, in 1986, after being told that it would only legalize about 1 million people, 3 million people were actually legalized. Three million illegal immigrants ended up being given amnesty. That's back in 1986.

□ 2145

It is now 20 years later. The current illegal immigrant estimate ranges from 12 to 20 million people. I keep hearing the lowball, 11 million. Let me note the 20 million figure that I just suggested, that we have up to 20 to 25 million illegals in this country, this didn't come from a government source, it was from a private study that was conducted on the monies that were sent back as remittances to other countries.

They studied that and figured out how many people it would take to supply those kinds of remittances, and they came up with about 20 million people could be here illegally. Well, what's going to happen when those people are legalized? Last time, 1 million people became 3 million, and now we have maybe 15 to 20 million. Well, if we legalize those people who are already here, and then we permit them into the Social Security system, this will turbocharge the flood of illegals into our country.

So, what does that mean? We are going to end up, not with the 20 million that we had, 3 million before, and it became 12 to 20 million, now, with 20 million, 12 to 20 million, we could expect that by legalizing their status we will have between 45 and 60 million illegals here by 2027.

Wake up, America, 45 to 60 million people from other countries pouring into the United States? What is that going to do to our society? No fence, no wall, no minefield, no system will keep illegal immigrations out of this country. If we give them a reasonable hope that generous government benefits, including retirement benefits like Social Security can be theirs, if they can just get across the border and wait us out. Because that's exactly what we are doing right now. If we pass this bill that's going through the Senate, we are telling the people throughout the world that they will be able, if they wait us out and get here, they can expect to get pension benefits, health benefits, education benefits, beyond their imagination.

Who would not come, when they come, by the tens of millions, oh, much to the surprise of the people who were passing this legislation. After all, Senator KENNEDY didn't predict this massive jump that we have now when they passed the bill in 1986. Well, what's going to happen when they get here? The Social Security system will collapse, as will most of our government infrastructure.

Listen, being irrationally benevolent to illegals is a crime against our own people. The bill that's going through the Senate would bring about such a calamity in the United States of America. It would be a calamity for average Americans. Illegal immigrants are not, despite what you have heard, required to even pay back taxes in the legislation going through the Senate. The bill originally did not require any back taxes to be paid however.

However, there was an amendment to the bill, I understand, that was passed, asking that illegals pay back taxes. All right, we are going to treat our illegals better than we treat our own people, because that provision in the bill is weak. It only requires that illegal immigrants show proof that they have paid taxes for 1 year under subparagraph DI, that's according to the bill.

Unfortunately, the bill was written in such haste that there is no subparagraph DI in the legislation. So there are certain to be court cases arguing whether or not the provision that requires a certain amount of back taxes to be paid, whether or not that is a legal requirement or not. Because there is no section DI in the bill.

Remember, you do not have to show that you worked in the past in order to obtain a legal status. So the actual effect of the full amendment on taxes will be that you will have to show that you will pay taxes in the future if you come, and, frankly, how do I become an illegal immigrant with this type of lax attitude towards taxation? I would love not to have to pay my taxes if I had back taxes that I owed.

If people are paid under the table for years, we are just going to give them, issue them a waiver. You have paid up, made all this money in the United States. U.S. citizens will go to jail if they make a \$1,000 mistake. You could have earned, \$10-, \$20,000, paid taxes, and you are forgiven.

The final insult, our tax dollars will go to lawyers that are helping illegal immigrants become legal. That's right, the bill gives money so that those people who are here working in agriculture will have other people who come to them and offer them free legal services to legalize their status.

Well, another problem, problem number 4. The authors of the bill say that this bill will end chain migration. But the bill that is going through the Senate does not end chain migration. Chain migration, just so people will understand, is when we allow relatives of immigrants who are already here to come to the country for family unifica-

tion. They will do that and get in line before those other people who have been waiting long, long periods of time to emigrate to the United States.

Well, chain immigration is actually dramatically increased by the legislation going through the Senate. Now, they claim they have ended it, but look at what the bill actually does. The bill, right now, there are 138,000 people who come into our country legally through what they call this chain migration, you know, family reunification. For 8 years, they are going to increase that number to 440,000 a year. You get that? So they say we are not going to change migration, but we are increasing it. We are tripling it for at least 8 years. Does anyone really believe that 8 years from now they are going to then end this? We have tripled chain migration.

The point system, which supposedly will take the place of this chain migration, is a joke. The merit system will not even kick in until 2016. What year is this? That's 9 years from now. So what you have to do is you have to take it on faith that the future Congresses won't scrap this system altogether. But, of course, the merit points are here, we are talking about, are granted for high demand occupations.

Now, what we are talking about here, of course, is the fact that the bill over there provides for a guest worker program and for us to restructure, supposedly restructure the legal immigration coming into our country, even though, by the way, we all know that by granting amnesty that will bring tens of millions of more illegals into the country anyway.

But the legal system, we are going to have a merit system, and we are going to have people coming into our country to fill jobs like janitors, maids, gardeners and other low-skilled occupations.

Well, you know, I can see that instead of bringing people in from overseas by the hundreds of thousands, by the millions, perhaps we should let the market work and let the pay level of our low-skilled workers increase so that our own people can get the job. In this country there are 69 million people of working age who are not working. People say, well, how are you going to get the people to pick the fruit and the vegetables? Some jobs they won't do. The President, of course, has stopped saying they won't do, he says jobs that they aren't doing.

Well, first of all, we have millions upon millions of prisoners. We have more prisoners who are healthy young men, by and large, 18- to 40 years old, who are sitting in prison doing nothing but pumping up, watching TV. Let's let them pick the fruits and vegetables. Let's let them make some money on it. Let's let them help pay for their incarceration.

No, there are people in our country to do the jobs, but they are not going to do it for free, and they are not going to do it for a pittance. I used to work

as a janitor, yet the janitors make about the same as I made when I was a janitor. What's different, the GDP has tripled. The janitors are making about the same amount of money.

Why? Because a flood of illegals have come into this country and bid down wages. Every middle class American working person has had his income brought down by illegals. Oh, yes, it's helped the employers, all right. It's helped the bosses. It's helped the rich people who want to hire illegal nannies. It's helped the people who want their lawns mowed because they would have to pay more wages.

They would have to pay the children of the neighborhood perhaps more than they would pay the illegal immigrant who comes around to mow the lawn. It's better for our country to have these people who are not working paid more money and have the people in our middle class pay more money than bring in millions and millions and millions of people into this country legally or illegally.

Of course, this country, this system would suggest that we bring them in illegally. That's what the Senate, the Kennedy bill, wants to do.

We currently have a 15 percent unemployment rate among those in America with less than a high school education. Why shouldn't we let them get those jobs? Yes, they might have to pay them more money, because they would have to attract them to work. That makes more sense to me than bringing in these people from overseas.

In my own district, I was contacted by people in the health care industry begging me, say we need nurses and health care people. Well, officially, they can't find the nurses and the people to work. They wanted me to support bringing in 100,000 Filipino nurses, 100 now from Pakistan and India.

But these are high-paying jobs, even the high-paying jobs, they want to bring in foreigners to do the jobs. No, this \$50- to \$75,000 health care job should go to a young American or middle-class American who is working their way through school. It could be a middle-aged American person who just wants to upgrade their skills. It should go to that person.

We went to junior colleges last week during break. I brought all the junior colleges and the hospital people together to find out why we didn't have enough people, trained health care people to work. Why was it a pressure for us to bring people from the outside?

We found out that in our junior colleges where we should be training these people, that they weren't permitted to pay the instructors of the people being trained for these health care programs more than they paid the other instructors who were teaching sociology and political science.

That just means that these nurses, who can earn more money on the outside, won't come to be teachers at junior colleges. They have 185 students at Golden West College who are taking

nursing, and yet 24,000 students are taking classes that will enable them to get a job selling clothing at Nordstrom's or being the assistant manager of a 7-Eleven at \$35,000 a year when there are \$60,000-a-year jobs that are going begging in the health care industry, and they want us to bring in people from the Philippines.

This is wrong. This is a betrayal of the American people to bring people in from outside our country to bring down wages and take the jobs away from the American people who need those jobs. This is wrong.

But people say, no, no, we need a comprehensive bill, there is all this talk about a comprehensive bill. All this talk about a comprehensive bill is a cover, because every part of the legislation going through the Senate actually, that will be implemented, that will be different than the law that exists today, actually encourages the invasion of our country by illegals and by a massive flow of people coming into the country even through the legal system.

Do we need a comprehensive bill in order to try to set up those protections that will protect our border? No. It's already mandated. That bill actually weakens it.

Do we need something to help us with our visa system? No. You know, this isn't helped at all by the legislation going through the Senate.

Do we need it in order to have more Border Patrol agents? No we have already mandated more Border Patrol agents that is required by that bill. All of those aspects of that legislation are covered for the real purpose of the bill, which is to legalize the status of 15 to 20 million illegals who are here, which will then create a massive flow of illegals into this country, which will result in 20 to 30 to 40 million new illegals in this country within 10 years. We will have lost our country. Wake up, America. We already have a flood of illegals sweeping into our country, crowding our classrooms, closing our hospital emergency rooms, up leashing violent crime, driving down wages. None of this is theory.

□ 2200

It is a harsh reality that faces the American people and is borne not out of academic studies but is being borne out by the life experiences of American people, the American people across our country.

Middle class America is being destroyed. Our communities are not safe, our Social Service infrastructure is collapsing, and, yes, it has everything to do with illegal immigration, immigration that is out of control. And the bill going through the Senate, once they legalize the status of all those who are here illegally, there will be five and six times more illegals, ten times more illegals in our country. And what will happen then? It'll be lost.

Year after year, while our schools have deteriorated, our jails filled and

our hospitals and emergency rooms shut down, the elite in this country have turned a blind eye to this disaster that is befalling the rest of us, their fellow Americans. The elites obscure the issues and try to maneuver, to keep in place the policies that reward illegal immigrants with jobs and benefits, just like the bill that's going through the Senate will reward the illegals who have come into our country.

This country, the upper class says, can't function without cheap labor. And it may be cheap to the captains of industry. It may be cheap to the political elite. But it's painfully expensive to the American middle class.

It's our kids whose education is being diminished, our families who are paying thousands more in health insurance to make up for the hospital costs of those who are giving free services to illegals. It's our neighborhoods that are suffering from crime, perpetuated by criminals who have been transported here from other countries. People who should not be here, criminals who should not be here are raping and murdering American citizens. More Americans have been murdered by illegals over the last 5 years than American soldiers have been killed in Iraq. Yet we hear a cry of pain and agony coming from the Congress for soldiers who volunteered to go overseas and take their chances. And what do we hear for the victimized Americans who are being raped and murdered in greater numbers than those being, the Americans being killed in Iraq? We don't hear anything except, well, let's, we need a comprehensive bill, a bill that somehow is going to be fair to the illegal immigrants who are already here.

Our job is not to be fair with people who have come here illegally, not to watch out for the benefit of people who are overseas. Our job as elected officials here, as Members of Congress, is to watch out for the United States of America and the people of the United States of America. There's nothing wrong with that. That's not being selfish.

And what do we hear from some of the Senators backing that legislation, even Republican Senators, as if we're being hateful by expecting our government to watch out for the benefit of Americans, rather than giving benefits away, draining our treasuries and giving it to people who have come here illegally or people in other societies? This is wrong. It's morally wrong. It's a dereliction of our duty as people who were elected to watch out for our people.

It's in our neighborhoods that are suffering from crime that's perpetuated by criminals who are here, as I say, from other countries. It's our livelihood that's being dragged down as wages are depressed and anchored down by a constant influx of immigrants, mostly illegal, some with H1-B visas, who will work for a pittance.

The American people have every right to expect that we're not going to

let masses of people come in and bid down their wages; that we're not going to let people come into this country and give them, like that bill does, immediate legal status when some of them have communicable diseases, diseases which are coming into our schools which we licked years ago, threatening our children.

It is not hateful to say that we have to watch out for our children. It is not wrong for us to put that as a priority and say, yes, we care about those overseas, we care about others. But it is not wrong and hateful and it is not some sort of a selfishness to say we've got to take care of our own people with our limited resources.

Of course, big business has a hold on the GOP. There's no doubt about it. I've been in the party for a long time to see the undue influence that big business has on the party. It's very clear.

Yet big business is in an unholy alliance and the GOP is in an unholy alliance with the liberal left, the liberal left coalition that controls the Democratic party. It is this unholy coalition between the big business element of the Republican party and the liberal left coalition which dominates the Democratic party that is responsible for this invasion of our country, this attack to the well-being of our people. The coalition gives the jobs and passes out the benefits that have lured tens of millions of illegals into our country.

And it's no accident. This predicament was predictable. Big business wants to depress wages. The liberal left that controls the Democratic party wants to have political pawns. They believe that large numbers of illegals will help them change America, or even large numbers of newcomers will help them change America.

Well, if you give the jobs and benefits, as this coalition in our Congress has done for the last 10 years, if you give away the policies that created the jobs and the benefits that have gone to people who've come here illegally from overseas, well, if you give them the jobs and benefits, the masses of the people over there, if you told them that they are eligible for these benefits and these jobs, they will do anything to get here. And that's exactly what they've been doing. As you say, give it, and they will come. Surprise, surprise.

And now, the out-of-touch elite claim this new piece of legislation, the so-called comprehensive bill will, in some way, fix the immigration crisis. That's what you hear.

Well, everybody wants a comprehensive bill because we've got to do something. Doing nothing is better than doing something wrong. Doing nothing is better than doing something that'll make a problem worse. And of course the people who say you've got to do something are the ones who created the problem in the first place.

And, as I said, all of these things that they're trumpeting in the bill, the new enforcement measures, the security

measures, the fence, the new agents, the employer sanctions, all of these things are already in place in the law. But we have to give amnesty to illegals and actually encourage tens of millions more to come here in order to get that?

It's like Lucy holding out the football for Charlie Brown. This bill is yet another attempt to trick us as Lucy tricked Charlie every time. It is an illusion, a scam that will make things worse.

The Senate legislation being touted by Senator KENNEDY and the few Republican senators and our President, as I say, the purpose of that bill is to legalize the status of 15 to 20 million illegals, which will then bring tens of millions more. It is a pro-invasion bill. It behooves all of us, all of us to oppose that legislation because we love America.

The President has it all wrong. We want to do what's right for America. That's why we're opposing what he's suggesting.

In that bill, of course, is a provision that would increase the Border Patrol. And, as I say, the legislation going through the Senate actually increases the Border Patrol by fewer agents than is already required that the Border Patrol expand. A great deal has been made out of that. But let's take a look at what that really means.

Do we really believe that President Bush and this administration and, yes, those supporting this bill, are supportive of a strong border control of the fence and strengthening the Border Patrol?

This is an administration that has backed up U.S. attorneys who have taken Border Patrol agents who have stopped drug smugglers at our border and thrown the Border Patrol agents in jail for not following the proper procedures, giving immunity to the drug dealer, and throwing the book at the people, the law enforcement agents who are trying to protect us.

As we speak, Ramos and Compeon, two Border Patrol agents who, for 15 years combined in their lives, were risking their lives every day to protect us. One of them is a 10-year veteran of the Naval Reserve. The other served in the military before joining the Border Patrol. These people have clean records.

Yet the U.S. attorney has thrown the book at these folks, these two brave men, men whose records are clean. And yet he has, the U.S. attorney claims they are corrupt again by playing word games, just like his boss. And today, as we debate this bill, these two Border Patrol agents languish in solitary confinement in Federal prison.

How can anyone claim that they are in favor of the Border Patrol, strengthening the Border Patrol agents, when this administration has done so much to demoralize those people in the Border Patrol and to attack the well-being of those who are protecting us?

The demoralization of our Border Patrol is a grave threat to our national

security and the safety of people. We need to back our Border Patrol agents. They do not support this legislation. We need to be strong. We need to make sure that we are doing what is right for the American people. That is what this battle is all about.

Let's remember those two Border Patrol agents because they symbolize everything that's wrong with that legislation, everything that's wrong with the position of the elite in this country. These are just ordinary men, Ramos and Compeon, who were out trying to protect us, just like our military people overseas, risking their life. Yet they were told not to use their weapons on the border, and they did, and they did not follow the proper procedures, and they were thrown in jail.

Remembering them, remembering what we do right for our own people, let us oppose this effort to change the immigration laws that would bring more illegals into our country.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLSWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker; and it is an honor to come to the floor once again. My good colleagues that have, we come to the floor working on behalf of the 30-Something Working Group; and I can just attest that it's just great to be an American and have an opportunity to share our thoughts and ideas and concerns.

As you know, the 30-Something Working Group, we come to the floor to shed light on the action of the House and to talk about this new direction that we fought so hard for last November, especially on the Democratic side of the aisle, to move this country in a new direction and exactly what the American people have called for. So we're excited.

I'm glad to have Mr. ALTMIRE and also Mr. MURPHY here with me tonight. And I know that Mr. MURPHY has been pulling almost a double duty here. I understand he was Acting Speaker a little earlier tonight.

And I had the opportunity, while you were in the Chair, to join Speaker PELOSI celebrating her 20th year of public service, 20 years here in the House. There were a number of great Speakers that were there, honored her family for allowing her to serve this great country of ours, and also recognizing the fact that she's history as being the first female Speaker. But also there were people like Patti LaBelle there, and just a really star-studded event. She deserves that honor and that appreciation; and constituents also, I'm pretty sure, are pretty happy and proud. All Americans are.

With that, I, of course, we, Mr. Speaker, we and mainly as of late, talking about Iraq, and as we speak

here on the floor, there's a major debate going on just across the hall in the Senate dealing with comprehensive immigration reform. Just in the last 6 months, we have done so much and we've talked about so much and we've taken action on so many different issues; and I know that Mr. MURPHY and Mr. ALTMIRE and I will be addressing many of those issues tonight.

This is our first time since the Memorial Day break, and I had a wonderful opportunity to attend a NATO conference, parliamentary, that the Speaker appointed me and I think 12 other Members of the House, bipartisan, spent some time over in Portugal meeting with some of our European Union partners there, and had the opportunity to go to Tunisia to honor those World War II veterans that are, or honor those that paid the ultimate sacrifice. It's the only U.S. cemetery on the continent of Africa; and it was so very, very special and touching, just as an American and as a Member of Congress, to go there and lay a wreath on behalf of those that paid the ultimate sacrifice.

And then having, and still having, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to come back here and join with my family, who's here in Washington, go down to the World War II Memorial, which had Tunisia and all of the different countries where World War II, we had fighting and men and women lost their lives, to make that connection, all in a 5-day span, is something great as an American.

□ 2215

I just want to share that with the Members of the House. And we know that one of our soldiers just today, one of the soldiers who was found in Iraq was laid to rest at Arlington Cemetery, and we know that there are two that are still missing of the recent ones that were missing from the IED that exploded recently in Iraq. So we paid honor to those that have paid the ultimate sacrifice and their families and also to those veterans that served beside them. And it was such a great week, and I know that many of the Members had an opportunity to go back to their districts to celebrate the life of those that paid the ultimate sacrifice.

With that, Mr. MURPHY, I would like to yield to you, sir.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

You know, it is funny. This is my first time as a member of the 30-Something Group, and I know I am the puppy of the group because I am only 33 years old. So when I ran for Congress, I had tremendous support from the network community, those bloggers out there all across America. But there are bloggers, especially in Philadelphia and greater Philadelphia and the suburbs that blog every day, and they got so excited when the 30-Something Group was their voice when

you were in the minority. Your voice in talking about progressive values, talking about the things in the New Direction, that if we were just given the chance, we would lead. And when we got that chance just a few months ago in the 110th Congress, those bloggers, that network community, are just so proud of their efforts. And it is neat for me to be here to think that when we had a rebirth in our country and Philadelphia, the city of Philadelphia was part of that rebirth and to know that six of the ten biggest bloggers in our country are from Philadelphia and the Philadelphia suburbs. People like Chris Bowers of MyDD and Duncan Black of Atrios and how they are following the 30-Something Group every day and to be part of this group now is just a really proud moment.

And another proud moment that the gentleman from Florida mentioned is the fact that today is the 20th anniversary of the public service of the Speaker of the House, Ms. NANCY PELOSI from California. And when I was in this body just a few months ago speaking and taking that oath of office, taking that oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States as a Member of Congress, and when I was there with my wife, Jenni, and my 6-month old, at that time a month old, daughter, Maggie Murphy, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that they are watching at home on C-SPAN because I am down here trying to work on behalf of our great country, I know that I was thinking of not just the folks that are over in Iraq, those men that I served with or those men that I had taught when I was a professor at West Point, but I thought about my month-old daughter, Maggie, and I thought about what an incredible story it is that when she was born into this great country, the third most powerful person is a woman, the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

And I thought about a role model. Here is this Italian Catholic woman originally from Baltimore, now in San Francisco, and the criticism about the Speaker before she got in here was that she wasn't going to do a good job or she was going to lead from the left. She has really made this a House united. She has reached across the aisle to the Republicans. She has tried to lead in a moderate fashion, and I think we have to give her a lot of credit. I know the analysts have said that she is getting high marks as the Speaker, and I know that I am proud that she is our Speaker and I am proud to serve under her leadership.

I will keep my remarks relatively brief. It is my maiden voyage here with the 30-Something Group, and I am joined as well with one of my brothers, the other MURPHY, CHRIS MURPHY, who is the elder statesman from Connecticut, who is a whole, I think, 30 some days older than I am, and I know tonight the Speaker Pro Tempore is the gentleman from the great State of Indiana, the sheriff, but tonight I want

to speak about the New Direction that we are bringing about.

Finally, the rubber stamp Congress of the past is gone and the do something Congress is here. And we all campaigned in saying that we were going to hold President Bush accountable. And I had served in Baghdad as a captain with the 82nd Airborne Division, and I am so proud of my military service. My father served during Vietnam in the Navy. My grandfather served. My brother is still serving in the Air Force. And I think back to those times and what you come to expect of the Congress. And our men and women who are serving so honorably fight for our country. They fight to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and they execute the public policy as it is drafted and implemented here in Washington.

And I know that I get e-mails from Iraq and Afghanistan and those heroes talk about sometimes they don't know what the policy necessarily should be, but what they do appreciate is the fact that we are actually having a debate, that we are actually asking the tough questions necessary. So when we talk about a New Direction in this 110th Congress, when we talk about accountability, part of that is what we just passed out of the Armed Services Committee with the defense appropriations bill. Talking about in Iraq when we give the Iraqis support, why is it that 4 years later they are still, for the most part, sitting on the sidelines? Why is it that we gave them pallets and pallets, crates and crates of literally U.S. money and pallets stacked this high, shipped it over to Baghdad, gave it out, and billions and billions of dollars are simply missing?

When we talk about accountability, we have to talk about the weapons that we have given the Iraqis. In the United States military, and I joined it back in 1993, we are taught pretty early that your weapon is your best friend. There was even a cadence that I used to sing when I would jog in the morning and run troops, "I used to date a beauty queen; now I date my M-16." And it is kind of funny, but it is true in that you are always around your weapon. It is part of that accountability. If you lose your weapon, that is the end of your career. You will be lucky if you don't get court-martialed.

But how that relates to Iraq is we have given the Iraqis 14,000 weapons, AK-47s, M-16s, that are now missing. Think about that. We have given 14,000 weapons to the Iraqis that are completely missing, unaccounted for. That is not the accountability that our taxpayers are expecting. That is not the accountability that we should be expecting when we fight the war on terror because when you give billions of dollars over in Iraq, when you give 14,000 weapons to Iraq that are now just missing, that affects the lives of our soldiers. And we cannot stand for that.

I would also like to talk about accountability when it comes to Afghanistan and Pakistan. Almost 6 years ago,

our Nation was attacked by Osama bin Laden. Thousands of innocent civilians, innocent Americans were murdered on September 11 of 2001. The culprit: Osama bin Laden. He was in Afghanistan. He trained al Qaeda, and al Qaeda was really given a free pass by the government there, the Taliban. And we made a decision. We got a coalition. We got Canada and all these other countries going in there in Afghanistan to do the job. And then a short time later, President Bush said, no, let's change our focus to Iraq. Well, we have ten times more troops now in Iraq now than in Afghanistan. And when we talk about accountability, you have to ask the question, what are we doing to get Osama bin Laden? Why is it that we give Pakistan billions of dollars? We actually give Pakistan \$80 million a month because we have intelligence that is unclassified that we can talk about here in this setting that Osama bin Laden is in Afghanistan and possibly on the border of Pakistan. So we need Pakistan's help as an ally.

Why is it that President Musharraf has outsourced the hunt for Osama bin Laden to his regional warlords?

Years ago we learned that we outsourced the hunt for Osama bin Laden in Tora Bora and he slipped through our fingers when we had a chance. We can't repeat the same mistakes. So if we are giving support to Pakistan and Afghanistan, which we should, they are our allies, we need to demand accountability. We need to demand the accountability that the American taxpayers, that the American families, and that the American soldiers deserve.

And the last point I would like to bring up on my maiden voyage here in the 30-something Group is education. One of the greatest jobs I ever had was being a professor at West Point teaching constitutional military law. And it was the Constitution that those young cadets who were about to become second lieutenants were going to take an oath to support and defend. And education is vital for Americans and our students to be more and more competitive in a global economy.

I joke with the gentleman from Florida we are not competing in my district in Bucks County for jobs against Florida. As I look at Mr. ALTMIRE, we are not competing with the folks in Pittsburgh in Bucks County. I look at the congressman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY). We are not competing with jobs necessarily against the folks in Connecticut. We are competing for jobs with people in China and South Korea and Japan and in Europe. And we need to have high investment in education so we remain more competitive.

And this gets me into our national debt. Right now our debt is over \$9 trillion. So that means every man, woman, and child in America owes over \$29,000 to our national debt. So that means when my daughter, Maggie, was born 6 months ago at Lower Bucks Hospital in

Bucks County, Pennsylvania, she was born in that hospital and she owed \$29,000 to our national debt. That is a debt that we owe to foreign countries like communist China, like Japan, like South Korea, like Mexico. We keep borrowing and borrowing and borrowing and borrowing.

Now, when I am back home, people say to me, PATRICK, we are at war. Of course it is going to cost money.

And I say, \$9 trillion we have in debt, \$9 trillion; yet this war in Iraq has only cost at this point about \$450 billion. That is a huge difference.

And how it relates to education is just in March of 2007, we paid \$21 billion just that month on the interest rate to this debt, just paying off the interest rate that we owe, \$21 billion. But that same month we only paid \$5 billion in education. So what we spend on education, \$5 billion, we spend four times that much that same month on our interest rate on our debt.

We need a change and we are making that change happen here in the 110th Congress. And I am proud to be part of it. I am proud to be part of the leadership to make sure we do what is necessary, establishing a pay-as-you-go system, doing the things necessary to hold all of us accountable and this government accountable.

So I would say to the gentleman of Florida, thank you for giving me the opportunity on this maiden voyage. I look forward to many more times back here with the 30-something Group, and I am proud of all those supporters not just back home in Bucks County and northeast Philadelphia and Montgomery County and the network community. I am proud, on this 20th anniversary, of the public service of our leader, Speaker PELOSI, to be here amongst the 30-something Group. Thank you so much.

□ 2230

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, I am just so happy that you had an opportunity to share some of your wisdom with us here tonight and also a perspective, especially someone who has been in harm's way and has been in the field with our men and women, and at the same time talking about education.

We just had a major education summit right before the break that the Speaker put forth, and Mr. MILLER and Ms. DELAURO were a part of that effort, and we were just so pleased to do that.

In the 30-Something Working Group, we kind of like to have a conversation. We know that everyone has to make an opening remark or statement, but, Mr. ALTMIRE, I am looking forward to hearing what you want to share with the members.

And, also, one of my constituents once called me. Serving in public service, you have an opportunity to hear some interesting things. He called me up. And you know these cable talk shows, where you go down to public television and you sign up and it's like

a nonprofit organization. He called me, and I was a State representative at that time, and he said, Kendrick, I want you to come on my show. And I said, well, what are we going to talk about? And he said, we're going to talk about the consequences of the consequences.

So I had to kind of, I was on the phone and I said, "consequences of the consequences?" And he said, "Yes, the consequences of the consequences could be consequential."

But in this case, as we look at the consequences of the consequences, using his description of what was going on at that particular time, I couldn't help, as I yield to you, but look at the Newsweek cover.

I went home tonight before I came over here. My wife joined me at the celebration for the Speaker. And this Newsweek cover that many of us will be reading this week says, "After Bush. How to Restore America's Place in the World." I mean, this is not a Democratic publication, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important for us to understand that we are living in serious times. And here at the 30-Something Working Group, we try to break things down so that everyone can understand, where Members won't say, well, I didn't know exactly my role at that particular time.

There are very historic votes that are taking place here. We just had an emergency supplemental. I think that every vote that every Member took was a heroic vote and a sheroic vote, in my opinion, need it be in the positive or the affirmative.

But I think it's important for all of us to realize that we have a role to play. And many of us, I know I do, share getting our men and women back home and bringing an end to this conflict, especially as it relates to U.S. troops serving in combat posture on the streets of Baghdad in the middle of a civil war.

Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I just want to say how proud I am of my fellow Pennsylvanian and the second Murphy now to join the 30-Something Working Group, along with the gentleman from Connecticut. He is someone that we look to for his expertise, having been in the field of battle and having served in this conflict; and I really am excited to hear that he is going to be joining us now with the 30-something group to talk more about these issues. And he definitely has a unique perspective that he's adding. So I was excited to hear his voice, and I am very proud to hail from the same State.

I wanted to talk a little bit about one of the consequences of this action that we're talking about, as Mr. MEEK brought up, is the fact that we are creating, through our actions in Iraq and Afghanistan, hundreds of thousands of new veterans are returning to this country, many of whom are returning seriously injured. We have over 25,000 that have been injured. We are approaching 4,000 killed now. And those

that are returning and are going to have to use the VA system are going to find, thankfully, that for the first time in the history of the program, 77 years of the Department of Veterans Affairs, we have increased funding at a rate that has never been seen in the history of the Department. We are up to approximately \$15 billion in increased funding for the VA in this Congress.

And as every member of the 30-Something Working Group knows and certainly every Member of this House knows, this is a priority issue for me. Funding for Veterans Affairs has languished in the past several years, unfortunately, but this Congress has stepped up to the plate in a bipartisan way, I will say, to give the Veterans Affairs Department, especially the health accounts, the necessary funding to take care of these hundreds of thousands of veterans that we are creating in Iraq and Afghanistan.

These are men and women who have fought bravely, people like Mr. MURPHY from Pennsylvania who have put their lives on the line, who have left a family behind to do this and have made every possible sacrifice. They deserve to know that they can count on the United States to give them the health care that they deserve and that they have earned, that they've been promised when they entered the military.

So we voted in just the first 5 months here in this Congress to increase funding by \$15 billion for the VA. And significantly, for the first time ever, we exceeded the recommended independent budget request of the service organizations, the American Legion, the VFW, and others.

I want to repeat that point for my colleagues. For the first time ever, Congress exceeded the request of the service organizations. I think that's something we can be proud of.

We talk about the enormous achievements we've had in the first 5 months, the many bills and the different subjects that we have addressed. The fact that we have paid attention to and finally moved forward with our veterans health care facility in a way that is unprecedented in the history of this country is I think one of the things we can be most proud of in our first 5 months in office here.

Some of the things that this funding is going to allow us to do, we are going to be able to hire more doctors and nurses and improve medical services at the VA. As we saw with some of the Department of Defense facilities with regard to health care and Walter Reed, chronic underfunding can lead to some disastrous consequences. We need to make sure that we don't allow that to happen in our VA system. So this bill is going to improve the quality of care.

I have in my district a Department of Veterans Affairs hospital that is undergoing a \$100 plus million expansion right now. Hopefully, when that is done, we are going to have in my district the preeminent health care facility in the entire VA network; and I

want every VA facility to have that type of access across this country. Our veterans deserve nothing less than the highest quality health care this Nation can provide for them.

We are going to reduce waiting times. We have a backlog at the VA, unfortunately, of nearly 500,000 cases. And every Member of this House knows, you probably have the same experience that I am having in my office of people who are calling, frustrated veterans who want to access the VA health system but they have to wait, they have to get in line. And it is a very long line, weeks or months of waiting, because of that backlog, nearly 500,000 cases. The bill that we passed in this House, the legislation that we've passed is going to go a long way towards improving that situation.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. ALTMIRE, if you would yield, and Mr. MURPHY, I just don't want it to go by. You're talking about what we just passed before we left, received the funding for, with a major fight at the White House. I mean, the President wanted to veto it. He said that's not what I asked for. Meanwhile, Walter Reed was still standing by for the dollars to be able to make the corrections that they need to make.

We know that we passed the Chairman's, Mr. SKELTON's, bill, Armed Services bill off this floor to help us with readiness and all of those things. The President said that he is going to veto many of these things that are over his mark. But what you're talking about is something that we couldn't even dream of in the last Congress. I mean, you start thinking about how we moved the ball down field, and I mean by force. And Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, many of us, not only do we have to eat our Wheaties, but we have to do our pushups. And mentally we have to prepare ourselves between our ears to go to battle on behalf of the American people and those that have served.

So I hear exactly what you're saying. I just want to make sure that Members understand. And guess what? Again, Democratic leadership. A number of Republican colleagues, I believe with maybe 80 of them, voted against the emergency supplemental to get these dollars to our veterans to show you that if we can get these great issues to the floor and that we can get a vote on them that the American spirit and the bipartisan spirit will then take off, versus those that said, well, we don't need to do it. And we are doing it in a meaningful way that veterans are going to see an improvement as we move on.

So I just wanted to hit that real quick, and I yield back. But I just wanted to be able to, especially from a person that was around as it relates to Members on the floor, now, I guess I'm the only Member that was in the 109th Congress and 108th Congress, to reflect on that historical note there of just leadership and making it happen on behalf of our veterans in Pennsylvania and other States.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) for his comments and certainly his leadership on this issue, which is unmatched in this House. I am proud to hear your comments.

We have a situation at Walter Reed which we all came to know very well, of course, in the months. I had the opportunity to tour Walter Reed, and when you see these kids that are returning from battle and you think about them, one of the fantastic gentlemen that we met was a 2005 graduate of the Naval Academy. And you can picture him just 2 short years ago in his uniform, throwing his hat in the air, excited, cream of the crop, the best this Nation can put forward, and he came home just horrifically injured.

It breaks your heart to see these men and women who fought so bravely, and you think that they went home to Walter Reed, and it is our responsibility to give them the best medical care that money can provide, and we had disastrous things happening there. You think of the living conditions that were outlined in that Washington Post article, and the paint peeling from the walls and the rodents and the mold, and you think, how could we possibly have let this happen?

For several years, there were complaints that were made, but nothing was done about it. But this Congress is doing something about it. We have not only done the investigations and the oversight to find out what went wrong and to hold those accountable who are responsible for what happened at Walter Reed, but, just as important, we have a commitment in this House and in this Congress that this is never going to happen again.

We are going to give the necessary funding to the Department of Defense and to Walter Reed so that they can take care of the maintenance and the repair that's necessary. And we are going to do a top-to-bottom review of every Department of Defense health facility and every VA facility in this country, find out if anything similar is happening, if there are any problems of this sort, and fix them immediately, not wait for this to take place again.

Because it shouldn't take a Washington Post article. It shouldn't take the newspaper to bring this situation to light. We have a responsibility, and we are fulfilling that responsibility, to ensure that this never happens again. And we are doing that in a variety of ways, through oversight and through the funding increases that I've talked about.

The supplemental bill that we supported and that went to the President's desk, which was signed, included an increase in funding to help the Department of Defense health care and the VA health facilities fulfill these obligations. And, as I said, we are now at record levels. The Appropriations Committee dealing with Veterans Affairs just today announced that they had marked up their bill with a \$6.7 billion

increase in funding for the VA which, as I said, for this 1 year is the largest in history and is nearly \$4 billion above what the President had requested.

We are going to talk a little bit later about bipartisanship, and that is an issue of which there can be no disagreement. There are issues that we talk about, like immigration, like Iraq, like tax cuts, where there is a deep divide among us. There are serious policy differences among us. But every Member of this House can agree that there is no group that should stand ahead of our Nation's veterans when it comes time to make Federal funding decisions. That is an issue that we can all agree on.

I am proud to be a Member of this House that has, for the first time in a very long time, as I said, created an atmosphere where we all agree that veterans come first, and we need to increase the level of funding for the VA health facilities after years and years of neglect.

So, with that said, I would yield at this time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Mr. ALTMIRE.

I want to key off of your last point there, just spend a couple moments before we kick it back to Mr. MEEK, on that issue of bipartisanship. Because you are exactly right. You know, it seems like a pretty simple premise that the cost of the war should include taking care of the warriors when they return back home, that the cost of the war isn't just the guns and the ammunition and the mechanics necessary to fight a war in Iraq or Afghanistan, the cost of the war is also taking care of those men and women when they get back home. That is this war and that is previous wars.

So it sounds like a pretty unanimous premise that we could all get behind, but the fact is that we didn't get behind it, and we didn't get behind it until the Democrats took control of this Congress. It was just platitudes and rhetoric for a long time, "let's support our troops and support our veterans."

□ 2245

So I think we got to be clear today, as much as we are going to talk about the importance of bipartisanship, it took the Democrats to put some of these issues out before the House in order to garner bipartisan votes. I think that is maybe as important as anything that we have done in these first 5 months, is that we have gotten rid of that old rule that I heard a little bit about when I was watching this place from afar in Connecticut called the "majority of the majority."

I heard about this rule where nothing could come to the floor of the House of Representatives unless the majority of the majority party supported it. So you had very few opportunities for there to be real bipartisan cooperation, because you had to have almost unani-

mous agreement from the majority party, at the time the Republicans, in order for anything to get down here to the floor of the House.

We talked a lot, Mr. MEEK, when we stood up here after that sort of glorious first 100 hours about those bills, those six or seven bills that we passed, and how many Republicans we had on board with each one of those. They were really remarkable numbers. On average we had 60-70 Republican votes for each one of those. It doesn't get covered much in the news. The news wants to cover just the grinding and gnashing of the two parties.

We had a lot of bipartisan cooperation, and that has continued. That has continued. In the last few weeks here we had on a bill to reauthorize funding for children's healthcare, we had 123 Republicans supporting it. That same 123 Republicans supporting increased record funding for Katrina recovery. On the joint funding resolution that finally restored some fiscal balance to this country, we had 57 Republicans supporting it. Increasing the minimum wage, 82 Republicans.

I know when you turn on the cable news networks you are not going to hear about the times that we agree. But why a lot of us were so enthusiastic to stop by and send well wishes to Speaker PELOSI on her 20 years in Congress is because she has made good on her commitment to make this the most open and ethical and bipartisan Congress in a real, real long time.

I know, Mr. MEEK, this doesn't get the headlines all the time, that the newspapers want to talk about the places that we conflict. But there has been a lot of cooperation here and it has mattered. I think it has made a difference.

I think one of the things the people don't understand is sort of how this place works, and I certainly didn't understand it until I got here.

It used to be it was impossible, virtually impossible, for Democrats to get their amendments heard on the floor of the House of Representatives. You were going to get a bill introduced by the Republicans, and that was about it. No more debate, no changes, no amendments. Nothing. No real opportunity for the People's House to actually engage in a real argument, in a process of coming up with a better piece of legislation.

That has changed now. In the first 5 months of 2005, we had two what are called open rules, bills in which any Member can put forth an amendment, have a chance to have that idea vetted and aired out before the House of Representatives. We have quadrupled the number of bills that have come before this House under a so-called open rule.

I know these are sort of arcane terms that people out there may not understand, but they matter. It means that every single one of the 435 people that are elected here have a chance to make a bill better, have a chance to have their voice their constituents' voices

heard. For a long time it was shut down.

So it was a good night tonight to be able to celebrate Speaker PELOSI's two decades here in the House. A lot of us are excited about the potential that lies before us to be able to really reset our direction in Iraq, to do better things in energy policy, to stand up for working families.

But for a lot of us that came here on the backs and shoulders of our constituents who have virtually lost complete faith in politics, maybe we are just as excited about the fact that, despite what you may see in the cable news networks or reading the headlines, we actually are starting slowly to bring people together here, to open up this House, this process, again, to make it a true bipartisan People's House.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Mr. MURPHY, it is very hard to move in a bipartisan fashion. One speaks constantly about the bipartisan spirit, about bipartisan action. Spirit and action are two different interpretations of actually getting something done.

The action part means that Members are able to vote with their voting cards or walk up to that desk and sign a card that says yea or nay and work in a bipartisan spirit on the yea. Many amendments from our Republican colleagues, some of them are passed and some of them are not passed. But the bottom line is they have at least the opportunity to come to the floor and to bring their ideas to the floor. Definitely in the area of financial services.

We have spent a very long time, Mr. Speaker, on this floor hearing Republican amendments that were offered in committee, offered in subcommittee. Some came to the floor and we were able to work those amendments out to become a part of the work product. Others just wanted to file an amendment, for whatever reason, but had their opportunity in this democracy to do so.

Many of the Members in this House, of course we have a lot to do, and Members when they come to the floor, they said, I thought this amendment was already voted down in committee? But many of the Members on the minority side, the Republican side, had an opportunity to offer it, Mr. MURPHY. I think this really makes a difference between Democratic leadership and Republican leadership.

Even though we may not agree, giving the opportunity to others to be able to take part in this democracy, something that was suppressed in the two previous Congresses that I can speak to. And I can tell you that it should be well-noted here that this House has provided the kind of leadership to allow the minority party here in this House, which are the Republicans, to have a voice in the process of making laws. That is so very, very important.

I will say this and then yield back to you. Some are saying, why aren't you

treating the Republicans as the Republicans treated you or treated Democrats. Well, guess what? Forty-two new Members of the House, especially when you are on the Democratic side, all of you in this Chamber who are part of the majority makers, they voted for change. They didn't vote for the same. They voted for a government that can work in a bipartisan way. They voted for the kind of leadership to allow minority Members, who have constituents just like I have, to vote for veterans assistance, to be able to vote to make sure we put forth dollars to come up with alternative fuels and other ways that we can supply America so that we can invest in the Midwest versus the Middle East. They voted for all of that.

And guess what? That takes time and tolerance, Mr. Speaker, and that is something that the Republican majority in the previous Congress did not have. I am glad we have the tolerance. I am glad we are taking the time. I am glad we are working the way we are working, even though it is very painful for many of us and our constituents and many that have our families back in the district.

In this time and this place in history, when you have cover after cover, how do we restore America's place in the world, it is not how the world thinks about us. It is about what kind of leadership are we providing, not only for our constituents, but for the United States of America. And just at a time we are trying to dig ourselves out of out-of-control borrowing from foreign nations, we are seeing differently.

I am a Member of the NATO parliamentary group, and I can tell you, when you are talking to some countries, and it is kind of like you have to be quiet for a moment, have some level of contrition and listen to what other people are saying, because they feel we have been dictating to them what they should do and what they should think, and they are saying, by the way, you owe us money. You owe me money. You owe my country money.

So we have domestic issues that we have to cover. I know we are going to talk about stem cell research and I think that is very, very important. That is part of the new direction. It is leadership. Sometimes leadership is lonely. But we have to do it.

Mr. MURPHY, I just want to thank you for bringing some of these issues to light and talking about what it takes to bring about bipartisan action versus Members coming to the floor and saying we should have a bipartisan spirit.

Well, spirit is a good thing, if you use it religiously. One of my friends, Dr. Michael Eric Dyson, I have read a couple of his books, he says spirit makes religion act right. The real issue is that it is good to have spirit. We all feel good about it. But action is even better.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. You can talk the talk, but you have to come out here and do it. You have got to put bills before this House that have

Republican ideas in them and have Democrat ideas in them. And you have to be okay with the fact that we can share credit. Listen, nobody in my district cares whether I am a Republican or a Democrat, as long as I am on the right side of the issues, as long as I am fighting for what they believe I should be fighting for.

People don't think in Republican or Democratic terms back at the places we come from. They think about Republican and Democratic terms here inside the Beltway in Washington, DC, but back out in America, Mr. MEEK, people think about what is right and wrong; what is good for people and what is bad for people. Not Republican and not Democrat. I think we are beginning to start to figure that out.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, you are 110 percent right, and that is what folks voted for. They didn't vote for you to go be the strongest Democrat you can be, or I want you to go and be Republican-like. The bottom line is they voted for us to be Members of Congress, constitutional officers having a part in this process, one of the three branches of Government, and making sure that every Member is able to fulfill their constitutional duty and come here and participate.

I feel so good about it, it is like almost I have chill bumps. To be able to come to this floor, to be a part of the whole begging, if you get us an opportunity to train the thought it could. All of those things we talked about, you think about where we were and where we are now, and that we still have the kind of spirit that we had then, we still want to fight and we still have battles ahead of us.

We have a President that is saying you do anything over the budget that I set forth, no matter how good it may be, children's healthcare, veterans affairs, the issues dealing with the environment, I am going to veto it.

Well, you know something? We are here saying fine, if you want to veto it, then consider yourself challenged, versus, well, if you say you are going to veto it, then I guess we can't do it. Even though we have our challenges in the Senate, I think that it is very, very important as it relates to getting a number of these agenda items through, because of the close numbers there, I think the American people are going to continue to follow in the spirit of a new direction and help us carry out the agenda that they wanted originally, and hopefully some of our Republican colleagues in the Senate will be able to come together and have bipartisan action and move it forward.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Before we send this back over to Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MEEK, let's talk about an issue on which I think this Congress is going to stand together tomorrow, Republicans and Democrats, and stand against the policies of a President who is going to show once again how out of step he is with the American public, and that is on the issue of stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity when I was in the Connecticut State Senate to author Connecticut's Stem Cell Investment Act. Connecticut became the first State in the Nation through a legislative act to invest public dollars in stem cell research. I am real proud of that.

But part of the reason that I decided to leave the State Senate and come here to the United States Congress is because it was a bittersweet victory for us. We shouldn't have 50 different State legislatures investing in basic scientific research; certainly not the type of potentially pioneering, life-saving scientific research that stem cell research, both adult and embryonic, holds in its vast and potentially limitless potential.

So, tomorrow, we are going to take up a bill that we took up at the beginning of January, now coming back to us from the Senate, which is the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007, which is once again going to allow for Federal dollars to be used for both embryonic and adult stem cell research around this country, and, by the way, finally put some real ethical and moral and scientific boundaries around that research.

One of the great secrets in this world today is if you don't live in a State like Connecticut, California or New Jersey that has put forth in State legislation some moral and ethical parameters around stem cell research, this research is largely unregulated in this country. So I think the most important thing we will do tomorrow is pass in a bipartisan way a bill that will start to turn on Federal funds for research that, as we know, potentially will unlock the treatments and cures for such insidious diseases as juvenile diabetes and Parkinson's research and maybe even for cancer some day.

This isn't tomorrow's cure and it is not even the day after tomorrow's cure, but if we don't start investing now and start investing at a Federal level, start investing our Federal dollars, we are never going to get to that day when we can start to realize the potential of stem cell research.

But here is where the rub is. We are going to do this with Republicans and Democrats standing together. There will be more Democrats supporting it than there will be Republicans. That is just how this issue is going to work. But this is going to be an issue in which this Congress, because we are in tune with what the people are telling us, that they want us to use the research at our disposal to try to make people's lives better, that is what this is all about, trying to use the resources of the Federal Government, the communal resources of the American people, to try to make our lives better, that is what stem cell research can do. They want us to make that jump. It is going to land on the President's desk and he has already told us once again that he will veto it.

He is continually out of step with where the American people are with

this war in Iraq. Now he will once again show us he is out of step with where the American people are on healthcare.

But, once again, we are going to show that if we stand together, if we put party aside and we listen to what the people want, in this case they want a Federal Government that is going to start standing up and trying to find cures for cancer and Parkinson's disease and bone marrow disease, that we can do some pretty amazing things here if we stand together.

We passed things with bipartisan support in the past. We will do it tomorrow on maybe one of the most important things that we will do before we take our break for the summer, which is invest in stem cell research.

□ 2300

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I just want to say that Mr. MURPHY presented himself so well tonight. Mr. RYAN is in Ohio tonight, and he BlackBerryed me and said he wished he could be here with us. As you know, Mr. RYAN is an outstanding Member of Congress. He had a death in his family and had to return to his district. We appreciate and recognize his absence. I am going to e-mail him back and say, Mr. RYAN, I think one of the reasons why things are moving so smoothly, you guessed, is because you're not here; but that is another issue.

Mr. ALTMIRE, one thing that we need to talk about as relates to stem cell research, there are so many diseases that could be cured, and 72 percent of Americans are supporting this research. We have kids with juvenile diabetes. There are a number of issues that we want to try to move on. This is a leadership issue. The thing about leadership is it is lonely sometimes.

I get e-mails and calls from my constituents, I support this; or, KENDRICK, I wasn't quite with you on that decision. But the good thing is something is happening, action versus inaction.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I wanted to commend the gentleman from Connecticut again. We say a lot of things when we are transferring comments here back and forth about the different roles that we play, but it truly is the truth to say there is no one in this Congress who has done more on a public policy basis to promote this issue than the gentleman from Connecticut. He has done it at the State level. He is passionate about it. He has done it here in Congress. He has made it a staple issue of his young career, and I want to commend him. He has shown great leadership.

And in saying that, I want to recognize that we have a colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who certainly deserves credit second to none for her pushing this agenda. I certainly don't want to overlook her in recognizing Mr. MURPHY's equal efforts on this issue.

I have a unique perspective in my support of this issue in that I am a pro-

life Member of Congress. I used the occasion of my first floor speech on the floor of this House specifically on this issue because it is that important to me.

I have a view that embryonic stem cell research and a vote to promote it is a pro-life vote. By voting to pursue embryonic stem cell research, we are voting to improve the lives of people. And most importantly with this bill, we are voting only on, and this is a very key point, lines of stem cells that would otherwise be discarded by the fertility clinic. That cannot be overlooked.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is a very good point.

Mr. ALTMIRE. This is not a situation where we are going to be able to pick and choose types of stem cells that can be used for other purposes. The administration talks about snowflake babies and other uses. These are only lines of stem cells where the donor has said I am done using them. They cannot be used for my other purpose, they are to be discarded, and then they agree that the stem cells could be used for research purposes. Otherwise they are discarded.

That is something that in my mind is the decisive point on this. If they are going to be discarded anyway, hundreds of thousands of lines of embryonic stem cells, why not use them for scientific research to save the lives and improve the lives of people who are alive today, real men and women who are suffering from diseases, and the people who don't know they are going to have those diseases in the future, people who are going to suffer from these diseases tomorrow.

We are talking about debilitating diseases, we are talking about long-term diseases that are reaching epidemic proportions in my district of southwestern Pennsylvania, like diabetes. Imagine if this research could show a cure or improved treatment for any of these illnesses. Why would we not use them for scientific purposes if they are otherwise going to be discarded.

I am certainly not the only pro-life Member who is going to support this tomorrow, as the gentleman said. But I do want to emphasize this is an issue whose time has come. The President has vetoed it in the 109th Congress. He has vetoed it once in this 110th Congress. We are expecting we are going to face a second veto, and I know the vote is going to be close on whether or not we are going to be able to override that veto.

But we have sent a message, and we are going to do it tomorrow, that the time for this issue has come. This is not about political games or trying to score points for a political agenda. This is about saving lives and improving the lives of people who are alive today, and I strongly support this initiative.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You couldn't ask for a better feeling being a Member of Congress. I always share out that. Out on the steps of the Capitol at least

once or twice a week we have young people from our districts, and they want to hear from Members of Congress. The difference between us and the average American out there, and there are only 500-plus Members of Congress, we read something in the paper, something that could have been avoided, we hear a story from our constituents, something that could have been avoided, and to have an opportunity to vote on a piece of legislation like we are going to vote on tomorrow, no matter how many times we have to vote on it, we are a part of the solution to many of the health problems that are facing Americans throughout this country. We are the leader in the world as it relates to research and being responsible and being respectful.

To have 200 organizations supporting the bill is very, very important. It is supported by the American Medical Association, the AARP, the Association of American Medical Colleges, Parkinson's Action Network, the American Diabetes Association, Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, Paralyzed Veterans of America, all of these groups. That is just to name a few. And also, 72 percent of Americans support this bill that we are looking to pass. You also have a number of corporations that are out there calling for it. Think about the money that could be saved, not only the money, but the lives. This is what it is all about.

People ask: How do you feel being a Member of Congress? I feel good because I feel we can bring to the floor and bring to this government what is needed to help Americans, and I am glad we are a part of that.

Mr. MURPHY, it is good having an authority on the floor. I was a member of the Florida State legislature, and a State legislature is an interesting organization to be a part of. I think the first line of public service is being a county commissioner or city commissioner. That is when somebody can leave their house and let you know what is on their mind. I am glad to have an opportunity to vote on this, and I look forward to releasing information to my constituents about what we have done, and hopefully put some pressure on the White House to do what so many Americans want us to do, and that is get at some of the issues that are facing our country right now.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. You talked about how much public support this enjoys, and it is broad and far ranging. I think the public support mirrors the support within this body. It probably cuts across partisan lines because the diseases that stem cell research can treat do not discriminate based on whether you are Democrat or Republican, not even on whether you are pro-choice or pro-life.

So when you have family members out there who are watching a loved one grapple with diabetes, watching a father or mother die of Alzheimer's disease, and they see there is this vehicle, there is this potential out there, untapped right now, with their Federal

tax dollars, they don't understand. They don't understand why their elected representatives wouldn't stand up and at least try to make an effort to bring a cure or treatment to their loved one who is struggling or dying with these diseases.

This issue enjoys public support because these diseases don't discriminate based on political discrimination, political views or geography. I think that is why you will see so many Republicans and Democrats supporting it.

This is an issue that arises a lot of passions in people. So there is rhetoric that sometimes doesn't match the reality. One of the arguments that you are going to hear tomorrow is we don't need to invest in embryonic stem cell research, which is the controversial piece of this debate, because adult stem cell research does the trick. That argument doesn't wash when you talk to the scientific community.

Adult stem cells have vast potential, and we have found ways to utilize them to make people better and give people longer lives.

□ 2310

But the fact is that adult stem cells only work on the person that those cells are harvested from. My adult stem cells work on me. So I can take stem cells out of my bloodstream, manipulate them, put them back into my bloodstream to try to cure the disease or whatever may be affecting me.

Embryonic stem cells have almost a limitless possibility of being manipulated, to being harvested and put into a limitless number of people. Those cells don't just work on the people they're taken from. Those cells can be manipulated and have universal traits to try to cure diseases.

So we're going to have to try to talk about that tomorrow and why we need to invest in both adult stem cell research and embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I will do two things. First, it has come to my attention that while we were talking the Anaheim Ducks kept the Stanley Cup in the United States of America. I want to congratulate them. And I will now yield back to the gentleman from Florida to wrap up.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so very much, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Also, we want the Members, if they want any information we talked about tonight or want to speak to us, we have the www.speaker.gov Web site.

With that, Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to address the House, the 30 Something Working Group, tonight, the two MURPHIES and also Mr. ALTMIRE and myself.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHUSTER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending his daughter's high school graduation.

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for after 1:30 p.m. today on account of personal business in the district.

Mr. BACA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for Tuesday, June 5, 2007, on account of illness.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for Tuesday, June 5 and for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WU, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 13.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 13.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and June 7.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, June 12.

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. 1675. An act to suspend the requirements of the Department of Housing and Urban Development regarding electronic filing of previous participation certificates and regarding filing of such certificates with respect to certain low-income housing investors.

H.R. 1676. An act to reauthorize the program of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for loan guarantees for Indian housing.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on May 31, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 7, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2032. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a legislative proposal that would shift funding for the research, development, and maintenance of information technology functions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) from the Government to the insurance companies participating in the crop insurance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2033. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's notification to Congress of any significant modifications to the auction process for issuing United States Treasury obligations, pursuant to Public Law 103-202, section 203; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2034. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received May 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2035. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received May 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2036. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received May 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2037. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received March 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2038. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act (NAHASDA); Revisions to the Indian Housing Block Grant Program Formula

[Docket No. FR-4938-F-03] (RIN: 2577-AC57) received May 2, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2039. A letter from the General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Sixth Progress Report on HUD's Strategy for Homeless Data Collection, Reporting and Analysis"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2040. A letter from the General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Affordable Housing Needs 2005"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2041. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of draft bills entitled, "To extend the authority for canceling debt owed to the United States pursuant to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative" and "To extend the authority for making contributions to the HIPC Trust Fund"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2042. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's annual report on material violations or suspected material violations of regulations relating to Treasury auctions and other Treasury securities offerings during the period January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006, pursuant to Public Law 103-202, section 202; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2043. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the final report of the Academic Competitiveness Council, including recommendations for legislation and administrative action, pursuant to Section 8003 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2044. A letter from the Interim Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2045. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicaid Program; Cost Limit for Providers Operated by Units of Government and Provisions to Ensure the Integrity of Federal-State Financial Partnership [CMS-2258-FC] (RIN: 0938-AO57) received May 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2046. A letter from the Director, Office of Enforcement, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Accounting and Reporting Requirements For Nonoperating Public Utilities and Licenses [Docket No. RM07-2-000; Order No. 694] received May 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2047. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for FY 2007 (RIN: 3150-AI00) received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2048. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of De-

fense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 05-07 informing of an intent to sign the Air and Space Capability Development Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and Australia, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2049. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the International Traffic in Arms Regulation: United States Munitions List [Public Notice:] received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2050. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Policy with respect to Vietnam [Public Notice:] received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2051. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2052. A letter from the Senior Vice President & Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting the 2006 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2053. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Waiver of Requirements For Continued Coverage During Retirement (RIN: 3206-AI62) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2054. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2006, through April 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2055. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, "to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to provide for Net Receipts Sharing and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2056. A letter from the Chairman, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, "To amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (IGRA) to revise the Act to clarify the scope of the National Indian Gaming Commission's authority and to make such other technical amendments as are required"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2057. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2007 Management Measures [Docket No. 070430095-7095-01; I.D. 042707D] (RIN: 0648-AV56) received May 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2058. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Commercial Shark Management Measures [Docket No. 070302052-7088-02; I.D. 021307B] (RIN: 0648-AV09) received May 4, 2007, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2059. A letter from the Under Secretary and Director, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Trademark Classification Changes [Docket No. PTO-T-2007-0004] (RIN: 0651-AC10) received May 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2060. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of the Standardized Request for Evidence Processing Timeframe [CIS No. 2287-03] (RIN: 1615-AB13) received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2061. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Office of the Executive Secretariat, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Adjustment of the Immigration and Naturalization Benefit Application and Petition Fee Schedule [Docket No. USCIS-2006-0044; CIS No. 2393-06] (RIN: 1615-AB53) received June 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2062. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of Justice Implementation of OMB Guidance on Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension [Docket Number: 0JP (DOJ)-1457; AG Order No. 2870-2007] (RIN: 1121-AA73) received May 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2063. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's report entitled, "Cocaine and Federal Sentencing Policy"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2064. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Implementation of OMB Guidance on Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension (RIN: 2700-AD32) received April 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

2065. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a proposed amendment to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

2066. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Business Loan Program; Lender Examination and Review Fees (RIN: Number 3245 AF49) received May 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

2067. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — United States — Singapore Free Trade Agreement (RIN: 1505-AB48) received June 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2068. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report regarding concerns expressed in the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2069. A letter from the SSA Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Temporary Extension of Attorney Fee Payment System to Title XVI; 5-Year Demonstration Project Extending Fee Withholding and Payment Procedures to Eligible

Non-Attorney Representatives; Definition of Past-due Benefits; and Assessment for Fee Payment Services [Docket No. SSA 2006-0097] (RIN: 0960-AG35) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2070. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting consistent with Title I of the Trade and Development Act of 2000, the "2007 Comprehensive Report on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2071. A letter from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Data Collection Related to the Participation of Faith-Based and Community Organizations [FNS-2007-0005] (RIN: 0584-AD43) received May 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Education and Labor.

2072. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the results of a study of initiatives to expand the relationship between the Department and Job Corps, as requested by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Education and Labor.

2073. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2008; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

2074. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the Combat Methamphetamine Epidemic Act of 2005; Notice of Transfers Following Importation or Exportation [Docket No. DEA-292I] (RIN: 1117-AB06) received April 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 459. Resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-first Congressional District of Florida (Rept. 110-175). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 461. Resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of Florida (Rept. 110-176). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 462. Resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana (Rept. 110-177). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 463. Resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of

Florida (Rept. 110-178). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. MATSUI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 464. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 5) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research (Rept. 110-179). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARCURI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 465. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 65) to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-180). 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 Ms. CARSON (for herself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 2576. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to prepare concise written materials for use by school personnel to help to identify students with a high potential to commit aggressive and harmful behavior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 2577. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide additional flexibility to State and local educational agencies to raise the academic achievement of all students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RAY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BONNER, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2578. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand the benefits for businesses operating in empowerment zones, enterprise communities, or renewal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOOZMAN:

H.R. 2579. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the use of funds in the Department of Veterans Affairs readjustment benefits accounts and funds appropriated for such purpose to provide funding for State approving agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MACK, Mr.

GERLACH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. FALLIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 2580. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 2581. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to permit States to expand coverage for children between 19 and 25 years of age under Medicaid and under the State child health insurance program (SCHIP); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 2582. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for qualified long-term care services in computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 2583. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to establish a loan program for eligible hospitals to establish residency training programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2584. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to alleviate critical shortages of physicians in the fields of family practice, internal medicine, pediatrics, emergency medicine, general surgery, and obstetrics-gynecology, and for other purposes; 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. BURGESS:

H.R. 2585. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify Medicare physician reimbursement policies to ensure a future physician workforce, and for other purposes; 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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2586. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to authorize the Commission to require the registration of hedge fund advisers under that Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2587. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 555 South 3rd Street Lobby in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Kenneth T. Whalum, Sr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DRAKE:

H.R. 2588. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the annual contribution limit for Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 2589. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and amend the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act and the Pediatric Research Equity Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORTUÑO:

H.R. 2590. A bill to provide for an additional requirements payment under the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure that Puerto Rico is treated in the same manner as other States for purposes of determining the amount of the requirements payment made under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALSH of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GORDON, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOEBACK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 2591. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the penalty for late enrollment under part B of the Medicare Program to 10 percent and twice the period of no enrollment, and to exclude periods of COBRA and retiree coverage from such late enrollment penalty; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 2592. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for one or more Critical Path Public-Private Partnerships to implement the Critical Path Initiative of the Food and Drug Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2593. A bill to secure and conserve Federal public lands and natural resources along the international land borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 2594. A bill to establish a Federal public relations and education campaign to promote responsible and fuel-efficient driving in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAHONEY of Florida (for himself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 2595. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of proxy votes relating to executive and director compensation by beneficial owners

of more than 5 percent of a company's shares; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 2596. A bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 2597. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to exist from conception; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 2598. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify that an expenditure made by a political party committee may not be considered to have been made in concert or cooperation with a candidate solely because the candidate has requested that the committee not make any expenditures in support of the candidate or in opposition to an opponent of the candidate; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2599. A bill to establish a program for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide financial assistance to certain homeowners experiencing temporary difficulty making home mortgage payments resulting from their call or order to active duty while a member of the Individual Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces or the inactive National Guard; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2600. A bill to authorize the imposition of a tax on imports from any country that employs indirect taxes and grants rebates of the same upon export and to authorize compensatory payments to eligible United States exporters to neutralize the discriminatory effect of such taxes paid by such exporters if United States trade negotiating objectives regarding border tax treatment in World Trade Organization negotiations are not met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2601. A bill to extend the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to collect fees to administer and enforce the provisions relating to the "Do-not-call" registry of the Telemarketing Sales Rule; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 2602. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility in Iron Mountain, Michigan, as the "Oscar G. Johnson Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 2603. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate high threat helicopter flight areas and to provide special rules for screening of passengers and property to be transported on passenger helicopters operating to or from such areas and for helicopters flights in such areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastruc-

ture, 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. DENT (for himself, Mr. ALTIRE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. FOX, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GILCHRIST, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCOUL of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. UPTON, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico):

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Teen Driver Safety Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CARSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WATT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WYNN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

By BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 460. A resolution permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 466. A resolution honoring and recognizing the achievements of Barbara Hillary, the first African-American woman on record to reach the North Pole; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. KIRK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. BACA):

H. Res. 467. A resolution condemning the decision by the University and College Union of the United Kingdom to support a boycott of Israeli academia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 468. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that officials of local governments who are also members of the National Guard or Reserves and are deployed as part of their service in the Armed Forces should be granted reasonable accommodation to fulfill their governmental duties while so deployed; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Res. 469. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Iraqi National Assembly should cancel or postpone its planned two-month recess scheduled to begin in July 2007 and work toward meeting political, social, and military benchmarks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

75. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 61 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to support the goals and ideals of a National Day of Remembrance for Murder Victims; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

76. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 67 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to expedite the repair and rebuilding of the St. Bernard Parish levee system by all appropriate federal agencies and to close the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. HALL of New York, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 135: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 156: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 199: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 211: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 278: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 297: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 322: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 440: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 473: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 549: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 550: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 583: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 620: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 621: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 643: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 661: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 695: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 741: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 782: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 819: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 840: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 980: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 997: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1004: Mr. WYNN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1014: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 1022: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 1023: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 1076: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1092: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1093: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1102: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1125: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 1167: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1187: Mr. GORDON, Mr. WU, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. INSLIE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. KIND, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1188: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1190: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WU, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1192: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1222: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1223: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1225: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1232: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 1283: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1293: Mr. COSTA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 1304: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 1330: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1371: Mr. UPTON and Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 1395: Mr. FEENEY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1396: Mr. WYNN and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1399: Mr. COBLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, and Mr. MCCREERY.

H.R. 1415: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1416: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1422: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1426: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1430: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1435: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1440: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1479: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1481: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1512: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1534: Mr. ELLISON and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1537: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALSH of New York, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1567: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1576: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1600: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1655: Ms. HIRANO and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1665: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1671: Ms. HIRANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1687: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1717: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1727: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 1733: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 1738: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1761: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1770: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1776: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1787: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1823: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1838: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PASCARELL, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1859: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1876: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1881: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. CASTOR.

H.R. 1888: Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 1893: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1895: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1911: Mr. EMANUEL and Mr. ELLSWORTH.

H.R. 1924: Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 1947: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1948: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1964: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1971: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 1975: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1979: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 2005: Ms. CARSON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ARCURI, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 2017: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 2019: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2035: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2049: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2073: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 2095: Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2109: Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 2116: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 2125: Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 2164: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2165: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2197: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2205: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2236: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2266: Ms. CARSON and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2274: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 2286: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2290: Mrs. GILLIBRAND.

H.R. 2295: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. BEAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DENT, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCARELL, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ROGERS of

- Kentucky, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 2303: Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 2304: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2305: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 2329: Mr. GERLACH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
 H.R. 2342: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 2353: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 2362: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 2367: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2368: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. GINGREY.
 H.R. 2370: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 2384: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2401: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2407: Mr. BOYD of Florida.
 H.R. 2417: Mr. ROSS, Mr. HILL, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 2432: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 2449: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2487: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 2521: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 2526: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2573: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
 H.J. Res. 12: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. EDWARDS.
 H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. GRAVES.
 H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. RAHALL.
 H. Con. Res. 142: Mr. HARE and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Con. Res. 162: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SHULER, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. HILL, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. SKELTON.
 H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
 H. Res. 49: Mr. RUSH.
 H. Res. 68: Ms. LEE.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H. Res. 169: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H. Res. 189: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H. Res. 194: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 226: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H. Res. 257: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 282: Mr. SPACE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 333: Ms. CLARKE.
 H. Res. 353: Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 356: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H. Res. 396: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H. Res. 416: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DENT, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H. Res. 431: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. COHEN.
 H. Res. 436: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WU, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
 H. Res. 442: Mr. KIND and Mr. PICKERING.