



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 11, 2007

No. 93

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.

June 11, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for 5 minutes.

IN MEMORIAM OF ARMY SERGEANT JAMES AKIN

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Army Sergeant James Akin, a true American hero who lost his life while serving his country in Iraq. James was one of four soldiers killed near Baghdad on Sunday, June 3, 2007 when a roadside bomb detonated alongside the Humvee he was driving. He was killed less than a month before his 24th birthday.

James was a successful businessman who sold his retail cell phone company

at an age when most Americans are just beginning their professional career. But he was always more interested in serving the public than himself. James felt that a public servant is effective through action and experience rather than rhetoric. To that end, he enlisted in the Army and was deployed to Iraq in the fall of 2004. He was honored to serve his country, and, envisioning a future political life, he wanted to understand issues of military conflict from the perspective of a war veteran.

I regret that I did not know James personally, for those who did describe him with love, and they do so passionately. The many messages posted on his personal web page by those who knew him convey the tremendous admiration they had for him, and illustrate the caring, influential and thoughtful man that he was. They describe a father figure, a brotherly adviser and a considerate, deeply loving and equally loved husband.

A current member of my staff, Sarah Cobb, who worked with James on a congressional campaign in Albuquerque, said of him: "He truly was what is said of him—gregarious, outgoing and effervescent."

The love James had for his country and his countrymen was infectious. He openly and honestly told anyone he met of his future desire to run for President of the United States. He encouraged those he knew, and those he did not, to stay informed and to be involved in government and the electoral process. From what I have learned of James, I believe that if his life had not been cut short, he may indeed have addressed the Nation from the floor of this great Chamber.

Today, there is a void in the lives of all who knew him, and New Mexico is a lesser place for having lost him. Yet James will live on in the hearts and minds of those he touched, and New Mexico is lucky to call him a native son.

In 2004, James managed the New Mexico State senate campaign of my friend Victor Raigoza. Though they did not win that tough political battle, James showed the true measure of his character when he sent the following words of wisdom and encouragement to Mr. Raigoza: "Live life to serve, because you can. Dissent, because you can. Enjoy freedom, because you can. Remember always that the measure of our progress is not whether we can provide more for those who have plenty, but whether we can provide enough for those who have little."

My heartfelt condolences go out to James' family and James' wife Syreeta, his father and namesake James, and the large number of friends, extended family members and fortunate individuals whose lives he touched.

I spoke to Syreeta last Friday and told her how much the Nation appreciates James' service to his country. To Syreeta and James' family, thank you for your sacrifice.

I believe I speak for all New Mexicans when I say our Nation will always maintain a priceless debt of gratitude and the utmost respect for the service and sacrifice of Army Sergeant James Akin. He will be missed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

□ 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.

H6185

PRAYER

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

We lift our eyes to You, O God of eternity. So far beyond our understanding or our experience You are all holy, all powerful.

To be fully present in Your sight this day stirs within us a desire to be truly humble, poor in spirit and truly silent, listening to Your Word speaking to our hearts.

Bless this assembly of the 110th Congress, Lord. Give us liberty from all the knotty problems of this world that tighten our imagination and narrow our perception.

Rather, breathe upon us Your cleansing Spirit that Your servants may have a broad and penetrating vision on how to unleash the free exercise of people and untie the mistakes of the past.

May the native born, new citizens, immigrants, guests and visitors, those in high places and the lowly, all give You glory and praise now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ALTMIRE 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.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE CRAIG THOMAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the committee to attend the funeral of the late Honorable Craig Thomas:

Mrs. CUBIN, Wyoming

PROTECTING CHILDREN IN THE WORKFORCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider a bill to further protect our children in the workforce. While children under the age of 18 are permitted to work under American labor

law, certain rules provide reasonable limitations.

Under this bipartisan measure, companies will receive stiffer monetary penalties should a violation of these laws result in the injury or death of a child in the workplace.

I appreciate the leadership of Chairman GEORGE MILLER and ranking Republican BUCK MCKEON on this issue. As ranking Republican of the Workforce Protection Subcommittee, I am pleased to have worked closely with Chairwoman LYNN WOOLSEY on this issue.

I am grateful the House is coming together to consider this bill and ensure the safety of our Nation's children. I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

RECOGNIZING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GEORGIA

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 354) to recognize the year 2007 as the official 50th anniversary celebration of the beginnings of marinas, power production, recreation, and boating on Lake Sidney Lanier, Georgia.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 354

Whereas the Congress of the United States authorized the creation of Lake Sidney Lanier and Buford Dam by official act in 1946 for flood control, power production, wildlife preservation and downstream navigation;

Whereas construction on the Buford Dam project by the Army Corps of Engineers began in 1951;

Whereas the Army Corps of Engineers constructed the dam and lake on the Chattahoochee and Chestatee Rivers at a cost of approximately \$45,000,000;

Whereas, in 1956, Jack Beachem and the Army Corps of Engineers signed a lease to create Holiday on Lake Sidney Lanier Marina as the lake's first concessionaire;

Whereas the first power was produced through Buford Dam at Lake Sidney Lanier on June 16, 1957;

Whereas Holiday on Lake Sidney Lanier opened on July 4, 1957;

Whereas Buford Dam was officially dedicated on October 9, 1957;

Whereas nearly 225,000 people visited Lake Sidney Lanier to boat, fish and recreate in 1957;

Whereas, in present times, more than 8,000,000 visitors enjoy the attributes and assets of Lake Sidney Lanier annually to boat, fish, swim, camp, and otherwise recreate in the great outdoors;

Whereas Lake Sidney Lanier generates more than \$5,000,000,000 in economic impact annually, according to a study commissioned by the Marine Trade Association of Metropolitan Atlanta;

Whereas, Lake Sidney Lanier has won the prestigious Chief of Engineers Annual Project of the Year Award, the highest recognition from the Army Corps of Engineers for outstanding management, an unprecedented 3 times in 12 years—1990, 1997 and 2002;

Whereas Lake Sidney Lanier hosted the paddling and rowing events for the 1996 Summer Olympics;

Whereas marinas serve as the gateway to recreation for the public on America's waterways;

Whereas Lake Sidney Lanier is now home to 10 marinas—Aqualand Marina, Bald Ridge Marina, Gainesville Marina, Habersham Marina, Holiday on Lake Sidney Lanier, Lanier Harbor Marina, Lazy Days Marina, Port Royale Marina, Starboard Cove Marina, and Sunrise Cove Marina;

Whereas Lake Sidney Lanier will join the Nation on Saturday, August 11 in celebration and commemoration of National Marina Day; and

Whereas 2007 marks the 50th anniversary of Lake Sidney Lanier: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representative recognizes the 50th anniversary celebration of the beginnings of marinas, power production, recreation, and boating on Lake Sidney Lanier, Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of House Resolution 354 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) to recognize the year 2007 as the official 50th anniversary celebration of Lake Sidney Lanier.

Congress first authorized the construction of Buford Dam in 1946 as one project in a comprehensive plan to develop our Nation's water resources for the purposes of national defense, power production, flood control, navigation, and water supply. The first groundbreaking for construction occurred on March 1, 1950, and on June 17, 1957, the first hydropower was produced by the generators of the dam.

Today, Lake Lanier provides power production, flood control, water supply, navigation, fish and wildlife management, and recreational activities to members of the surrounding communities and businesses. This week in June is a suitable time to recognize Lake Lanier's contributions to the area and accomplishments. As summer heat begins to spread across the Nation, both water supply and cooling water recreational activities are on many minds.

More than 60 percent of the population of the State of Georgia relies on water stored in Lake Lanier or down the Chattahoochee River. Similarly, properties around the lake and down the river rely on its banks and dam for flood control.

Nearly 8 million visitors come annually to appreciate the scenery and leisure opportunities provided by the lake. In fact, Lake Lanier holds the title of the most-visited Army Corps lake in the entire country. Facilities include 10 marinas and 57 parks for swimming, boating, fishing and picnicking. In 1996, Lake Lanier hosted the paddling and rowing competitions for the Summer Olympics in Atlanta.

And several years ago, the Marine Trade Association of Metro Atlanta found that Lake Lanier has an economic impact of \$5.5 billion.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) in supporting House Resolution 354 to honor the impacts, accomplishments and continuing success of Lake Lanier on its 50th anniversary.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, today we recognize the 50th anniversary of Lake Sidney Lanier, an Army Corps of Engineers facility located in the State of Georgia.

Lake Lanier is one of 464 lakes in 43 States constructed and operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Our Nation is blessed with considerable water resources that support our Nation's economy and quality of life. We need water for our homes, farms and factories. Water also supports navigation, generates power and sustains our environment.

Congress authorized the Buford Dam Project in 1946 just after the end of the Second World War. Groundbreaking for the project began in 1950. Constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Lake Lanier is a multipurpose, 38,000-acre lake that provides flood protection, power production, water supply, navigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife management.

Nestled in the foothills of the Georgia Blue Ridge Mountains, Lake Sidney Lanier is one of America's favorite lakes. Over 7.5 million people a year choose to visit Lake Lanier. With over 692 miles of shoreline, the lake is well known for its aqua-blue colored water, spectacular scenery and variety of recreational activities.

When completed, the total cost of construction, including land acquisition, was almost \$45 million. When the gates of the dam were closed in 1956, it took more than 3 years for the lake to reach its normal elevation of 1,070 feet above sea level.

The lake is named for one of the Nation's most famous poets, Sidney Lanier. Born in Georgia in 1842, Mr. Lanier entered Oglethorpe College at 14 years of age, graduating at the top of his class in 1860.

While serving on the blockade runner "Lucy" during the Civil War, Mr. Lanier was captured and contracted tuberculosis while imprisoned in Maryland. Following the Civil War, Mr. Lanier played the flute for the Peabody Symphony and lectured at Johns Hopkins University.

While he is known for works like "The Harlequin of Dreams," "In Absence," "Acknowledgement," and "Sunrise," he is best remembered for "The Song of the Chattahoochee," an enduring legacy for the native Georgian.

I urge all of our Members to support this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 354, recognizing the year 2007 as the official 50th anniversary celebration of the beginnings of marinas, power production, recreation, and boating on Lake Sidney Lanier, Georgia.

Lake Lanier is named after Sidney Clopton Lanier, a poet and musician who was born in Macon, Georgia, in 1842. After participating in battle during the Civil War, and being captured and imprisoned in Point Lookout, Maryland, Mr. Lanier contracted tuberculosis, which would affect him for the rest of his life.

Mr. Lanier's life was one of practicality and beauty: while he practiced law to support his wife and four children, he was also the first flutist in the Peabody Orchestra in Baltimore, Maryland, and an accomplished poet. The Lake was named after Mr. Lanier because of the way he positively portrayed the Chattahoochee River in his poetry.

In fact, Lake Lanier itself is a symbol of both practicality and beauty. It provides crucial flood control, protecting approximately \$2 billion worth of property in the surrounding area. Similarly, on June 16, 1957—50 years ago this week—Buford Dam began producing power for the first time. Hydropower continues to flow from these waters to this day.

Although the lake is one of 464 lakes constructed and operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, it has won the annual award for "best operated lake" for three separate years: 1990, 1997, and 2002.

While the flood control, water supply, and power production role of Lake Lanier may be critical to the continuing livelihood of the communities in the surrounding area, the lake also provides beautiful scenery and recreational opportunities that local citizens and visiting tourists enjoy. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates that more than 7.5 million people visit the 692 miles of lake shoreline each year.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in recognizing the 50th anniversary of Lake Lanier.

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I urge passage 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 354.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOVING V. VIRGINIA LEGALIZING INTERRACIAL MARRIAGE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 431) recognizing the 40th anniversary of Loving v. Virginia legalizing interracial marriage within the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 431

Whereas the first anti-miscegenation law in the United States was enacted in Maryland in 1661;

Whereas miscegenation was typically a felony under State laws prohibiting interracial marriage punishable by imprisonment or hard labor;

Whereas in 1883, the Supreme Court held in *Pace v. Alabama* that anti-miscegenation laws were consistent with the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment as long as the punishments given to both white and black violators are the same;

Whereas in 1912, a constitutional amendment was proposed in the House of Representatives prohibiting interracial marriage "between negroes or persons of color and Caucasians";

Whereas in 1923, the Supreme Court held in *Meyer v. Nebraska* that the due process clause of the 14th Amendment guarantees the right of an individual "to marry, establish a home and bring up children";

Whereas in 1924, Virginia enacted the Racial Integrity Act of 1924, which required that a racial description of every person be recorded at birth and prevented marriage between "white persons" and non-white persons;

Whereas in 1948, the California Supreme Court overturned the State's anti-miscegenation statutes, thereby becoming the first State high court to declare a ban on interracial marriage unconstitutional and making California the first State to do so in the 20th century;

Whereas the California Supreme Court stated in *Perez v. Sharp* that "a member of any of these races may find himself barred from marrying the person of his choice and that person to him may be irreplaceable. Human beings are bereft of worth and dignity by a doctrine that would make them as interchangeable as trains";

Whereas by 1948, 38 States still forbade interracial marriage, and 6 did so by State constitutional provision;

Whereas in June of 1958, 2 residents of the Commonwealth of Virginia—Mildred Jeter, a black/Native American woman, and Richard Perry Loving, a Caucasian man—were married in Washington, DC;

Whereas upon their return to Virginia, Richard Perry Loving and Mildred Jeter Loving were charged with violating Virginia's anti-miscegenation statutes, a felonious crime;

Whereas the Lovings subsequently pleaded guilty and were sentenced to 1 year in prison, with the sentence suspended for 25 years on condition that the couple leave the State of Virginia;

Whereas Leon Bazile, the trial judge of the case, proclaimed that "Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, Malay and red, and he placed them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his arrangement there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix.";

Whereas the Lovings moved to the District of Columbia, and in 1963 they began a series of lawsuits challenging their convictions;

Whereas the convictions were upheld by the State courts, including the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia;

Whereas the Lovings appealed the decision to the Supreme Court of the United States on the ground that the Virginia anti-miscegenation laws violated the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the 14th Amendment and were therefore unconstitutional;

Whereas in 1967, the U.S. Supreme Court granted certiorari to Loving v. Virginia and readily overturned the Lovings' convictions;

Whereas in the unanimous opinion, Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote: "Marriage is one of the 'basic civil rights of man,' fundamental to our very existence and survival. . . . To deny this fundamental freedom on so unsupportable a basis as the racial classifications embodied in these statutes, classifications so directly subversive of the principle of equality at the heart of the Fourteenth Amendment, is surely to deprive all the State's citizens of liberty without due process of law.";

Whereas the opinion also stated that "the Fourteenth Amendment requires that the freedom of choice to marry not be restricted by invidious racial discriminations. Under our Constitution, the freedom to marry, or not marry, a person of another race resides with the individual and cannot be infringed by the State.";

Whereas in 1967, 16 States still had law prohibiting interracial marriage, including Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia;

Whereas Loving v. Virginia struck down the remaining anti-miscegenation laws nationwide;

Whereas in 2000, Alabama became the last State to remove its anti-miscegenation laws from its statutes;

Whereas according to the U.S. Census Bureau, from 1970 to 2000 the percentage of interracial marriages has increased from 1 percent of all marriages to more than 5 percent;

Whereas the number of children living in interracial families has quadrupled between 1970 to 2000, going from 900,000 to more than 3 million; and

Whereas June 12th has been proclaimed "Loving Day" by cities and towns across the country in commemoration of Loving v. Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) observes the 40th Anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Loving v. Virginia; and

(2) commemorates the legacy of Loving v. Virginia in ending the ban on interracial marriage in the United States and in recog-

nizing that marriage is one of the "basic civil rights of man" at the heart of the 14th Amendment protections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BALDWIN. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 431, a resolution I introduced along with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), commemorating the 40th anniversary of Loving v. Virginia, the landmark Supreme Court decision legalizing interracial marriages within the United States.

I thank Chairman CONYERS for expedition consideration of this resolution so it could be brought to the floor before the actual date of the anniversary which is tomorrow, June 12.

In June of 1958, two residents of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Mildred Jeter, a black Native American woman, and Richard Perry Loving, a Caucasian man, were married in Washington, D.C. Upon their return to Virginia, Richard Perry Loving and Mildred Jeter Loving were charged with violating Virginia's anti-miscegenation statutes, which made their marriage a felony.

□ 1415

They challenged their convictions, culminating in the June 12, 1967, U.S. Supreme Court opinion in Loving v. Virginia, striking down the remaining anti-miscegenation laws that were still in effect in 16 States.

In the unanimous opinion, the Supreme Court rejected bigotry against interracial relations, recognizing an individual's right to marry under the 14th amendment. Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote: "Marriage is one of the 'basic civil rights of man,' fundamental to our very existence and survival. . . . To deny this fundamental freedom on so unsupportable a basis as the racial classifications embodied in these statutes, classifications so directly subversive of the principle of equality at the heart of the 14th amendment, is surely to deprive all the States' citizens of liberty without due process of law."

The opinion also stated that "the 14th amendment requires that the freedom of choice to marry not be restricted by invidious racial discriminations. Under our Constitution, the freedom to marry, or not marry, a person

of another race resides with the individual and cannot be infringed by the State."

The Loving decision marked a critical step forward in our Nation's struggle toward equal rights for all, particularly full marriage equality. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, from 1970 to the year 2000 the percentage of interracial marriages has increased from 1 percent of all marriages to more than 5 percent. The number of children living in interracial families has quadrupled between 1970 and 2000, going from 900,000 to more than 3 million. Because of the decision's profound impact in our society, numerous cities and towns across this country have already proclaimed June 12 Loving Day in commemoration of this decision.

Indeed, the Supreme Court's opinion forcefully rejected the argument employed by Leon Bazile, the trial judge of the case, who defended his decision convicting the Lovings as part of God's plan. Unfortunately, after 40 years, similar types of arguments are still being employed by a few to deny full marriage equality to everyone.

In commemorating the legacy of Loving v. Virginia in ending the ban on interracial marriage in the United States, H. Res. 431 reaffirms the Loving court's recognition that marriage is one of the "basic civil rights of man" at the heart of the 14th amendment protections.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this timely resolution.

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

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

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for presenting this resolution to this Congress, and I notice that many of the statements that she has made have laid out I think the history of this Loving case very well to the Congress, and so what I will seek to do is perhaps just add and fill in perhaps some of the blanks that may have been left, although I'm not convinced that there are many.

And that is the emphasis on equal protection and due process clause of the 14th amendment. I think it was clear when a unanimous decision in the Supreme Court in the Loving case, and it isn't often that you see an issue that has been traditionally rooted from the time of our Founders up until 1967, have a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, even though it met that resistance at every step of the way throughout the entire appeals process until it got to the Supreme Court.

Today, it looks like a clear decision. It looks easy; it's simple. None of us would have any trouble with this Loving decision; but, in fact, then it was a matter of an idea whose time had finally come.

But the Supreme Court laid out very clear language in their decision that legislative classifications based on race

were “odious to a free people whose institutions are founded upon the doctrine of equality,” and further condemned Virginia’s interracial marriage statute. And then the Court concluded: “There can be no doubt that restricting the freedom to marry solely because of racial classifications violates the central meaning of the equal protection clause.”

I just appreciate the privilege to emphasize those things, and then I’d like to add then some other thoughts to this record, Mr. Speaker, and that is that we rightfully celebrate the anniversary of the landmark decision here today. The institution of marriage between one man and one woman is older than the Nation itself. It predates government itself, and it also limits the power of government because traditional families are the fundamental units of our society.

Through them, we pour through that crucible our values from a father and a mother into the children and the values of our patriotism, our faith, our work ethic, our culture. The things we eat and the things we do, every component of our culture and civilization is concentrated through those values of those children that we have and that we’re so well-blessed with; and without marriage, government would be bound to expand to take its place and would try lamely to do so.

But marriage embraces only one principle, and that is the marriage of a union between a man and a woman, and the further distinction of that and to have government draw a distinction between people based upon their ethnicity should be abhorrent to a free people.

And I stand here, Mr. Speaker, before you this afternoon, and I take this position that I believe we are all created in God’s image, and what He has created, I believe it’s an insult to Him if we draw distinctions between His creation. He has also seen to bless us with some specific characteristics that help us identify one another. And because He has seen to bless us with those characteristics, and in this case it was skin color, it doesn’t mean it still isn’t a reflection of God’s image.

And I recall stepping into a church in Port Gibson, Mississippi, the Catholic church there that was built in 1848 by the hands of some of the family of Jim Bowie, and the priest in that church was Father Tony Pudenz, and he showed me in the church that this church that was built in 1848, the floor of the church was built for whites, the balcony was built for blacks. And just a week before that, they had buried the editor of the newspaper who had in 1967 taken his white family from the floor of the church and walked his five children and his wife up there where they sat in the balcony with the African Americans, thereby sending a statement where half of the congregation walked across the street to the Episcopal church where they go to church to this very day. But the balance of

that congregation is an integrated congregation.

And so I would say we can’t be for equality if we’re not in support of intermarriage. God has created us all equally, and based upon that, I support this resolution. I think it’s appropriate that we bring it today.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, the Loving v. Virginia decision was a milestone in our continuing efforts to fulfill the original promises of our Constitution, fulfilling the blessings of liberty for all Americans. It is highly fitting that we remember and honor the decision on its 40th anniversary. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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 Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 431.

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.

ENCOURAGING DISPLAY OF THE FLAG ON FATHER’S DAY

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father’s Day.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2356

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL OCCASSION FOR DISPLAY OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 6(d) of title 4, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “Flag Day, June 14;” the following: “Father’s Day, third Sunday in June;”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2356 and include extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

As part of our Nation’s bicentennial celebration in 1976, Congress passed a

joint resolution re-emphasizing existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag, especially recommending its display on a number of different holidays, including Mother’s Day, the second Sunday in May.

Omitted from the list was Father’s Day. H.R. 2356 would amend the Federal flag code to include Father’s Day, the third Sunday in June, among important holidays on which to fly the American flag.

The law now provides that, in addition to the important occasions listed in the flag code, “the flag should be displayed on all days.” I know that this is the custom in every community in the United States.

Still, I think that it is important for the flag code to recognize both mothers and fathers, who raise the next generation, inculcate them with the values they need to be good citizens and good neighbors.

I want to thank our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for his efforts to enact this worthwhile legislation.

And I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to honor fathers in the flag code, just as we now honor mothers.

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

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

I rise in support of this legislation which would add Father’s Day, the third Sunday in June, to the list of holidays listed in the U.S. flag code on which it’s particularly appropriate to fly the American flag.

It’s altogether appropriate that Father’s Day be added to the list of holidays on which the flag should be flown. Both fathers and mothers are essential elements to the basic family unit that has made America so strong. And so the flag should be flown proudly on both Father’s Day, as provided by this bill, and on Mother’s Day, as already provided in existing law, as a sign of respect for both mothers and fathers and the essential role the traditional family plays in raising new citizens in our democracy.

I would add, I want to also thank Congressman TODD TIAHRT for bringing this initiative to Congress. It’s interesting to note that there was a class in his district that when they were studying the history and studying the days that the Federal Government encourages display of the flag, they noticed that Father’s Day was missing. They had written a letter to Congressman TIAHRT asking that he take action on this, and he has introduced a bill and it complements this bill before us.

So I thank him for that and I wanted to emphasize how important it is for citizens to weigh in and to reach out and communicate with Members of Congress because here’s a perfect example of how young people saw a gap, had their voice heard, and we have an opportunity here now to fill that gap.

The first Father's Day celebration occurred in Fairmont, West Virginia, in 1908, and the first Mother's Day celebration occurred just 15 miles away in Grafton, West Virginia. So that neighborhood is the home now of Father's Day and Mother's Day. But it's a historical anomaly that Mother's Day and Father's Day were instituted so close in time, but it has taken until today for the House to pass a bill to add Father's Day to the day on which it's especially appropriate to fly the flag.

President Calvin Coolidge recommended Father's Day as a national holiday in 1924; and in 1966, President Johnson made Father's Day a holiday to be celebrated on the third Sunday of June. The holiday was officially recognized in 1972, during the Presidency of Richard Nixon. I look forward to President Bush signing this legislation into law and encouraging all Americans to fly the flag of their own fatherhood celebrations, which will happen at my house.

And as a father, I'm particularly pleased to be here on the eve of the next Father's Day, helping support this piece of legislation.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), the sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1430

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, thank you to Ms. BALDWIN, the distinguished lady from Wisconsin for her generosity, and thanks to Mr. KING and those on the other side of the aisle who are joining in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, without question, this is an extraordinary day, it is an extraordinary bill, is an extraordinary occasion. This is America, the greatest country in the world, and our flag represents greatness. To have now, finally, fruition, the manifestation of those precious words that were captured in the book of Exodus in the holy scriptures, where God said, the greatest and the first commandment in relationship of man to man were these words, "Honor thy father," and then He said, "and thy mother that thy days will be long in the land."

Finally, today, on this day, June 11, in the year 2007, nearly 4,000 years since those words were written down and inscribed, we are finally recognizing fathers as well as mothers by making sure the flag flies not just on Mother's Day but on Father's Day as well.

In the Hebrew language, the word for "father" is "abba," and in the Greek language it is "pater," and together those words mean the begatter, the progenitor, the source. But it also means provider and protector. It is no wonder why God in His wisdom said: "Honor thy father" and He put father first, and our mother, and now we are rectifying that situation.

I am very delighted to be here. This is an important bill, at an important

time, because never before have we needed to stress the role of father, to be a good father.

It is a gaping hole in the fabric of America that fathers are not being fathers. Throughout so many aspects of our society, the American flag is one of the greatest symbols of our country. It is the representation of our freedoms, our values, our heritage as a Nation.

As Americans, our flag code instructs us to fly the flag every day, but especially on a number of very special significant Federal, religious, and cultural holidays. For many years, this list of occasions has included Veterans Day, President's day, Columbus Day and Mother's Day.

In the past several years, the list was amended to include the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.'s observation of his birthday as a national holiday, in honor of his outstanding contributions that he made in his lifetime to the advancement of the civil rights of all Americans.

But our flag code currently does not reflect the important roles of both men and women in the raising of children, and never before have we needed to emphasize that. It is time that this body officially recognizes the importance of American fathers by passing this important legislation today.

I am pleased that the House is considering H.R. 2356, for fathers play an extraordinary role in the development of children. Psychologists have emphasized that the presence of a father significantly influences a child's development in many ways. Infants not only distinguish between their father and strangers' voices within the first 4 weeks of life, but infants also recognize that a father is likely to engage in play time with them.

That first impression, to hear that strong comforting voice of a father, to balance that with the mother, is so critical in the development of our children. In later years, the relationship between a father and his children strongly influences success in the classroom, improves relationships with peers, and decreases the likelihood of negative behavior.

Is there any wonder that today in so many reaches and depths in our neighborhoods that there is negative behavior, and that is so much associated because there is not a father being a father in the home and in the life of that child.

The presence of a father is also a very important determinant in the child's socioeconomic potential later in life. Unfortunately, over the last four decades, research shows that there has been an unprecedented rise in this Nation in the number of fatherless homes, especially when they are first born, no father.

The National Fatherhood Initiative emphasizes that children from families with fathers are five times less likely to be poor. What is the answer to poverty? Getting the fathers who produce these children to be fathers, to take

care of these children and be responsible for these children.

It is important for Congress to emphasize the significance of fathers and their socioeconomic value of the two-parent family as well, for studies also show that children are more likely to engage in recreational activities when their fathers are present. When fathers are involved in organized sports such as soccer, baseball and basketball, they are not only encouraging physical activity in their children, but also character development and sportsmanship.

Fathers also benefit for participating in their children's teams, as physical activity contributes to increased wellness and disease prevention in men. Fathers who are active in child rearing may also find themselves more nurturing toward their colleagues in the workplace, improving other aspects of their lives, by taking younger co-workers under their wing or volunteering more time to charitable organizations as well.

Schools across this country are developing innovative programs to reach out to parents and to especially get fathers involved in various and positive activities. In Kansas City, Missouri, the Reconnecting Education and DADS organization developed a specific reading program for fathers to use with their children.

The Kindering Center of Belleview, Washington, created a weekly support group for fathers of children with special needs. All over the country, schools are facilitating courses in responsible fatherhood, including education on child development, managing stress and good nutrition for their children and themselves.

I want to take just a minute here to acknowledge the important work of a similar organization in my own congressional district in Georgia. These men, these fathers are making a difference in the lives of our children by volunteering their time to improve the learning environment, not only for the children, but the many others who are within the school as well. They call it the DADS organization, DADS, whose acronym stands for Diverse and Dedicated Support, and it is a collective effort by fathers in my congressional district to serve as role models, not the athlete, not the rap guy, not the singer, not the superstars. The great role models for our young people need to be their fathers. By doing this today, this Congress is making this bold and much-needed statement.

This program places fathers of students in Clayton County, Georgia, middle schools to serve as hallway and classroom monitors to help with the discipline problems in our schools. Who better to do that, helping faculty to maintain order as students transition between classes throughout the day. This is where the violence sometimes starts. But with a parent there, particularly a father, a strong male presence, these men also serve as tutors when students need the help the most,

including Clayton County students to pursue their education and their dreams.

One self-employed volunteer at Lovejoy Middle School works while students are in class, and takes breaks throughout the day to monitor hallways and classrooms. That's a father.

Another volunteer, a wounded veteran from the war in Iraq, not only sacrificing his life in Iraq, where he was wounded, but he comes back home in Clayton County, Georgia, and walks the halls of Adamson Middle School with a cane. What a sight. These are heroes. No greater role model could we find than this wounded veteran who was wounded in Iraq, but comes back to help shape the lives of our young people in school.

He came so that he may assist the faculty in ensuring good discipline among the students. I am so honored, I am so full, I am overflowing up here today to know these fathers are making the ultimate difference in our communities and in my district. These men are not just fathers to individual students. They are dads to the children who lack the involvement of a father in their lives. The expansion of this program to elementary and high school underscores the success to reach out and encourage the involvement of fathers both inside the school and out.

In closing, I want to also note that many children from single-parent families are doing well. They are succeeding. But just think what it would be if they had both parents there, if they had been raised to be upstanding and successful members of our community. By passing this legislation today, we will show our support for the important roles that fathers, as well as mothers, play in preparing future generations in this country.

Honor thy father and thy mother so that thy days will be long in the land. We are doing that in Congress today, with extraordinary important, meaningful, and significant legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, listening to Mr. SCOTT talk about the importance of fathers and mothers in the family and the home and the children, I can't any longer resist reflecting through the generation and what this means to me as we discuss this bill that will encourage the special attention to flying the flag on Father's Day.

All of us, each of us has a father. We don't always get to know that father, but I certainly got to know mine. There is hardly a day that goes by that I don't think of him.

I know that there is never a day that goes by that his influence on me doesn't show up in me in something that I do. I look at the grandfathers that I have known. I had the privilege of knowing one of my grandfathers. I watched the message that came from them, the work ethic and the history, and to sit on his knee and to listen to

him tell me about his father and his grandfather and the relation of the families and about how far it goes back and rooted into the settlers that came across the country, the pioneers.

My grandfather on my mother's side was sent at a young age, about 13 years old, to go from Indiana to Iowa, to go work on a farm that had only daughters and no sons. What little bit of pay that he got, even at that young age, he had to send back to Indiana. Then when he needed a pair of shoes, he had to write a letter and ask, can I have some money, I need a pair of shoes.

Well, he was a smart young man, and he married the farmer's daughter, and another generation began. That farmer's daughter and that fellow, of course, that young man, were the parents to my mother.

But on my father's side, my father taught me some things that I think have been invaluable in my life. He was the one that always challenged me. Every evening we sat down, all our life was about like the book "Fun with Dick and Jane." Every evening we sat down at the supper table, and Dad carried the conversation. It was either about his day at work, or it was about current events, and then sometimes and oftentimes it was the same thing, given his job. He was the one that taught me to be intellectually honest.

First, you listened before you spoke, and you looked for an opportunity, and the amount of seniority you had in the family and credibility gave you a little bit more opportunity to speak. But if you spoke, and you could not support the statement that you made, he would be there to challenge you on what do you support that statement with. Why can you make a statement like that when these are the countervailing facts?

So, from a young age, one of the most important things my father taught me was to be intellectually honest and expect to be challenged if you are not intellectually honest.

On one of those occasions we began a discussion of whether you can convert watts to horsepower. We had a debate going on, an argument going on, that lasted for 3 days. Every night at supper, I would start that debate up again.

Then I went to the school library and went through a book and finally found the equation that showed how to do the math between watts and horsepower. I snuck that book down to the supper table, marked it, set it on my knees throughout supper. Then when we finished eating and the conversation began, we went into that discussion again.

When I got him just to the right point in the conversation that I could win the debate, I pulled out the book, opened it up to the formula and said here, so many watts equals horsepower. I thought I had the argument won. But I had not been apparently intellectually honest enough, because he said, that's not what I am talking about. Horsepower is mechanical power, watts

is electrical power, and you can't equate the two. I learned a real important lesson there as well, but time after time, day after day, the important values of hard work and ethics and integrity and telling the truth and knowing that when I looked him in the eye he knew what was in my mind and he knew what was in my soul.

Even when I watch my hands work today, they are the hands of my father doing that work. When I come here to work here in this Congress, I know that I just don't represent the 600,000 people in my district, which is a profound thing and a tremendous honor to be able to do that, but all of us are the legacy of our fathers and mothers, the work ethic that they taught us, the values that they taught us. We are what has come through that crucible. We are the representatives of the generations.

□ 1445

And to be those representatives, we can thank two people in our lives more than any others, and that's our fathers and our mothers. And I think that came through Mr. SCOTT's discussion here very well, and I appreciate that that's in the record and we had the opportunity to hear that. I wanted to add some of those words from my side of this as well.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to join the gentleman from Iowa in giving special recognition to our colleague, Mr. TIAHRT of Kansas, who has also worked on this issue and is sponsoring similar legislation. This really is a remarkable bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, this is simple, yet sensible legislation to accord equal honor to fathers as to mothers in the statutory guidance on flying our Nation's flag on special days of the year. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2356, which amends title 4 of the United States Code to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father's Day. Unfortunately, our flag code does not include Father's Day in the list of important occasions. H.R. 2356 rectifies this oversight by including Father's Day, among the important holidays on which Americans are encouraged to fly the American flag.

Father's Day in USA is celebrated with great enthusiasm and lot of fanfare on third Sunday of June. In observing this day, people reflect on the invaluable role played by fathers in building the character of children and in the development of the Nation. On Father's Day we honor our fathers and express gratitude for their love and affection.

It is a wonderful idea to raise the American flag on Father's Day, and allow it to symbolize the hard work and dedication of our fathers. The benefits of a father's influence are well documented. School achievements in children may be negatively effected in the absence of a good father-child relationship. Father influence can affect the choice of occupations, preferred school subjects, and role development of their children. Clearly, the father can greatly impact the lives of his children.

For all of these reasons, we should honor American fathers by amending the flag code to include Father's Day on the list of important observances.

Ms. BALDWIN. 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 Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2356.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. 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.

SUPPORTING THE IDEALS AND VALUES OF THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 395) supporting the ideals and values of the Olympic movement.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 395

Whereas, for over 100 years, the Olympic movement has built a more peaceful and better world by educating young people through athletics, by bringing together athletes from many countries in friendly competition, and by forging new relationships bound by friendship, solidarity, sportsmanship, and fair play;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee is dedicated to coordinating and developing athletic activity in the United States to foster productive working relationships among sports-related organizations;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee promotes and supports athletic activities involving the United States and foreign nations;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee promotes and encourages physical fitness and public participation in athletic activities;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee assists organizations and persons concerned with sports in the development of athletic programs for able-bodied and disabled athletes regardless of age, race, or gender;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee protects the opportunity of each athlete, coach, trainer, manager, administrator, and official to participate in athletic competition;

Whereas the United States Olympic Training Centers in Colorado, California, New York, Michigan, and Alabama are dedicated to the development of Olympic athletes;

Whereas athletes representing the United States at the Olympic games have achieved great success personally and for the Nation;

Whereas thousands of men and women of the United States are focusing their energy and skill on becoming part of the United States Olympic team and aspire to compete in the 2008 Olympic games;

Whereas the Nation takes great pride in the qualities of commitment to excellence, grace under pressure, and good will toward other competitors exhibited by the athletes of the United States Olympic team; and

Whereas June 23, 2007 is the anniversary of the founding of the modern Olympic movement, representing the date on which the Congress of Paris approved the proposal of Pierre de Coubertin to found the modern Olympic games; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the ideals and values of the Olympic movement;

(2) calls upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the anniversary of the founding of the modern Olympic movement; and

(3) calls upon the people of the United States to observe such anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I would first like to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), for introducing this important resolution.

The Olympics are, first and foremost, about sports, athletes from around the world uniting in their love of their games and their commitment to free and fair competition.

But the Olympics are also an important global forum where athletes, trainers and leaders and spectators from around the world come together to participate in and observe the greatest competition on Earth. The games epitomize the spirit of global harmony and cooperation among nations.

For over 100 years, the modern Olympic movement, in sponsoring the games, has built understanding by bringing athletes together around the world in open competition and by forging new bonds of friendship, solidarity and sportsmanship.

Given the current state of global affairs, we all have learned a lot from the Olympic participants and from the symbolism of the peaceful assemblage of people from all different walks of life.

It is with this harmonious sentiment that Mr. LAMBORN's resolution recognizes the significance of the Olympic movement in global understanding.

This resolution is particularly timely as we approach the 2008 games in Bei-

jing, China, and encourages China to act responsibly in accordance with the spirit of this Olympics.

This bill also recognizes the proud history of our own U.S. Olympic Committee, which has coordinated the development of young athletes in the United States and sent so many of them to represent our country with amazing poise.

I'm delighted that the House will today take this opportunity to recognize the anniversary of the founding of the modern Olympic movement on June 23.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 395. I am pleased to sponsor this resolution that supports and commemorates the ideals and values of the Olympics.

In a few weeks, on June 23, 2007, the United States Olympic Committee will be celebrating the anniversary of the founding of the modern Olympic movement.

Specifically, June 23 represents the date in 1896 on which the Congress of Paris approved the proposal of Baron Pierre de Coubertin to found the modern Olympic games.

The Olympics emphasize the values and ideals of, among other things, an active, healthy lifestyle for both able-bodied and disabled athletes, personal excellence, good sportsmanship and fair play, without regard for gender, race or age.

The Olympic movement and its message of peace and solidarity offer hope during times of tumultuous world events.

For over 100 years the Olympic movement has built a more peaceful and better world by educating young people through athletics, by bringing together athletes from many countries in friendly competition, and by forging new relationships bound by friendship, solidarity, sportsmanship and fair play.

Presently, thousands of men and women throughout the United States are working hard to prepare for competition to proudly represent our great Nation. Embodying values of health and fitness, Olympic athletes are role models for young people as obesity becomes far too widespread in the United States.

These athletes will be participating in one of the upcoming Olympic games: the XV Pan American Games, which will take place in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, later this year; the XXIV Summer Olympics in Beijing, China, in 2008; and the XXI Winter Olympics in Vancouver, Canada, in 2010.

As China prepares to open its doors to the world, the 2008 Olympic games in Beijing could well be a defining event for our generation.

The Olympic movement's ideals and values are as relevant today, if not more so, than when the modern Olympic games began more than 100 years ago.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman for his statement, and to honor the spirit of the Olympic movement, and especially that the great State of Colorado hosts the resources and the facilities that allow our athletes from all over the country to come and to train and to prepare adequately for this important global event.

And I cannot help but to reflect on some of the history and how important are some of the events that were classical as far as the Olympics were concerned. And I want to share with my colleagues one of the great personalities that have come out of this, a gentleman by the name of Jim Thorpe, who was a descendent, who was a Sauk and Fox Indian, American Indian, a descendant of a great warrior chief and athlete himself, Black Hawk, Jim Thorpe. It is very interesting in the annals of the Olympic games. In 1912, when he won the Olympics, several gold medals in the Olympics there, and he was approached by the King Gustav of Belgium, and he said, Sir, this is what the king said to Mr. Thorpe. Sir, you are the greatest athlete in the world. And Thorpe, never a man to stand on ceremony, answered and simply said, Thanks, King.

Jim Thorpe was one of the greatest athletes in the world. He played baseball, he played football, in fact, in 1950 he was named the greatest American football player. And then another accolade that was given to this great athlete, Olympic athlete, the greatest overall male, at least by the Associated Press in 1950.

Jim Thorpe, unfortunately, was suspended in terms of the medals that he won during the Olympics supposedly because he had played professional baseball. Supposedly, this is what he was accused of.

Well, later on his medals were restored.

But given the fact that this is one of the great personalities that have evolved from the spirit of the Olympic movement, another gentleman that I want to share with my colleagues historically was a gentleman by the name of Jesse Owens, a son of Alabama, but raised in the State of Ohio, in Cleveland, Ohio, specifically.

It was in the 1936 Olympics, 1936 Olympics in Berlin, Germany, and there was this problem that some of our friends from Germany, particularly Adolph Hitler, had this very interesting concept about the supremacy of the white Aryan race. And this African American athlete went there and won four gold medals, to the extent that it was very ironic.

Here, Jesse Owens could not even train together with his white counterparts, the members of the Olympic Committee, representing the United States of America. And yet, when he got to Germany, in the midst of 110,000 spectators in that stadium there in

Berlin, ironically Owens was allowed to travel and stay in the same hotels as whites in Germany, and yet was denied the same privilege here in our own country.

The fact is even noted that after a New York ticker tape parade that was given in his honor in New York City, that Owens had to ride the freight elevator to attend a reception for him at the Waldorf Astoria.

I think it's worth noting that this gentleman, humble as he was, one of the greatest athletes, one of the greatest athletes coming from our country, again the spirit of the Olympics, where race, color, creed or religion should have no barrier, and yet this great American set a tremendous example of what he did in 1936.

Unfortunately, as well, in 1968, at the height of the civil rights movement, the Olympics that took place in Mexico, where gentlemen by the name of Tommy Smith and John Carlos demonstrated in their own way, of course they were highly ridiculed by the media; and it was their way of showing that something was wrong here in America. African Americans were not given the same civil rights and liberties as all other Federal Americans, as is guaranteed supposedly by the U.S. Constitution.

They made a display of their concern that in America, that something was wrong in our country. And I think they were later honored by the San Jose State University for the fact that they stood up for principle, not because they hated the Olympics or being athletes, but because of that.

Then the Olympics of 1980, we had a very serious problem when the Soviet Union attacked Afghanistan. And President Carter then issued a very interesting statement. You pull out of Afghanistan or we're going to boycott the Olympics. That's exactly what happened in 1980. And unfortunately, all our athletes who trained so hard for that 4-year period just wasted that whole energy and time unfortunately. But because of political reasons.

And here's one of the ironies, Mr. Speaker, that the United States was joined in this boycott with Japan, West Germany, China and Canada. And guess who didn't join us? Great Britain, France, Greece. Very, very interesting host of supposedly our allies and friends as a matter of principle in terms of what the Soviet Union did in 1979.

And then what happened in 1984? The Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact members turned around and boycotted the Olympics in Los Angeles.

□ 1500

In the 1988 Olympics in Korea, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to lead the first delegation of my territory, as members of the Olympic Committee, believe it or not, in the Olympic organization, in Seoul, Korea. And what an awesome and powerful force it was to show the world community in terms of

showing these athletes who prepare for so long and so hard that they could share not only their talent but, more than that, their fellowship with each other.

Now, in the advent of what is happening seriously in terms of what we are trying to do in Darfur, the moment now among some of the leaders and others in the world is to boycott the Olympics in China because some feel that China is not doing enough to put pressure on the Sudanese Government to stop the genocide, to stop the genocide in Darfur, where over 400,000 lives have already been lost because of that terrible crisis of genocide, and over 2 million refugees have already been sighted because of this terrible incident's happening, and the fact that China receives 70 percent of its oil supply from Sudan and the fact that China also supplies arms to the Sudanese Government.

It is a very serious issue. And, unfortunately, like I said, I wish we lived in a perfect world where we can separate the politics from athletics, but this is not the reality that we are faced with.

And I am also making an urgent plea to our good friends from China, the leaders of China, to put pressure on the Sudanese Government, put pressure on the Sudanese Government to stop the genocide in Darfur.

Again, I want to commend my colleague and good friend for his support and for the sponsorship of this important legislation.

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

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

I want to thank my colleague from American Samoa for the words he has just shared and especially for the inspiring example that he recounted to us of Jim Thorpe and Jesse Owens.

An Olympic athlete has the potential to galvanize the attention of the entire country, sometimes the entire world, through overcoming adversity through athletic excellence, and I expect that we will be seeing a lot more of that in the future. And that is the kind of inspiration that we as Americans and our young people can benefit from.

I am proud that in Colorado Springs we have the headquarters of the United States Olympic Committee and we have a very involved training center in Colorado Springs, in my district. We also have training centers in other parts of the country. I am aware of training centers in California, New York, and Michigan as well. So the Olympics movement is something that we as a Nation can be proud of and can support, and I would hope that this resolution makes a big step in that direction.

I want to thank my colleague across the aisle for helping me on this resolution, for the words that he shared.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 395.

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.

PROVIDING THAT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK MAY SERVE ON BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 676) to provide that the Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank or the Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank may serve on the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 676

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO APPOINT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OR ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION.

The third sentence of section 401(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 (22 U.S.C. 290f(g)) is amended to read as follows: "Three members of the Board shall be appointed from among the following: officers or employees of agencies of the United States concerned with inter-American affairs, the United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, or the Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this proposed legislation.

The Inter-American Foundation is an important agency of the United States Government that strengthens relations

between the United States and Latin America and makes significant contributions to economic development and civil society throughout the region. The foundation, which also receives contributions from the Inter-American Development Bank, primarily funds partnerships among grass-roots and nonprofit organizations and businesses and local governments. These partnerships are directed at improving the quality of life of poor people and strengthening civic participation, accountability, and democratic practices.

The foundation is therefore a vital agency that bolsters Latin America and ought to have the full support of relevant agencies and bodies, especially the Inter-American Development Bank.

The bill before the House today comes to us from the Senate. It simply makes explicit that the executive director of the Inter-American Development Bank should be eligible for appointment to the board of the Inter-American Foundation. While it was previously assumed that the head of the bank could be appointed to the foundation board, such eligibility was never codified in the law.

This bill is a technical fix that our good friends, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. BIDEN; and the senior ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. LUGAR, believe that this law should be installed.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation adds a technical clarification to the Inter-American Foundation Act. By background, this bill would amend the Inter-American Foundation Act to clarify that the President may appoint the U.S. executive director of the Inter-American Development Bank, or IADB, or his alternate to serve as a member of the Board of the Inter-American Foundation.

The Inter-American Foundation Act requires that three members of the nine-member board "shall be appointed from among officers or employees of agencies of the United States concerned with inter-American affairs."

The authors of this legislation appear to believe the clarification is necessary because some have recently questioned whether or not a U.S. executive director to an international financial institution, or IFI, like the IADB, is actually an officer or employee of agencies of the United States.

I would note simply that this question is largely a nonissue. To my knowledge, never before has Congress questioned whether a U.S. executive director could concurrently serve on the Inter-American Foundation's board.

Indeed, any experience with the day-to-day operations of the international

financial institutions would suggest that the U.S. executive directors to IFIs effectively function as officers or employees of the United States. In this regard the World Bank Web site states that "the U.S. executive director is an employee of the U.S. Department of Treasury and is supported by an alternate executive director for the United States, as well as a team of advisers representing different executive branch agencies."

The U.S. representatives to the IFIs receive detailed instructions from the Secretary of the Treasury regarding the position of the United States Government on all votes pending before the board, as well as on all outstanding policy matters. The U.S. representatives to these institutions are also eligible to receive employee benefits, and the Treasury Department serves as the employing office for collecting, accounting for all retirement and health insurance benefits payments made by these individuals.

Having said that, passage of this act will certainly do no harm and may serve to help expedite the consideration of Hector Morales to serve as a member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation. Mr. Morales is currently serving as the United States executive director of the Inter-American Development Bank, a position to which he was appointed after receiving the advice and consent of the Senate in November 2004. The position on the Board of Inter-American Foundation would be a part-time appointment.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, for his most eloquent statement.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 676.

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. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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.

RECOGNIZING AND WELCOMING THE DELEGATION OF PRESIDENTS, PRIME MINISTERS, AND FOREIGN MINISTERS FROM THE CARIBBEAN TO WASHINGTON, DC

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

to the resolution (H. Res. 418) recognizing and welcoming the delegation of Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from the Caribbean to Washington, DC, and commending the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) for holding the Conference on the Caribbean.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 418

Whereas Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad, and Tobago will travel to Washington, DC, to attend the Conference on the Caribbean and meet with Members of Congress;

Whereas for the first time in its history, through the cooperation of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the Department of State, and Congress, the Conference on the Caribbean is convening June 19, 2007, through June 21, 2007, in Washington, DC;

Whereas CARICOM was created through the Treaty of Chaguaramas in 1973 at Chaguaramas, Trinidad and Tobago;

Whereas CARICOM was established in order to improve labor standards, production, and sustained economic development, expand foreign trade and economic relations, increase economic leverage and effectiveness of Member States in dealing with third-party states, enhance the coordination of Member States' foreign policies and trade relations, and promote the tradition of democracy in the region;

Whereas CARICOM is developing stronger trade, economic relations, and overall cooperation with the United States Government;

Whereas the Conference on the Caribbean is a unique dialogue between leaders of the United States and Caribbean countries to develop regional strategies for economic development and better relations with Caribbean countries;

Whereas the United States has maintained deep and enduring relations with the peoples of Caribbean countries and is linked to the Caribbean not only through geography but also through common interests and values;

Whereas the United States and Caribbean countries can enhance their cooperation in many areas, including mutually beneficial trade and economic relationships, countering the transnational scourges of crime, drugs, and terrorism, combating the spread of infectious disease, protecting the environment and encouraging tourism, maintaining fisheries and other maritime resources, addressing climate change, energy security and renewable energy sources, and promoting democracy and good governance; and

Whereas there are increasing numbers of Americans of Caribbean heritage making myriad contributions to America's rich cultural fabric and diversity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the deep and historic ties between the peoples of the United States and the Caribbean;

(2) expresses the hope that relations between the United States and the Caribbean will continue to grow closer in the future;

(3) commends the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) for holding the Conference of the Caribbean; and

(4) recognizes and welcomes the delegation of Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign

Ministers from Caribbean countries to Washington, DC.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Let me first commend my distinguished friend and colleague, also a senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New York, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, for introducing this important resolution, which welcomes an impressive delegation of Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from the Caribbean to Washington, DC for the Conference on the Caribbean.

Mr. Speaker, the Caribbean nations are as varied and stunningly exquisite as anywhere in the world. We are pleased to have a strong relationship with the Caribbean Community, also known as CARICOM, the free trade association that unifies these states.

For the first time in its history, through the coordination of the Caribbean Community, the State Department and Congress, the Conference of the Caribbean is convening in Washington. The Foreign Affairs Committee is pleased to be meeting with the members of this delegation when they convene here on June 19 through June 21. They will also be meeting with President Bush as well as members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Congressional Black Caucus.

This is to be a historic meeting that ushers in a new era of cooperation between the United States and the nations of the Caribbean, an area of the world often neglected.

The United States and the countries of the Caribbean can enhance collaboration in several important areas, including mutually beneficial trade and economic relationships; battling crime, drugs, and terrorism; and combating the spread of diseases including HIV/AIDS. This will also be a golden opportunity for the Caribbean nations and the United States to cooperate on new and clean energy production technologies.

Our relations with the Caribbean also hit very close to home as there are increasing numbers of Americans of Caribbean heritage making significant

contributions to our culture here in America. I need only to cite a few that come to mind, and one of the gentlemen I had the privilege of meeting years ago was none other than Mr. Harry Belafonte, whose roots are also from the Caribbean. What about the late and former Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, the first African American woman to run for President of the United States, and she certainly distinguished herself in representing her constituents from New York.

□ 1515

Also, at the meeting, I had the privilege of meeting with a gentleman by the name of Sidney Poitier from the Caribbean, of Caribbean heritage. And of course none other than former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and also former Secretary of State, Mr. Colin Powell, whose heritage is also from the Caribbean.

We need to continue to work on ways to strengthen the open markets and economic ties that have brought prosperity to many Caribbean nations that promise to lift up those in need. We all look forward to seeing some real tangible results coming out of this upcoming conference.

I urge my colleagues to give this resolution its fullest support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 418 that welcomes the delegations of presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers from the Caribbean to Washington to meet with the U.S. Congress. This delegation brings the President of Suriname, the prime ministers of Barbados, Belize, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago, foreign ministers from the CARICOM countries, and the Assistant Secretary General of the Caribbean Community.

These unprecedented meetings are part of the CARICOM Conference on the Caribbean that will take place from June 19–21.

The Caribbean Community, or CARICOM, was established in 1973 to unify member countries on foreign policies and trade relations with outside states, and to improve the economic conditions of the region.

Fourteen member states will be represented at the meeting, which will focus on trade relations with the United States, energy cooperation, and security concerns, including small arms trafficking and counternarcotics efforts, immigration and the reintegration of the Portuguese in the region, and the prevention of HIV/AIDS.

There is always room to improve U.S. relations with our southern neighbors. Other such areas to be addressed during the discussions include encouraging tourism, protecting the environment, addressing energy security and renewable resources, combating the spread of infectious disease, and promoting democracy and good governance. This bill

recognizes the deep and historic ties between the people of the United States and the Caribbean, and it commends the Caribbean Community for the establishment of the first-ever conference of this kind.

I applaud this important step, and look forward to working with CARICOM to improve the overall relations between the U.S. Congress and our Caribbean allies.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Arkansas for his support of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I forgot to mention as part of my commenting on this, the tremendous number of world-renowned athletes also coming from the Caribbean. I can only think of Bob Clemente from Puerto Rico. I know of one other, but I am going to get back to you on them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my privilege to yield such time as he may need to the chief sponsor and author of this proposed legislation, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend from American Samoa, my classmate, who came to Congress together in 1989, for yielding me this time. I would like to thank Chairman LANTOS for marking up this resolution, and for the support of many members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I would also like to thank my colleagues. This is the first speech I am making on the House floor since the passing of my dear mother, and I want to thank my colleagues for their support and for their strength and caring for me and my family.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution welcomes a delegation of presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers from 14 Caribbean nations to Washington, D.C., for the Conference on the Caribbean, which will be held next week.

I am the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I can tell you that the relationship that the United States has with the Caribbean nations is of paramount importance. In fact, in many of the trips that we have gone on, people have said to us they want the United States to be involved. They have a sense, many times, that we have looked elsewhere, and they don't understand why.

So I think it is important for our subcommittee to be involved, our committee to be involved and for the U.S. Congress to be involved in helping to foster good ties with the Caribbean nations; and of course this resolution lays the groundwork, and the interaction with the delegations from the Caribbean that will be here this week is very, very important.

As Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA said, the Caribbean nations are as culturally varied and physically beautiful as anywhere

in the world. It is important to expand our strong relationship with the Caribbean Community, also known as CARICOM. This is an historic conference. For the first time in its history, through the coordination of the Caribbean Community, the State Department, the Congress, the Conference on the Caribbean is convening in Washington. I cannot state how important that is and how significant that is and what kind of important role the United States Congress can play.

I am honored to be the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, and I will do everything in my power to help facilitate relations between the United States, United States Congress and the nations of the Caribbean.

The Foreign Affairs Committee is pleased to be meeting with the members of this delegation on June 20 at 2:30 p.m., and I encourage all our colleagues, both on our committee and on our subcommittee, and even people that are not on our committee, to attend this meeting.

The delegation will also be meeting with President Bush, as well as members of the Ways and Means Committee and the Congressional Black Caucus, and as well as, of course, our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I visited four Caribbean countries in the last 6 months and have learned much from our friends in the south. In Haiti, leaders are very appreciative for the support of the United States and for the recent passage of the HOPE legislation, but want to make sure we coordinate closely with the government on our assistance plan.

Further to the south, leaders of the many small island nations feel neglected by the United States and are looking for closer cooperation on energy, security, crime, education, health and other issues. Countries like China are stepping in and filling the vacuum left by the United States in these small, but strategically important countries. This is our hemisphere, the Western Hemisphere, and we simply must be more engaged. We cannot stand back and think that other countries are not going to move into the vacuum. You know, we used to go to school when we were kids and learn about the policy of "hands off the Americas," but that's not true anymore. Other countries, like China and like Iran and other places, will step in if we neglect these countries.

Our friends in the Caribbean have offered their support for U.S. efforts to combat global terrorism. With the recent revelation that the suspects from Trinidad and Tobago and Guyana were involved in the plot to blow up JFK Airport in New York City, we need more than ever to work closely with our allies in the Caribbean to defeat terrorism.

I was just in Trinidad with a delegation. We met with the leader of Trinidad, and he told us in emphatic terms how closely he wanted to work with

the United States to combat terrorism. They're willing, they're able, they want to work with us. We just need to show that we want to work with them.

Terrorism is not just a single region issue, it impacts all areas of the world. When we have friends reaching out to us in our hemisphere as allies on the war on terror, we must closely engage with them.

I am looking forward to this historic meeting that ushers in a new era of cooperation between the United States and the Caribbean, an area of the world to which, again, I don't believe we have been paying adequate attention.

The United States and the countries of the Caribbean can enhance collaboration in several important areas, including mutually beneficial trade and economic relationships, battling crime, drugs and terrorism, and combating the spread of diseases, including HIV/AIDS. There is also a golden opportunity for the Caribbean nations and the U.S. to cooperate on new and clean energy production technologies. And, again, when we were in Trinidad, we visited some of those technologies, Trinidad being a major supplier of natural gas to the United States of America.

Our relations with the Caribbean also are very important as there are large numbers of Americans of Caribbean heritage, as the gentleman from American Samoa pointed out, making significant contributions to our culture in America. I represent the New York City area district. In New York City and in the suburbs, and in my district alone in New York, there are very, very large numbers of Caribbean residents, including Jamaicans, Haitians, Dominicans, and many, many others. The Dominican Republic is a country that wants to work closely with us, a very important country. Haiti needs our attention. Grenada, where the United States invaded when Ronald Reagan was President, now we seem to be neglecting them. We visited there as well. So these are countries that we need to watch, to work with.

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle mentioned St. Vincent and the Grenadines. It's just coincidental that the foreign minister of St. Vincent and the Grenadines, who will be here, went to college with me some 40 years ago in New York City. And we have maintained our friendship through all those years, never knowing that I would eventually go to Congress and he would become the foreign minister of St. Vincent in the Grenadines. And so I hope to work with him on these issues. His name is Louis Straker. These are important relationships, and we need to continue to foster them.

And finally, we must continue to work on ways of strengthening the relationships that have brought prosperity to many Caribbean nations and that promise to lift up those in need. It

is my hope that our friends in the Caribbean can see some real concrete results coming out of this important Caribbean Conference in Washington.

Let me just conclude by saying the time for rhetoric is over. It is now time for action and a real enhancement of our relations with the Caribbean.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for their support of this legislation. I thank the chairman. I thank the gentleman from the American Samoa, the gentleman from Arkansas. We all need to work together. This should be bipartisan. This is good for America. We need to strengthen our ties with the Caribbean.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the subcommittee chairman for his hard work. Also, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN for bringing this forward along with our staff.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague and chairman of our Subcommittee of the Western Hemisphere. Not only am I an original cosponsor of this important resolution, but also, as a member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, it has been my privilege over the years to also visit some of our countries here in the Caribbean area. And as my friend from New York has said, sometimes we neglect these so-called small states.

A couple of weeks ago, I had the privilege of hosting several presidents and prime ministers from the South Pacific, from the Pacific region. Currently, in the United Nations they have what is known as a small states association, which is comprised primarily of states or countries from the Caribbean, and also from the Pacific region. And they number about a little over 42 members in the United Nations.

The point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, is these are sovereign, independent nations, and we are not to look at them as just because they're small, that they are not important as far as our national needs are concerned. We ought to be very sensitive to the needs of small states, no matter where they are.

I also want to note with a sense of irony that right in the middle of the Caribbean we have 4 million U.S. citizens living in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I failed to mention that with my love and passion for the sport of golf, it was my privilege to meet a couple of years ago the great golfer from Puerto Rico, Chi Chi Rodriguez. I stated earlier Sammy Sosa. We have so many names here, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to share with my colleagues and my good friend from Arkansas, tremendous contributions of talent coming from the Caribbean region. I don't need to say them in terms of the wealth of talent coming from the Caribbean as far as the sport of baseball is concerned. I just want to share that note with my colleagues.

And again, I want to commend my good friend, the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere. We look forward to meeting with these presidents and prime ministers coming from the Caribbean region.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a daughter of the Caribbean and the only member of the House from the English-speaking Caribbean, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 418, which recognizes and welcomes the delegation of Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from the Caribbean to Washington, DC, and commends the Caribbean Community, CARICOM, for holding their Conference on the Caribbean.

It is with great pride that I join my colleagues in applauding the heads of Government of the CARICOM Caribbean Community of nations for convening their conference on the Caribbean—A 20/20 Vision—here in Washington. The theme of the conference is: CARICOM DEVELOPMENT IN THE 21st Century: Economic Growth with Social Equity.

I want to thank and commend my colleague and friend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Representative ENGEL for introducing H. Res. 418 and for shepherding it on to the floor of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, the nations of the Caribbean, some of the longest and most stable democracies in the region, have long been among our closest friends and staunch allies. In recent years, the region was described as America's "third border" because events there have a direct impact on the security of the United States. However, while we have made statements about bolstering political and economic stability in the region, the reality is that our friends to the south have been suffering from our benign neglect.

Whether it has been our position on Caribbean bananas at the WTO, or our insistence that our Caribbean neighbors make costly upgrades to their air and seaports to comply with our post-September 11th security concerns, to the recently instituted Western Hemisphere Initiative, our Caribbean neighbors have been taking it on the chin economically as a result of policy decisions we have made to address our domestic and foreign policy agendas.

I also hope that the recently uncovered plot to blow up a fuel supply line at the JFK Airport in NY, allegedly involving four men from Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago will not lead to the belief that the Caribbean is becoming a "hotbed of terrorism".

In holding their conference in Washington, our Caribbean neighbors hope to strengthen the relationship between the United States and CARICOM by addressing priority areas for future Caribbean growth and development, including issues related to trade, competitiveness and investment, in mutually beneficial and reinforcing ways.

They also hope to deepen and broaden the dialogue between the Governments and people of CARICOM and the Government and people of the United States of America that should result in the renewed appreciation of the Caribbean.

We—the Congress and the Bush Administration—owe it to these small and vulnerable friends to seriously consider the issues they will raise with us during the conference. These include, trade and competitiveness, immigra-

tion, cooperation on security issues including the return of criminal deportees, disaster preparedness and mitigation and health-care including HIV/AIDS.

The Caribbean and its peoples have deep and historic ties with the United States and its peoples. It is my fervent hope that through this conference and the meetings that will take place with President Bush and the Members of Congress, including the Congressional Black Caucus, that relations between the United States and the Caribbean will continue to grow closer in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support adoption of this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 418, recognizing and welcoming the delegation of Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from the Caribbean to Washington, DC, and commending the Caribbean Community, CARICOM, for holding the Conference on the Caribbean.

I will first begin by thanking my colleague on the Foreign Affairs committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Representative ELIOT ENGEL, for introducing such an important key resolution, which welcomes to Washington, DC, Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Foreign Ministers from all nations of the Caribbean. Through cooperation between CARICOM, the Department of State and the United States Congress, delegates will meet for the first time in history for a three day—June 19—June 21, 2007—Conference on the Caribbean.

As a member of the United States House of Representatives, I recognize the deep and historic ties between our American people and those of the Caribbean. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Caribbean community, CARICOM, for holding this conference, as well as to recognize and welcome all delegates to the United States. I look forward to working with the Caribbean community in maintaining and strengthening the relations between both countries.

CARICOM was created through the Treaty of Chaguaramas in 1973 to aid in developing stronger trade and economic relations, improving labor relations, and sustaining economic development and overall cooperation when dealing with third-party states. It will be the hope of all delegates convened to usher in a new era of cooperation between the U.S. and the Caribbean; an area of the world that is often neglected.

As a strong supporter of the notion of a global marketplace of ideas, I strongly believe that this meeting can serve as a landmark toward creating mutually beneficial relationships, as well as enhancing collaboration in several areas such as trade and economic relationships, crimes, drugs and terrorism, while also combating the spread of diseases, including HIV/AIDS. The Conference on the Caribbean also allows the two countries to cooperate on new and clean energy-production technologies.

As a leader in one of the most diverse metropolitan districts in the nation, as well as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee here on Capitol Hill, I strongly cherish the bond that our two nations share. I can attest to the significant contributions that Americans of Caribbean heritage are making in America. Houston

is a multicultural city with a large and even advancing international community; for that reason, I strongly support and value a cultural outreach effort.

I thank you once again, Mr. ENGEL, for your efforts in introducing this piece of legislation. I am looking forward to witnessing the results of this upcoming conference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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 American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 418.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING THE STRONG ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 295) recognizing the strong alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States and expressing appreciation to the Republic of Korea for its efforts in the global war against terrorism, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 295

Recognizing the strong alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States and expressing appreciation to the Republic of Korea for its efforts in the global war against terrorism.

Whereas for more than 50 years since the outbreak of the Korean War, a close relationship has existed between the United States and the Republic of Korea, which has been of enormous economic, cultural, and strategic advantage to both nations;

Whereas President George W. Bush and President Roh Moo Hyun have demonstrated their mutual willingness to forge a deeper alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea to enhance stability in East Asia;

Whereas the 29,000 United States armed services personnel who are stationed in the Republic of Korea serve as a testament to the enduring strength of the 1953 U.S.-R.O.K. Mutual Defense Treaty;

Whereas the foundation of the relationship between the United States and the Republic of Korea rests on a shared interest in and commitment to peace, democracy, and freedom on the Korean Peninsula, in Asia, and throughout the world;

Whereas the Republic of Korea and the United States are both deeply committed to the Six Party Talks and have a mutual interest in keeping the Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons;

Whereas the Republic of Korea has more than 1,200 armed services personnel deployed in Iraq, constituting the third largest coalition contingent in Iraq behind the United States and the United Kingdom;

Whereas the Republic of Korea has more than 200 armed services personnel deployed in Afghanistan; and

Whereas the Republic of Korea has pledged \$460,000,000 toward reconstruction and stabilization in postwar Iraq: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the strong alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States and expresses appreciation to the Republic of Korea for its contributions to international efforts to combat terrorism.

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let me first commend our distinguished colleague and former member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), for being the author of and introducing this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the strong alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea has been a pivotal relationship in world affairs since our involvement when we fought side by side in the Korean war over half a century ago. Out of that conflict was born one of the most significant dividing lines of the Cold War, a demilitarized zone on the 38th parallel that splits the Korean Peninsula and marked the divide between Communist Asia and democratic Asia. The partnership between our two countries held this line for decades. Today we help maintain a stable peace in Southeast Asia.

In the post-Cold War period, the Republic of Korea has remained a steadfast U.S. ally. It has contributed troops and pledged reconstruction funds for Iraq, and its forces are deployed in Afghanistan. As a key member of the six-party talks to denuclearize North Korea, it shares an important responsibility for broader security in Northeast Asia. Today we are committed absolutely to compelling the dangerous North Korea regime to eliminate its nuclear program.

Overall, South Korea is a key partner and an ally in the challenge of com-

bating world terrorism. The combination of emerging terrorism threats and the North Korean challenge makes this resolution particularly important today.

I certainly want to commend my good friend, Assistant Secretary Christopher Hill of the State Department, for his diligence and efforts in negotiating with the North Koreans in the six-party talks. I would be remiss if I did not also recognize a most significant contribution made by the Republic of China and the help that they have contributed in bringing the North Koreans to the negotiating table and for which the negotiations are now ongoing, hopefully to bring about a resolution to this important problem.

In economic realms, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. relationship with the Republic of Korea is one of our strongest in Asia. The Republic of Korea was one of the original East Asian Tigers and served as a model for other countries in Asia with its booming economic growth in the seventies, eighties and nineties. South Korea now is the United States' seventh largest trading partner in the world.

This resolution honors the close alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea and recognizes South Korea's important contributions to fighting not only terrorism around the world, but also welcomes a strengthening and deepening of the relationship between our two countries and our peoples.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in Vietnam, I remember vividly the presence of some 50,000 soldiers from South Korea who served alongside us, the U.S. forces. I kind of like to say now you know where your real friends are.

I am reminded of a Chinese proverb: there are many acquaintances, but very few friends. South Korea was one of those few friends who was willing to put their action where their talk is; and the fact that 50,000 soldiers were there fighting along U.S. forces and in that terrible conflict that we faced in Vietnam, I cannot help but express my personal commendation and appreciation to the leaders and to the people of South Korea when they were there with us when we needed help.

I visited South Korea several times and I consider them the most industrious people on this planet. There are over 1 million Korean Americans living in our country today, some among the most prominent in the areas of science and doctors. They have become lawyers, engineers and are in all types of businesses. I have a very strong affection for the Korean people and those fellow citizens who happen to be of Korean ancestry.

So I think this resolution is most fitting. Again, I commend my good friend, the gentleman from New York, for offering and proposing this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, which recognizes the enduring ties of an alliance first forged over half a century ago in the crucible of the Korean War. It was heartening to see the photographs from Seoul of the thousands of South Korean citizens who gathered in a downtown plaza on June 6, Korea's memorial day, to express their support of the alliance. They waved South Korean flags and the Stars and Stripes together to show enthusiasm for the strong bonds that link our two countries.

Later this month, June 25, marks the 57th anniversary of the North Korean invasion across the Demilitarized Zone. This surprise attack in the early hours of a Sunday morning sought to snuff the life out of an embryonic South Korean democracy. President Harry Truman's immediate unflinching decision to come to the aid of an embattled South Korea proved that the United States would not retreat from its rendezvous with destiny.

Together with our South Korean and other allies, we turned the tide of war at Inchon and preserved the South Korean state, which we honor as an ally today.

South Korea's commitment to the alliance is seen in many ways, as in the 1,200 South Korean military personnel deployed to Iraq, which makes South Korea's contribution the third largest in the coalition contingent. There is also the \$460 million which the Republic of Korea has pledged toward post-war Iraq reconstruction, and there are the close consultations we hold together in the six-party process to resolve the North Korean nuclear issue. These are the actions of a true and loyal friend, for which we express our gratitude in this resolution.

Let me also take this opportunity to second the words of the United States forces Korea commander, General Bell, that South Korea Sergeant Yoon Jang-ho, who was South Korea's first uniformed casualty in the war on terror, was a hero. Sergeant Yoon was killed February 27 by a suicide bomber in Bagram, Afghanistan.

This young soldier, although born in Korea, had spent his high school and college years in Indiana, graduating from Indiana University. He returned to South Korea to complete his military service and volunteered for service in Afghanistan. His loss was deeply felt, both in his home nation of Korea and his adopted hometown of Bloomington, Indiana.

The shared mourning of the peoples of two nations for this valiant soldier is one more concrete indication of the ties that bind our two nations. Another, of course, is the talent and dynamism of the 2-million-strong ethnic Korean community in the United States. Los Angeles represents the largest concentrated urban center of Korean culture outside of the Korean Peninsula. For this enriching contribution to America's melting pot, we are extremely grateful.

I therefore urge immediate passage of this resolution which recognizes this strong and enduring alliance.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again I want to commend and thank my good friend for his eloquent statement and add that this is not a partisan piece of legislation. It is fully bipartisan. I certainly commend not only our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. LANTOS, but also our senior ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for their support of this proposed legislation.

It is ironic that we are dealing with several pieces of legislation, earlier on being the Olympics, and now we are dealing with South Korea.

I remember years ago when I attended the Olympics in 1988 in Korea, I ran into a gentleman who is a Korean American by the name of Dr. Sammy Lee. I asked him why this Samoan American was so good in the art of diving, perhaps one of the greatest Olympic divers ever in the history of the Olympics, whose name is none other than Greg Louganis. I asked Dr. Sammy Lee, why is it that Greg Louganis was such a great Olympic diver? He said, Eni, look at his legs. They are Samoan legs, and the reason for this is that it gives him the ability to jump higher than any of his Olympic competitors. And because he can jump higher than anybody, that is what gives him the opportunity to accomplish more difficult flips than any of the other divers. By the way, Dr. Sammy Lee was also the trainer for Greg Louganis in the Olympics in 1988.

Another note of interest is that when I talked to Dr. Sammy Lee when he was training for the Olympics, he could not even train together with his fellow white Americans while he was training for the Olympics. Can you believe that? So he had to invent what high diving boards were supposed to look like, whether it be going on cliffs or other high platforms to allow him to practice his diving ability. And guess what? He got the gold medal for the United States for the Olympics, a Korean American, Dr. Sammy Lee.

I just wanted to make that as a note of interest for my colleagues and also in view of the fact that we have talked about the Olympics and we have talked about South Korea.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is very important to show our sense of appreciation, especially to the good leaders and the people of South Korea, how much we care about them, how important they are, how important they are to our strategic and our economic interests in that important region of the world.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 295, and, in doing so, I would first like to commend Mr. KING for introducing this resolution. The relationship between the United

States and the Republic of Korea has been a pivotal relationship in world affairs since our forces fought side by side in Korean War over a half century ago. Out of that conflict marked the divide between communist Asia and democratic Asia. The partnership between us and the Republic of Korea held the divide for decades, and together we helped maintain stable peace in East Asia.

In the post-Cold War world, the Republic of Korea has remained a steadfast U.S. ally. Its forces are deployed in Afghanistan and it has contributed troops and pledged reconstruction funds for Iraq. As a key member of the Six Party Talks to denuclearize North Korea, it shares an important responsibility for broader security in Northeast Asia. Together, we are committed absolutely to compelling the dangerous North Korean regime to eliminate its nuclear program.

Overall, South Korea is a key partner an ally in the challenge of combating terrorism worldwide. The combination of emerging terrorism threats and the North Korean challenge make this resolution particularly important today.

In the economic realm, too, the U.S. relationship with the Republic of Korea is one of our strongest in Asia. For example, the Republic of Korea was one of the original "East Asian Tigers," and served as a model for other Asian countries with a booming economic growth in the 1970s, 80s and 90s. Currently, South Korea is now the United States' 7th largest trading partner in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to stand as one of cosponsors of this legislation. This resolution honors the close alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea, and recognizes South Korea's important contributions to fighting against terrorism around the world. It also welcomes the strengthening and deepening of the relationship between our two countries and our peoples. I thank all of my colleagues who have already signed on to this bill, and I urge those who have not to support this legislation.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 295, a resolution recognizing the strong alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States and expressing appreciation to the Republic of Korea for its efforts in the Global War on Terror. As the sponsor of this resolution, I join with over 35 of my colleagues in urging the House to pass this resolution today.

For almost six decades, the United States and the Republic of Korea have maintained a strong alliance that rests on a shared commitment to peace, democracy, and freedom not only on the Korean peninsula but throughout Asia and the rest of the world. The nearly 30,000 American soldiers who remain stationed in the Republic of Korea are a testament to this relationship.

Since September 11, 2001 we have seen this bond further strengthened as Korea has joined with the United States and other coalition nations in supporting the Global War on Terror both militarily and financially. Korean President Roh truly understands this grave threat and the need for it to be confronted. Presently, the Republic of Korea has the third largest coalition contingent of forces in Iraq. Korea also has troops deployed in Afghanistan and has generously pledged \$460,000,000 toward reconstruction and stabilization efforts in post-war Iraq.

The U.S. and Korea also both remain deeply committed to the Six Party Talks and have

a mutual interest in keeping the Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons.

Finally, the U.S. and Korea have been working diligently on a free trade agreement between our two countries that will deepen economic ties and boost trade and investment for both countries. I am pleased that these negotiations concluded on April 1, 2007 and it is my hope that the agreement will soon be signed and Congress passes the required enacting legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass this resolution today.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 295.

This resolution recognizes the tremendous alliance that the United States shares with the Republic of Korea. Korea has been one of this country's strongest allies, both in the international war on terror, as well as in expanding free trade. Korea stands as a shining example of democracy in action.

In the 11th Congressional District of Virginia, I represent a growing and vigorous Korean American population. Korean Americans thrive in areas such as business, medicine, law, art and athletics. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Korean Americans own and operate over 130,000 businesses and employ over 333,000 individuals. These are prime examples of their importance in the United States and to the growth of our economy. It is clear to me that the strong alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea can be seen everyday in the neighborhoods and workplaces right here in the Washington, D.C. area.

The Republic of Korea's strong belief in upholding individual rights and liberties serves as an example for the entire Korean peninsula, as well as beyond. Korea's 2,300 troops deployed in Iraq and 200 troops deployed in Afghanistan indicate not only Korea's support of our efforts in ending terrorism abroad, but also illustrate Korea's strong commitment to spreading democracy throughout the world. Indeed, Korea has been one of our most ardent and unfailing allies abroad.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today we honor an ally who is standing with us in the Global War on Terrorism. An ally who knows what it is like to fight for peace and freedom, South Korea. Just over 50 years ago, Korea was the most violent spot on the planet as the North Korean government, backed by the Soviets and Chinese, swooped in to destroy the fledgling democracy in the south.

I am a proud cosponsor of this resolution which recognizes the significant contributions that the South Korean military has made in Afghanistan and in Iraq. Our South Korean allies maintain the third largest contingent of personnel in Iraq, where they are helping each day to rebuild that nation and spread the freedom they too earned with blood, sweat, and grit.

While as many as 3,600 personnel have at some time served, currently 2,300 work in the country to provide medical services, build and repair roads, power lines, schools, and other public works.

The Republic of Korea has contributed both men and money to rebuilding Iraq because they know how difficult it is to rise from the ashes of war. Since the end of the Korean

War, the people of South Korea have built one of the world's most modern and dynamic economies.

We hope that the Iraqi and Afghani people can look to the South Korean model to develop into a peaceful and prosperous nation. We thank the Republic of Korea and the Korean people for their sacrifice and their stand for freedom.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 295, a resolution that recognizes the strong alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States and further expresses appreciation to the Republic of Korea for its efforts in the global war against terrorism. The dynamic and strong relations that exist between the United States and Republic of Korea serve as a model for partnerships the United States must continue to seek to establish and cultivate with other countries within the Asia-Pacific region and throughout the world.

The contributions made by the government of the Republic of Korea toward helping battle terrorism are vital to providing for safety and security throughout the world. The efforts on the part of the Republic of Korea to help fight terrorists in Afghanistan and Iraq and help develop democratic governance, strengthen civil society, and establish stronger economies in those countries are of particular importance to the United States and our allies. These missions are challenging ones. Their eventual, positive outcomes are less than certain at this point. The commitment to achieving success in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom displayed by the Republic of Korea is commendable and an important component of the Coalition force structure.

Efforts on the part of South Korea to encourage the government of North Korea to act in a responsible manner with respect to its misguided pursuit of nuclear weapons and ballistic missile technology are also of paramount importance at this time to the United States and our allies. I am encouraged by the strong partnership that has been formed between the United States and South Korea and other countries with respect to this issue.

I welcome the opportunity to continue to work with our South Korean allies toward ensuring a more peaceful, stable, and prosperous Asia-Pacific region and world. I am confident that the United States and South Korea will develop even stronger political, economic, and security ties in the years ahead. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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 American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 295, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution recognizing the strong alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States and expressing appreciation to the Republic of Korea for its contributions to international efforts to combat terrorism."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING JOHN PEHLE FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS IN HELPING RESCUE JEWS AND OTHER MINORITIES FROM THE HOLOCAUST

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 226) to recognize John Pehle for his contributions to the Nation in helping rescue Jews and other minorities from the Holocaust during World War II, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 226

Whereas some 6,000,000 Jews were slaughtered pursuant to Adolf Hitler's diabolical plan for the total extermination of the Jews during the Third Reich, and even more would have perished had it not been for the efforts of a number of United States Government officials who spoke out forcefully against American policy and persuaded President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the need for extraordinary measures to save Jewish lives;

"Whereas on November 9, 1943—the 5th anniversary of Kristallnacht, when pogroms against Jews and the burning of synagogues and Jewish businesses and homes were carried out throughout Nazi Germany—identical Congressional resolutions were introduced in both houses of Congress calling for the creation of a United States Government commission "to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany";

"Whereas the Senate version was introduced by Senator Guy Gillette of Iowa with the support of Elbert Thomas of Utah and Edwin Johnson of Colorado and was unanimously approved in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on December 20, 1943, and scheduled for a full Senate vote in early 1944;

Whereas the House version was introduced by Representative Will Rogers, Jr., of California and extensive hearings on the resolution were held by the House Foreign Affairs Committee;

"Whereas United States Government agencies were receiving extensive credible information about the extent of Nazi atrocities against the Jews and other minorities in Europe, nevertheless, the policy of the United States as developed and implemented in the Department of State opposed American government action to save the lives of Jewish and other minorities who were being systematically exterminated by the Nazi German government;

"Whereas in 1943 and early 1944, an extraordinary group of officials at the United States Department of Treasury sought to change those policies and Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau directed the preparation of a memorandum to the President of the United States urging more direct and forceful American action to aid Jewish victims of the Nazi atrocities, and this document, prepared by Josiah DuBois, Jr., Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury Department, and John Pehle, a 33-year-old attorney in the Foreign Funds Control unit of the Treasury Department, was presented to President Franklin D. Roosevelt by Secretary Morgenthau, Randolph Paul and Pehle on January 16, 1944;

Whereas President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9417 on January 22, 1944, affirming that "it is the policy of this Government to

take all measures within its power to rescue the victims of enemy oppression who are in imminent danger of death and otherwise afford such victims all possible relief and assistance consistent with the successful prosecution of the war" and creating the War Refugee Board, composed of the Secretaries of State, Treasury and War, to carry out this policy;

Whereas John Pehle was appointed the Acting Executive Director and subsequently Executive Director of the Board and Josiah DuBois, Jr. was appointed General Counsel of the Board;

Whereas on January 25, 1944, the Board issued a critically important diplomatic cable to all United States diplomatic missions abroad ordering that "action be taken to forestall the plot of the Nazis to exterminate the Jews and other persecuted minorities in Europe" and developed new programs to increase the flow of Jewish and other refugees from Nazi persecution to neutral countries in Europe, including Turkey, Portugal, Switzerland, Spain, and Sweden, from where they were assisted to go to North America, Palestine and North and South America;

Whereas the Board assisted the International Red Cross to provide food parcels to "stateless" civilians in internment camps, to support and protect some 3,000,000 Allied and Axis prisoners of war, and to streamline Federal licensing procedures for the transmission of funds to pay for Red Cross relief supplies and rescue operations, thus saving the lives of thousands of Jews and other internees;

Whereas in April 1944, John Pehle, on behalf of the War Refugee Board, urged all neutral nations to increase their diplomatic representation in Hungary to help prevent the accelerating deportation of Jews to Auschwitz-Birkenau and other Nazi extermination camps and to begin providing vital funding and other resources to assist in saving Hungarian Jews from concentration and extermination camps;

Whereas the War Refugee Board sought out Swedish citizen Raoul Wallenberg and, with the support of the Swedish government and its legation in Budapest, supported one of the most extensive and successful rescue efforts during the Holocaust; and

Whereas subsequent academic studies have credited the War Refugee Board with rescuing as many as 200,000 Jews from Nazi occupied countries through the efforts of Wallenberg and others: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the efforts and contributions of those who worked for the establishment of the War Refugee Board and for a more active United States policy to rescue Jews and other victims of Nazi repression who were in imminent danger of death and to provide these persecuted minorities with relief and assistance during World War II; and

(2) commends in particular the actions of Secretary of Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Josiah DuBois, Jr., and John Pehle for their dedication and devotion to helping rescue Jews and other persecuted minorities in the Holocaust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include

extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LANTOS, chairman of the committee and my Bay Area neighbor, for working so closely with me to bring this resolution to the floor today. As the only Holocaust survivor in the Congress, his support of this resolution means very much to all of us, and particularly to me.

H. Res. 226 is a resolution to recognize American government officials who played a critical role in the creation and activity of the War Refugee Board in an effort to help rescue Jews and other persecuted minorities during the years of the Holocaust.

Because of their actions and because of their bravery, an unknown number of people were saved from the horrific reign of Adolf Hitler and his followers. Specifically, we are commending the actions of Secretary of Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Josiah DuBois and John Pehle for their dedication and devotion to helping rescue Jews and other persecuted minorities during the Holocaust.

To many, World War II and the Holocaust may seem long, long, long ago. For others, however, this is a memory which will be imprinted in their soul forever. Six million Jews were killed under the brutal and evil reign of Adolf Hitler while many countries turned a blind eye to their ethnic cleansing and genocide.

During this dark time, some brave men and women stood up and demanded that every person, no matter their ethnic background, be treated justly and humanely. The people serving the War Refugee Board sent a historic cable to the diplomatic missions ordering that "action be taken to forestall the plot of the Nazis to exterminate the Jews and other persecuted minorities in Europe."

□ 1545

They developed new programs to increase the flow of Jewish and other refugees from Nazi persecution to neutral countries.

After the horror of the concentration camps and extermination campaigns were revealed, the world said "never again."

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we look around the world to see hauntingly similar events occurring, particularly in places like Darfur. Mr. Speaker, if we truly wish to honor the memory of the Holocaust victims, we must come together to stand up in the face of bigotry and hatred all around the world today. The action of the War Refugee Board is an amazing example of courage, human kindness, and compassion.

Today, we rise to recognize their service to this country and to humankind. We rise to remember the Jews and minorities who perished under a reign of terror. But it is with hope that we look to the future, a future of peace and human dignity where "never again" means never again.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 226 recognizes American government officials who played a critical role in the creation of the War Refugee Board in an effort to help rescue Jews and other persecuted minorities during the Holocaust.

In the early stage of World War II, there was an extensive flow of information about the extent of Jews and other minorities being systematically murdered by the Nazi regime.

A heroic group of U.S. Government officials from the Treasury Department, including Secretary of the Treasurer, Henry Morgenthau, as well as Joseph DuBois and John Pehle, urged President Franklin Roosevelt to take more direct and forceful action to help the victims of the Nazi atrocities.

President Roosevelt later signed an executive order creating the War Refugee Board. Mr. John Pehle became the executive director of the board which helped to rescue Jews and other victims of Nazi persecution and prevented thousands of people from dying in extermination camps.

Furthermore, the board assisted the International Red Cross to provide food and shelter to over 3 million prisoners of war. Efforts by those who worked to establish the War Refugee Board, particularly of Secretary of Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Joseph DuBois, and John Pehle, were instrumental in saving thousands of lives during the Nazi extermination policy.

H. Res. 226 recognizes and honors these government officials for their efforts, and I urge support for this legislation.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) not only as chief sponsor of this proposed legislation, but also for her leadership and her compassion and commitment in the field of human rights for fellow human beings all over the world.

I cannot help but stand here on the floor and share with my colleagues some of the thoughts that came to my mind when my colleague from California was explaining about the provisions of this important legislation.

Usually I am not a person who gets emotional watching movies, but recently I watched the movie "Freedom Riders." I cannot help but recall the experience that these teenagers in Long Beach went through, and how creative this teacher was in trying to get kids who were from basically low-income areas and who had no idea or concept what it means to read. Somehow the teacher was able to get these high school students to read "The Diary of Anne Frank." It got to the point where the students became so interested in what happened when they read this book, "The Diary of Anne Frank," that they invited a Holocaust survivor to speak to them in Los Angeles. She testified personally what it meant to be not only a prisoner but I would say a slave during the Nazi period and the terrible time that the Jewish people went through during that period of their history.

I thank Chairman LANTOS not only for his leadership, but as a Holocaust survivor himself, I cannot think of a better person who can share with our colleagues what it means to be part of that period and the pain and suffering 6 million Jews went through during that process.

I recall a statement made by one of the great poet philosophers, Santayana, who said: "Those who don't remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Some say why should we worry, this happened in the past. Why worry about it. I think we have to remember so these things never happen again.

Yes, I visit the Holocaust Museum and what do I say: Never again. Never again. That racism and bigotry and hatred should never be a part of the legacy of our great Nation.

I commend my friend from California for bringing this resolution before the Members for their consideration, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim 30 seconds of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am remiss in not complimenting the gentleman from California for bringing this forward. It is very, very important that we do remember what people have done and when good people have stepped forward.

We are sitting here and you always want to do your best on the pronunciation of names, and it is sad we don't know these names better than we do. I think you bringing forward this resolution, again it just highlights the importance that we do remember what has happened in the past and we keep it from happening in the future.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from American Samoa and the gentleman from Arkansas for their kind words.

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 California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 226, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution to recognize American government officials who played a critical role in the creation and activity of the War Refugee Board in an effort to help rescue Jews and other persecuted minorities during the Holocaust."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITION ON SALE BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF PARTS FOR F-14 FIGHTER AIRCRAFT

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1441) to prohibit the sale by the Department of Defense of parts for F-14 fighter aircraft, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1441

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

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON SALE BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF PARTS FOR F-14 FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.

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

(1) The Department of Defense is responsible for demilitarizing and auctioning off sensitive surplus United States military equipment.

(2) F-14 "Tomcat" fighter aircraft have recently been retired, and their parts are being made available by auction in large quantities.

(3) Iran is the only country, besides the United States, flying F-14 fighter aircraft and is purchasing surplus parts for such aircraft from brokers.

(4) The Government Accountability Office has, as a result of undercover investigative work, declared the acquisition of the surplus United States military equipment, including parts for F-14 fighter aircraft, to be disturbingly effortless.

(5) Upon the seizure of such sensitive surplus military equipment being sold to Iran, United States customs agents have discovered these same items, having been resold by the Department of Defense, being brokered illegally to Iran again.

(6) Iran is pursuing a nuclear weapons capability, and the Department of State has identified Iran as the most active state sponsor of terrorism.

(7) Iran continues to provide funding, safe haven, training, and weapons to known terrorist groups, including Hizballah, HAMAS, the Palestine Islamic Jihad, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

(8) The sale of spare parts for F-14 fighter aircraft could make it more difficult to confront the nuclear weapons capability of Iran and would strengthen the ground war capability of Iran. To prevent these threats to regional and global security, the sale of spare parts for F-14 fighter aircraft should be prohibited.

(b) PROHIBITION ON SALE BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in paragraph (2), the Department of Defense may not sell (whether directly or indirectly) any parts for F-14 fighter aircraft, whether through the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service or through another agency or element of the Department.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the sale of parts for F-14 fighter aircraft to a museum or similar organization located in the United States that is involved in the preservation of F-14 fighter aircraft for historical purposes.

(c) PROHIBITION ON EXPORT LICENSE.—No license for the export of parts for F-14 fighter aircraft to a non-United States person or entity may be issued by the United States Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1441, a bill that will put an end to military surplus sales that may inadvertently be helping to sustain Iran's Air Force.

First, I would like to thank Chairman LANTOS and Chairman SKELTON for their leadership on this issue. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this critical national security issue.

The background to this problem begins in the 1970s when our country sold F-14 Tomcats to Iran's pro-Western secular government. Iran was a close ally of the United States at the time and needed the capabilities of the F-14 in a dangerous part of the world. Times have changed, unfortunately. And Iran has now called for the destruction of Israel and is refining uranium in what many observers from the non-proliferation community believe is an attempt to develop the fuel necessary for an atomic weapon.

Iran is a state sponsor of terrorism and is likely responsible for arming insurgents in Iraq. Iran has ignored the calls of the international community for greater transparency in its nuclear power research and development, and the United Nations Security Council recently imposed stricter economic sanctions on Iran as a result.

When the United States Navy retired the F-14 fleet last September, that left Iran as the only nation still flying those aircraft. Iran has been trying to get around United States sanctions and export controls to secure the parts necessary to keep the F-14 flying. Recent

undercover investigations and reports have made it clear that Iran may have been successful.

Following an undercover investigation, the GAO reported in 2006 that acquiring surplus military hardware not properly demilitarized is disturbingly easy.

In January of this year, the Associated Press reported that front companies were able to secretly purchase military parts for resale in Iran. Iran is the only nation still using the F-14. There are no other legitimate buyers overseas.

In order to address this issue, I worked with my colleague from New Mexico, Mr. PEARCE. And after a joint trip to Israel, we introduced H.R. 1441, which will prevent the United States Government from selling approximately 10,000 parts that are unique only to the F-14 Tomcat.

This legislation will prohibit the military, as well as any other private company, from selling F-14-specific parts. It is also, Mr. Speaker, a complete ban on all international sales of parts specific to the F-14.

We cannot take the risk that components unique to the F-14 could be resold to Iran. The text of this bill was included in the fiscal year 2008 defense authorization bill, H.R. 1585, as section 1049.

The House Armed Services Committee approved the language in its markup of that bill, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has already marked up the specific bill and has reported it favorably.

Mr. Speaker, we must take the responsibility to ensure that our military hardware never falls into the hands of nations hostile to the United States and can never be used against our men and women in uniform and not used against our allies.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1441.

I include for the RECORD an exchange of letters related to this bill between Chairman SKELTON of the Armed Services Committee and Chairman LANTOS of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

JUNE 8, 2007.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, On March 27, 2007, the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered reported favorably H.R. 1441, "The Stop Arming Iran Act." This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Armed Services, and thus, was sequentially referred to the Committee on Armed Services by the Parliamentarian for the House.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1441 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over this legislation, the Committee on Armed Services will waive further consideration of H.R. 1441. I do so with the understanding that by waiving further consideration of the bill, the Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claims over similar measures. In the event of a conference with the Senate on this bill, the Committee on Armed Services

reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees.

I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter and a copy of the response in your Committee's report on H.R. 1441 and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON
Chairman.

JUNE 8, 2007.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1441, an Act to Strengthen Controls on the Export of Surplus F-14 Fighter Aircraft Parts.

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

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

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in any Committee report on the bill and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the time of consideration by the whole House. I look forward to working with you on this important legislation.

Cordially,

TOM LANTOS,
Chairman.

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

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

I would like to thank Representative GIFFORDS for her leadership on this issue, as well as Chairman LANTOS for sponsoring the committee amendment clarifying the intent and impact of this legislation.

Earlier this year as a result of the Federal sting operation, Congress learned that Iran had illegally purchased parts for F-14 fighter planes from a U.S. military surplus store. According to investigators, the incident was just one piece of a larger ring of illegally sold military surplus parts that found their way to China and Iran.

The report prompted the Pentagon's Defense Logistics Agency to suspend sales of the F-14 components.

□ 1600

Military surplus offices are supposed to demilitarize parts, which would render them useless for military purposes.

They are also allowed to auction the parts but only to buyers who promise to obey U.S. arms embargoes, export controls, and other laws. That was not the case, however, with these particular F-14 parts.

As Members are aware, Tehran is in search of several key components for

its aging fleet of F-14 Tomcat jets, which the United States sold to Iran prior to its 1979 Islamic revolution. This bill will add another layer of protection to the extensive array of export sanctions already imposed on Iran under the International Economic Emergency Powers Act and related executive orders.

The committee amendment recognizes these facts and adjusts the title of the bill to more accurately reflect the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, given the clear and present danger Iran poses to the national security interests of the United States and to the broader peace and stability of the Middle East, this is an appropriate and timely measure for our consideration today.

I want to thank again Ms. GIFFORDS and Mr. PEARCE, and I support the adoption of the resolution.

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

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his comments, and I indeed think that this is an important piece of legislation that will further support our interests abroad and make sure that parts like the F-14 Tomcat are not sold to the Iranians.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, we must utilize every resource available while fighting the Global War on Terror. Currently, we are fighting two major combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan which are critical to implementing democracy and peace throughout the Middle East. In both these areas we have a common enemy that continues to increase its forces. Recent reports have shown that Iran is supplying arms to both the terrorists in Iraq and the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Every night on the news we see the price we pay in a two front war against a sinister and studious enemy. It is difficult enough to fight an insurgency inspired by hatred, let alone an enemy supported by a sovereign nation such as Iran.

Reports of Iranian weapons and funds surfacing both in Iraq and Afghanistan are indicators that Iran is willing to use other countries to attack American interests without having to sacrifice their own sons and daughters. We are fighting a cowardly enemy which uses others to do its dirty work for them. This is state sponsored terrorism and we must take steps to cut off the resources they use to fund our enemies.

In addition, under the guise of energy development, Iran continues a program that puts them closer and closer to developing weapons grade plutonium. I have severe reservations allowing this program continue until Iranian President Ahmadinejad can unequivocally prove that he does not have intentions of someday creating and using a nuclear warhead against the United States, Israel, Europe or other Allies.

This legislation is crucial in the Global War on Terror because it is a tangible indicator to Iran, and all other nations which harbor or sponsor terrorist tactics in any form, that we will not allow the violence to escalate any further. By preventing the sale of F-14s in whole or part to Iran we will be cutting off the supply of arms that may someday be used to kill American soldiers.

I congratulate my colleague and Congressional neighbor from Arizona for her hard work and dedication to this issue. It is important for our safety as a country, as well as the world's freedom from terrorism, that we cut off the supply of F-14 parts to Iran. I call to my friends on both sides of the aisle for overwhelming bipartisan support of this legislation.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. 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 Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1441, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to strengthen controls on the export of surplus parts for F-14 fighter aircraft."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF OF HON. JO ANN DAVIS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Chris Connelly, Chief of Staff, Office of the Honorable JO ANN DAVIS, Member of Congress:

JUNE 7, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Circuit Court of the City of Richmond, Virginia, for documents in a civil case.

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

Sincerely,

CHRIS CONNELLY, Chief of Staff.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JUNE 6, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702, I hereby appoint as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress the following person: Mr. Bernard Forrester, Houston, Texas.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER, Clerk.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2638, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-184) on the resolution (H. Res. 473) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2638) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, 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, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2356, by the yeas and nays;

S. 676, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 418, by the yeas and nays.

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

ENCOURAGING DISPLAY OF THE FLAG ON FATHER'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2356, 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 Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2356.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 0, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 448] YEAS—386

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann

Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra

Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer

Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest

Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery

McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner

Serrano	Tancredo	Wasserman	Bachus	Etheridge	Lowe	Royce	Slaughter	Visclosky
Sestak	Tanner	Schultz	Baird	Fallin	Lucas	Ruppersberger	Smith (NE)	Walberg
Shays	Tauscher	Waters	Baker	Farr	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Shea-Porter	Taylor	Watson	Baldwin	Fattah	E.	Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Walsh (NY)
Sherman	Terry	Watt	Barrett (SC)	Ferguson	Lynch	Salazar	Snyder	Walz (MN)
Shimkus	Thompson (CA)	Waxman	Barrow	Filner	Mack	Sali	Solis	Wasserman
Shuler	Thompson (MS)	Weiner	Bartlett (MD)	Flake	Mahoney (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Souder	Schultz
Shuster	Thornberry	Welch (VT)	Bean	Forbes	Maloney (NY)	T.	Spratt	Waters
Simpson	Tiahrt	Weldon (FL)	Becerra	Fortenberry	Manzullo	Sanchez, Loretta	Stearns	Watson
Sires	Tiberi	Weller	Berkley	Fossella	Markey	Sarbanes	Stupak	Watt
Skelton	Tierney	Westmoreland	Berman	Fox	Marshall	Saxton	Sullivan	Waxman
Slaughter	Towns	Whitfield	Berry	Frank (MA)	Matheson	Schakowsky	Sutton	Weller
Smith (NE)	Turner	Wicker	Biggert	Franks (AZ)	Matsui	Schiff	Tancredo	Weiner
Smith (NJ)	Udall (NM)	Wilson (NM)	Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt	Tanner	Welch (VT)
Smith (TX)	Upton	Wilson (OH)	Bilirakis	Gallely	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz	Tauscher	Weldon (FL)
Snyder	Van Hollen	Wilson (SC)	Bishop (NY)	Garrett (NJ)	McCauley (TX)	Scott (GA)	Taylor	Weller
Solis	Velázquez	Wolf	Blackburn	Gerlach	McCollum (MN)	Scott (VA)	Terry	Westmoreland
Souder	Walberg	Woolsey	Blumenauer	Giffords	McCotter	Sensenbrenner	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Spratt	Walden (OR)	Wu	Blunt	Gilchrest	McCrery	Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Stearns	Walsh (NY)	Wynn	Boehner	Gillibrand	McDermott	Sestak	Thornberry	Wilson (OH)
Stupak	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth	Bonner	Gillmor	McGovern	Shays	Tiahrt	Wilson (NM)
Sullivan		Young (AK)	Bono	Gingrey	McHenry	Shea-Porter	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Sutton		Young (FL)	Boozman	Gohmert	McHugh	Sherman	Tierney	Wolf
			Boren	Gonzalez	McIntyre	Shimkus	Towns	Woolsey
			Boswell	Goode	McKeon	Shuler	Turner	Wu
			Boustany	Goodlatte	McMorris	Shuster	Udall (NM)	Wynn
			Boyd (FL)	Granger	Rodgers	Simpson	Upton	Yarmuth
			Boyd (KS)	Graves	McNerney	Sires	Van Hollen	Young (AK)
			Brady (PA)	Green, Al	McNulty	Skelton	Velázquez	Young (FL)
			Brady (TX)	Green, Gene	Meehan			
			Braley (IA)	Grijalva	Meek (FL)			
			Brown (SC)	Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)			
			Brown-Waite,	Hall (TX)	Melancon			
			Ginny	Hare	Mica			
			Buchanan	Hastert	Michaud			
			Burgess	Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Akin	Doolittle	King (NY)
			Burton (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Allen	Doyle	Larson (CT)
			Butterfield	Hayes	Miller (NC)	Barton (TX)	Edwards	Marchant
			Buyer	Heller	Miller (NY)	Bishop (GA)	Everett	Murtha
			Calvert	Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Pascrell
			Camp (MI)	Herge	Miller, George	Boucher	Gordon	Radanovich
			Cannon	Herseth Sandlin	Mitchell	Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Rush
			Cantor	Higgins	Mollohan	Campbell (CA)	Harman	Sessions
			Capito	Hill	Moore (KS)	Costa	Hinojosa	Shadegg
			Capps	Hinche	Moore (WI)	Crowley	Hookey	Smith (WA)
			Capuano	Hirono	Moran (KS)	Cubin	Hunter	Space
			Cardoza	Hobson	Moran (VA)	Culberson	Israel	Stark
			Carnahan	Hodes	Murphy (CT)	Davis (IL)	Johnson (IL)	Udall (CO)
			Carney	Hoekstra	Murphy, Patrick	Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, E. B.	Wamp
			Carson	Holden	Murphy, Tim	Davis, Lincoln	Kagen	Wexler
			Carter	Holt	Musgrave			
			Castle	Honda	Myrick			
			Castor	Hoyer	Nadler			
			Chabot	Hulshof	Napolitano			
			Chandler	Inglis (SC)	Neal (MA)			
			Clarke	Inslee	Neugebauer			
			Clay	Issa	Nunes			
			Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar			
			Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Obey			
			Coble	(TX)	Olver			
			Cohen	Jefferson	Ortiz			
			Cole (OK)	Jindal	Pallone			
			Conaway	Johnson (GA)	Pastor			
			Conyers	Johnson, Sam	Paul			
			Cooper	Jones (NC)	Payne			
			Costello	Jones (OH)	Pearce			
			Courtney	Jordan	Pence			
			Cramer	Kanjorski	Perlmutter			
			Crenshaw	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)			
			Cuellar	Keller	Peterson (PA)			
			Cummings	Kennedy	Petri			
			Davis (AL)	Kildee	Pickering			
			Davis (CA)	Kilpatrick	Pitts			
			Davis (KY)	Kind	Platts			
			Davis, David	King (IA)	Poe			
			Davis, Tom	Kingston	Pomeroy			
			Deal (GA)	Kirk	Porter			
			DeFazio	Klein (FL)	Price (GA)			
			DeGette	Kline (MN)	Price (NC)			
			Delahunt	Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)			
			DeLauro	Kuhl (NY)	Putnam			
			Dent	LaHood	Rahall			
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Lamborn	Ramstad			
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Lampson	Rangel			
			Dicks	Langevin	Regula			
			Dingell	Lantos	Rehberg			
			Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Reichert			
			Donnelly	Latham	Renzi			
			Drake	LaTourrette	Reyes			
			Dreier	Lee	Reynolds			
			Duncan	Levin	Rodriguez			
			Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)			
			Ellison	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)			
			Ellsworth	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)			
			Emanuel	Linder	Rohrabacher			
			Emerson	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen			
				LoBiondo	Roskam			
				Loebsack	Ross			
				Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman			
					Roybal-Allard			

NOT VOTING—46

Akin	Doolittle	Kucinich
Allen	Doyle	Larson (CT)
Barton (TX)	Edwards	Marchant
Bishop (GA)	Everett	Pascrell
Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Radanovich
Boucher	Gordon	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Sessions
Campbell (CA)	Harman	Shadegg
Carson	Hinojosa	Smith (WA)
Costa	Hookey	Space
Crowley	Hunter	Stark
Cubin	Israel	Udall (CO)
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Wamp
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Wexler
Davis, Jo Ann	Kagen	
Davis, Lincoln	King (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1856

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.” So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING THAT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK MAY SERVE ON BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 676, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 676.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 1, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

YEAS—386

Abercrombie	Alexander	Arcuri
Ackerman	Altmire	Baca
Aderholt	Andrews	Bachmann

NAYS—1

Kucinich

NOT VOTING—45

Akin	Doolittle	King (NY)
Allen	Doyle	Larson (CT)
Barton (TX)	Edwards	Marchant
Bishop (GA)	Everett	Murtha
Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Pascrell
Boucher	Gordon	Radanovich
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Rush
Campbell (CA)	Harman	Sessions
Costa	Hinojosa	Shadegg
Crowley	Hookey	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Hunter	Space
Culberson	Israel	Stark
Davis (IL)	Johnson (IL)	Udall (CO)
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, E. B.	Wamp
Davis, Lincoln	Kagen	Wexler

□ 1905

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING AND WELCOMING THE DELEGATION OF PRESIDENTS, PRIME MINISTERS, AND FOREIGN MINISTERS FROM THE CARIBBEAN TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 418, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 418.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 0, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—386

Abercrombie	Alexander	Arcuri
Ackerman	Altmire	Baca
Aderholt	Andrews	Bachmann

Bachus	Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger	Smith (NE)	Visclosky
Baird	Etheridge	Lowey	Ryan (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Walberg
Baker	Fallin	Lucas	Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Walden (OR)
Baldwin	Farr	Lungren, Daniel	Salazar	Snyder	Walsh (NY)
Barrett (SC)	Fattah	E.	Sali	Solis	Walz (MN)
Barrow	Ferguson	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda	Souder	Wasserman
Bartlett (MD)	Filner	Mack	T.	Space	Schultz
Bean	Flake	Mahoney (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Spratt	Waters
Becerra	Forbes	Maloney (NY)	Sarbanes	Stearns	Watson
Berkley	Fortenberry	Markey	Saxton	Stupak	Watt
Berman	Fossella	Marshall	Schakowsky	Sullivan	Waxman
Berry	Fox	Matheson	Schiff	Sutton	Weiner
Biggert	Frank (MA)	Matsui	Schmidt	Tancredo	Welch (VT)
Bilbray	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Schwartz	Tanner	Weldon (FL)
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (GA)	Tauscher	Weller
Bishop (NY)	Gallely	McCaul (TX)	Scott (VA)	Taylor	Westmoreland
Blackburn	Garrett (NJ)	McCollum (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Terry	Whitfield
Blumenauer	Gerlach	McCotter	Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Wicker
Blunt	Giffords	McCrery	Sestak	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (NM)
Boehner	Gilchrest	McDermott	Shays	Thornberry	Wilson (OH)
Bonner	Gillibrand	McGovern	Shea-Porter	Tiahrt	Wilson (SC)
Bono	Gillmor	McHenry	Sherman	Tiberi	Wolf
Boozman	Gingrey	McHugh	Shimkus	Tierney	Woolsey
Boren	Gohmert	McIntyre	Shuler	Turner	Wu
Boswell	Gonzalez	McKeon	Shuster	Turner	Wynn
Boucher	Goode	McMorris	Simpson	Udall (NM)	Yarmuth
Boustany	Goodlatte	Rodgers	Sires	Upton	Young (AK)
Boyd (FL)	Granger	McNerney	Skelton	Van Hollen	Young (FL)
Boyd (KS)	Graves	McNulty	Slaughter	Velázquez	
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	Meehan			
Brady (TX)	Green, Gene	Meeke (FL)			
Braley (IA)	Grijalva	Meeks (NY)	Akin	Edwards	Manzullo
Brown (SC)	Hall (NY)	Melancon	Allen	Everett	Marchant
Brown-Waite,	Hall (TX)	Mica	Barton (TX)	Feeney	Murtha
Ginny	Hare	Michaud	Bishop (GA)	Gordon	Pascrell
Buchanan	Hastert	Miller (FL)	Bishop (UT)	Gutierrez	Radanovich
Burgess	Hastings (FL)	Miller (MI)	Brown, Corrine	Harman	Rangel
Burton (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Miller (NC)	Campbell (CA)	Hinojosa	Rush
Butterfield	Hayes	Miller, Gary	Costa	Hooley	Sessions
Buyer	Heller	Miller, George	Crowley	Hunter	Shadegg
Calvert	Hensarling	Mitchell	Cubin	Israel	Smith (WA)
Camp (MI)	Herger	Mollohan	Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Stark
Cannon	Herseht Sandlin	Moore (KS)	Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Udall (CO)
Cantor	Higgins	Moore (WI)	Davis, Jo Ann	Kagen	Wamp
Capito	Hill	Moran (KS)	Davis, Lincoln	King (NY)	Wexler
Capps	Hinchee	Moran (VA)	Doolittle	Larson (CT)	
Capuano	Hirono	Murphy (CT)	Doyle	Linder	
Cardoza	Hobson	Murphy, Patrick			
Carnahan	Hodes	Murphy, Tim			
Carney	Hoekstra	Musgrave			
Carson	Holden	Myrick			
Carter	Holt	Nadler			
Castle	Honda	Napolitano			
Castor	Hoyer	Neal (MA)			
Chabot	Hulshof	Neugebauer			
Chandler	Inglis (SC)	Nunes			
Clarke	Inslee	Oberstar			
Clay	Issa	Obey			
Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Olver			
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz			
Coble	(TX)	Pallone			
Cohen	Jefferson	Pastor			
Cole (OK)	Jindal	Paul			
Conaway	Johnson (GA)	Payne			
Conyers	Johnson, Sam	Pearce			
Cooper	Jones (NC)	Pence			
Costello	Jones (OH)	Perlmutter			
Courtney	Jordan	Peterson (MN)			
Cramer	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)			
Crenshaw	Kaptur	Petri			
Cuellar	Keller	Pickering			
Cummings	Kennedy	Pitts			
Davis (AL)	Kildee	Platts			
Davis (CA)	Kilpatrick	Poe			
Davis (KY)	Kind	Pomeroy			
Davis, David	King (IA)	Porter			
Davis, Tom	Kingston	Price (GA)			
Deal (GA)	Kirk	Price (NC)			
DeFazio	Klein (FL)	Pryce (OH)			
DeGette	Kline (MN)	Putnam			
Delahunt	Knollenberg	Rahall			
DeLauro	Kucinich	Ramstad			
Dent	Kuhl (NY)	Regula			
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaHood	Rehberg			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lamborn	Reichert			
Dicks	Lampson	Renzi			
Dingell	Langevin	Reyes			
Doggett	Lantos	Reynolds			
Donnelly	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez			
Drake	Latham	Regula			
Dreier	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)			
Duncan	Lee	Rogers (KY)			
Ehlers	Levin	Rogers (MI)			
Ellison	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher			
Ellsworth	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen			
Emanuel	Lewis (KY)	Roskam			
Emerson	Lipinski	Ross			
Engel	LoBiondo	Rothman			
English (PA)	Loebach	Roybal-Allard			
		Royce			

REPORT ON H.R. 2642, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008

Mr. VISCLOSKY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-186) on the bill (H.R. 2642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

□ 1915

PASSPORT PROCESSING BACKLOG

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to raise awareness of an issue in our Texas offices and I think around the country: The significant application backlog in the Houston passport office.

Last Friday morning, a number of Members of Congress from Texas and I went to that office. I call on the administration and the State Department to take the necessary steps to alleviate the backlog.

I know in the Houston office, Jacqueline Harley-Bell, the regional director of the Houston Passport Agency, and the staff have been working long days and weekends, and I commend them for their efforts to serve the public because they are understaffed and overwhelmed by the number of applications they are getting.

The Houston office has already issued nearly 11 million passports in the first 5½ months of 2007. That is 3 million more than the 7.9 million that were issued in all of 2006.

The administration needs to provide the resources necessary now for additional workers or funding, to clear the backlog due to the new requirement that folks traveling in North America by plane need to have a passport.

On Thursday the administration changed the requirement, or delayed it, that individuals flying into Canada, Mexico, the Caribbean and Bermuda must only present a State Department receipt they have applied for a passport through the end of September. But this is much later than it should be. People are standing in line from 2 in the morning. People wait in line to get rock concert tickets, not a passport. I hope the State Department and administration will immediately address this problem.

HONORING JOHN BACH

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the

NOT VOTING—46

Edwards	Manzullo
Everett	Marchant
Feeney	Murtha
Gordon	Pascrell
Gutierrez	Radanovich
Harman	Rangel
Hinojosa	Rush
Hooley	Sessions
Hunter	Shadegg
Israel	Smith (WA)
Johnson (IL)	Stark
Johnson, E. B.	Udall (CO)
Kagen	Wamp
King (NY)	Wexler
Larson (CT)	
Linder	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1912

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was absent from this chamber today, due to a health matter in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 448, 449 and 450.

REPORT ON H.R. 2641, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008

Mr. VISCLOSKY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-185) on the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SUTTON). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to honor John Bach, a pillar of our law enforcement community, and a recent retiree from the Kenton County Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Bach's career is one that embodies dedication and service to this country. From 1966 to 1970, he served with the 777th Tactical Air Squadron based out of Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, and was also part of the 556th Reconnaissance Squadron in southeast Asia.

After completing his military service, John pursued a degree in business that he completed at Northern Kentucky University. John was quick to answer the call to service in our community. Throughout his career in law enforcement, he protected our communities in the line of duty at the Elsmere Police Department, the Boone County Police Department, the Independence Police Department and the Kenton County Sheriff's Department.

I would like to thank John for his brave service to our Nation and for helping to make the communities of northern Kentucky safer for all of our residents as part of local law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, I would like to wish John and his wife, Linda, all the best as they enter this new chapter of their lives.

PASSPORT PROCESSING BACKLOG

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, on Friday I joined Congressman GREEN, who just spoke, and Congresswoman JACKSON-LEE, who will speak shortly, at the Houston passport office.

Some people had been in line for hours, and some of them had driven hundreds of miles. Most were frustrated and confused. Many had applied months ago to comply with the new passport laws, but the last Congress failed to provide Federal agencies the resources they need to uphold our laws.

These passport delays have inconvenienced thousands across our country. Some State Department estimates range up to 12 weeks or even longer to process passport applications, forcing some people to either cancel travel plans or lose deposits.

We can't have homeland security without adequate resources. It is not enough to talk tough, we must follow through. The State Department has said that it would temporarily suspend the law to some countries so Americans can take their trips. Forcing agencies to suspend laws because they lack the capacity to enforce them sets a dangerous precedent.

We need more agents to provide border security, customs and immigration enforcement officers and Federal pros-

ecutors and immigration judges to uphold our laws. Let's fix this problem now before it gets much worse.

NOE ALEMAN—BORDER AGENT

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, Noe Aleman is a 12-year veteran of the U.S. Border Patrol in the El Paso sector. He and his wife, Isbell, who have no children of their own, plan to adopt his wife's three fatherless nieces from Mexico.

They hired a U.S. immigration lawyer and paid him \$40,000 to help with the process. The girls were given temporary visas, but when they expired after 6 months, Agent Aleman went to the immigration service to find out why.

Aleman was arrested for harboring illegals and making false reports on the application. Apparently the lawyer listed the girls as adults instead of minors. In any event, Aleman was prosecuted and convicted. The girls were arrested and deported back to Mexico and live in an orphanage where they have been for 2 years.

Today, Aleman went to a Federal penitentiary. And yes, he was prosecuted by the same U.S. Attorney's Office, the same judge heard the case as the Ramos and Compean cases.

Unfortunately, every time a border agent is prosecuted in the Western District of Texas, the U.S. Attorney's Office has a credibility problem; and this case is automatically suspect and suspicious.

And that's just the way it is.

PASSPORT PROCESSING BACKLOG

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, just last week I joined my colleagues Congressman GENE GREEN and Congressman NICK LAMPSON on trying to address the ongoing crisis in our communities, because we have a regional office for passports. Overnight stays, early morning arrivals, families crying and families not being able to be reunited, people traveling for hundreds of miles, and the reason is passport backlog because of no extra staff.

Let me thank the staff who work so hard to ensure that those who came could be served. We asked the State Department today to provide us with temporary permanent workers to carry out the responsibility.

I would also say if there are waivers now being made for places like the Caribbean and Canada, I would only beg that information be given to travelers so they don't go to the airport and not have the necessary documentation.

Madam Speaker, I close by saying I am reading today as well that the U.S. military is getting ready to arm the

Sunnis. I would say if the Iraq war has come to this, it is time to bring our soldiers home. This is not the way to run a war.

HONORING SOUTHCO AS ROLE MODEL

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

Mr. KUHL of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the special environmental achievements of a vibrant small business located in my district.

Southco, a manufacturer of access hardware, has reduced the amount of hazardous waste it generates from more than 3,200 pounds in 2002 to zero just 3 years later in 2005. Through systematic changes in their manufacturing process, they have completely ceased producing hazardous waste.

Moreover, Southco has committed to reducing its consumption of electricity by 15 percent over the next 3 years. Clearly Southco is a role model for our Nation's businesses when it comes to preserving our precious resources. There is a lot of talk about environmental conservation and energy independence, but through innovative thinking, Southco has delivered tangible results in the private sector and provided an excellent example.

This month, the Environmental Protection Agency has made Southco a member of its National Environmental Performance Track Program, designed to honor leaders who have demonstrated a commitment to reducing their negative impact on the environment.

I would like to personally thank Southco for being an excellent corporate citizen.

Madam Speaker, Southco is a leader in these efforts, and deserves our praise for its forward-thinking, socially conscious practices.

CONGRATULATING THE CEDAR VALLEY, IOWA

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening as a proud resident of Waterloo, Iowa. Recently, Forbes named the Waterloo-Cedar Falls metro area as the "13th best place for business and careers" among small metro areas in the United States.

There is nothing unlucky about this number 13. I have lived in Waterloo for almost 25 years, and I can tell you from experience that the people of the Cedar Valley have made all of the difference there. The last decade has brought a renewed commitment to civic improvement, and these investments have paid off.

Investments in things like good schools, an expanding workforce and an

improved infrastructure have clearly played a big part of this recognition. Businesses are attracted to the skilled, smart and hardworking workforce of the Cedar Valley, ranked number 49 because of educational attainment.

It is clear to me that more and more people are catching on to what the Cedar Valley has to offer. I congratulate my neighbors in Waterloo and Cedar Falls.

HONORING HORACE LIVINGSTON AND WILLIAM DEMPSEY

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

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor two great community leaders from Decatur, Illinois.

Horace "Buck" Livingston is a local civil rights activist who sought higher-paying jobs and better education for African Americans. For over 40 years, he has published the African American Voice, the only African American newspaper within 150 miles of Decatur, Illinois. His tireless efforts continue to strengthen our community and give all of us hope for a better future.

William "Skip" Dempsey, my brother in the labor movement, sadly passed away on April 13. After teaching at Purdue University, Skip served for over 12 years as training coordinator for Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 65. He continued his leadership as a business agent, advancing education, economic growth, and the building trades in the Decatur area. Skip's valuable service will be sorely missed.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary and unselfish contributions of Buck Livingston and Skip Dempsey.

ARMING SUNNI GROUPS IS LUNACY

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in the wake of news that comes to us that the United States will now have as a policy in Iraq the arming of Sunni groups who have admittedly killed and maimed Americans. We have now reached the point of public-political lunacy.

Representative PAUL, myself, Representative JONES and others have entered a bill for consideration of the House that will cause us to have to reauthorize this war. Any conceivable reason for having allowed the President to enter into this war with the enabling resolution that we passed has now been accomplished; any "whereas," any "be it resolved" of that resolution is now moot.

In order for any of us to justify spending one more penny or commit-

ting one more soldier of the United States into this war, we have to have an up-or-down vote on whether it should be authorized.

Arming Sunni groups that have murdered U.S. service men and women as a policy, a strategy, is without merit and devoid of any political sensibility.

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SUTTON). 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.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2007 AND 2008 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2008 THROUGH FY 2012

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

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 and for the 5-year period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and sections 204, 206 and 207 of S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature. The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by S. Con. Res. 21. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels.

The second table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The third table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under S. Con. Res. 21 for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 and fiscal years 2008 through 2012. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure.

The fourth table gives the current level for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 for accounts iden-

tified for advance appropriations under section 206 of S. Con. Res. 21. This list is needed to enforce section 206 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that: (i) Are not identified in the statement of managers; or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2008 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

(Reflecting Action Completed as of June 8, 2007—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year— 2007	Fiscal year— 2008 ¹	Fiscal years— 2008–2012
Appropriate Level:			
Budget authority	2,255,558	2,350,261	2
Outlays	2,268,646	2,353,893	2
Revenues	1,900,340	2,015,841	11,137,671
Current Level:			
Budget authority	2,255,558	1,422,153	2
Outlays	2,268,646	1,767,190	2
Revenues	1,904,540	2,050,461	11,313,270
Current Level over (+) / under			
(–) Appropriate Level:			
Budget authority	0	–928,108	2
Outlays	0	–586,703	2
Revenues	4,200	34,620	175,599

¹ Pending action by the House Appropriations Committee on spending covered by section 207(d)(1)(E) (overseas deployments and related activities), resolution assumptions are not included in the appropriate level.
² = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2009 through 2012 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing any new budget authority for FY 2007 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 21.

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2008 in excess of \$928,108,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2008 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 21.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing any new outlays for FY 2007 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 21.

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2008 in excess of \$586,703,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2008 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 21.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for FY 2007 in excess of \$4,200,000,000 (if not already included in the current estimate) would cause FY 2007 revenue to fall below the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 21.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for FY 2008 in excess of \$34,620,000,000 (if not already included in the current estimate) would cause FY 2008 revenue to fall below the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 21.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012 in excess of \$175,599,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by S. Con. Res. 21.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of June 8, 2007 (H. Rpt. 110-182)		Current level reflecting action completed as of June 8, 2007		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	18,569	19,356	18,569	19,356	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	51,950	52,236	51,950	52,236	0	0
Defense	489,519	499,510	489,519	499,510	0	0
Energy and Water Development	30,296	29,882	30,296	29,882	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	19,488	20,360	19,488	20,360	0	0
Homeland Security	33,962	41,195	33,962	41,195	0	0
Interior, Environment	26,411	27,569	26,411	27,569	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	144,766	145,567	144,766	145,567	0	0
Legislative Branch	3,774	3,950	3,774	3,950	0	0
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs	49,752	46,889	49,752	46,889	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	31,358	35,186	31,358	35,186	0	0
Transportation, HUD	50,471	107,765	50,471	107,765	0	0
Unassigned (full committee allowance)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	950,316	1,029,465	950,316	1,029,465	0	0

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(B) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of June 8, 2007 (H. Rpt. 110-183)		Current level reflecting action completed as of June 8, 2007		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	18,825	20,027	7	5,437	-18,818	-14,590
Commerce, Justice, Science	53,551	55,318	0	20,389	-53,551	-34,929
Defense	459,332	475,980	45	163,824	-459,287	-312,156
Energy and Water Development	31,603	32,774	0	13,178	-31,603	-19,596
Financial Services and General Government	21,028	21,650	80	4,323	-20,948	-17,327
Homeland Security	36,254	38,247	0	17,112	-36,254	-21,135
Interior, Environment	27,598	28,513	0	11,198	-27,598	-17,315
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	151,112	148,433	19,151	100,179	-131,961	-48,254
Legislative Branch	4,024	4,036	0	606	-4,024	-3,430
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs	64,745	54,831	-2,414	14,260	-67,159	-40,571
State, Foreign Operations	34,243	33,351	0	16,407	-34,243	-16,944
Transportation, HUD	50,738	114,869	4,193	71,015	-46,545	-43,854
Unassigned (full committee allowance)	0	369	0	0	0	-369
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	953,053	1,028,398	21,062	437,928	-931,991	-590,470

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 8, 2007

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2007		2008		2008-2012 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:						
Allocation	0	0	-50	-50	-410	-410
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	50	50	410	410
Education and Labor:						
Allocation	0	0	-150	-150	-750	-750
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	150	150	750	750
Energy and Commerce:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial Services:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foreign Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
House Administration:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Resources:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oversight and Government Reform:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Science and Technology:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small Business:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 8, 2007—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2007		2008		2008–2012 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation	0	0	125	0	1,525	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	-125	0	-1,525	0
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0

FY2009 AND 2010 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 206 OF S. CON. RES. 21 [Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars]

	2009	2010
Appropriate Level:	25,558	25,558
Accounts Identified for Advances:		
Corporation for Public Broadcasting Employment and Training Administration	400	0
Education for the Disadvantaged ...	0	0
School Improvement	0	0
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	0	0
Special Education	0	0
Vocational and Adult Education	0	0
Payment to Postal Service	0	0
Section 8 Renewals	0	0

U.S. CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, Washington, DC, June 11, 2007.

Hon. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., Chairman, Committee on the Budget House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2007 budget and is current through June 8, 2007. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, as approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Pursuant to section 204(b) of S. Con. Res. 21, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the en-

closed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 1 of the report).

Since my last letter, dated January 4, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2007:

The Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 110-5); and

The U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28).

The effects of the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 are identified separately in the enclosed report. The effect of the Continuing Resolution is included in the "previously enacted" section of the report, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

Sincerely,

PETER R. ORSZAG, Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2007 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JUNE 8, 2007

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous session:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,904,706
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,350,273	1,299,295	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	1,477,616	1,540,849	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-571,507	-571,507	n.a.
Total enacted in previous session	2,256,382	2,268,637	1,904,704
Enacted this session:			
Appropriation Acts: U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28) ¹	-794	9	-166
Total, enacted this session	-794	9	-166
Entitlements and mandatories: Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	-30	0	0
Total Current Level ^{1,2}	2,255,558	2,268,646	1,904,540
Total Budget Resolution	2,380,535	2,300,572	1,900,340
Adjustment to budget resolution for emergency requirements ³	-124,789	-31,926	0
Adjustment to the budget resolution pursuant to section 207(f) ⁴	-188	0	0
Adjusted Budget Resolution	2,255,558	2,268,646	1,900,340
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	4,200
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

¹ Pursuant to section 204(b) of S. Con. Res. 21 the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, as approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. The amounts so designated for fiscal year 2007, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28)	120,803	31,116	n.a.
--	---------	--------	------

² Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

³ S. Con. Res. 21 assumed \$124,789 million in budget authority and \$31,926 million in outlays from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in P.L. 110-28 (see footnote 1 above), at the direction of the House Committee on the Budget, budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison.

⁴ Pursuant to section 207(f) of S. Con. Res. 21, the House Committee on the Budget adjusts the budget authority to reflect the difference between the amount assumed in the budget resolution for nonemergency supplemental appropriations in fiscal year 2007 and the amount actually appropriated for nonemergency purposes.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

U.S. CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, Washington, DC, June 11, 2007.

Hon. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2008 budget and is current through June 8, 2007. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of sec-

tion 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, as approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Pursuant to section 204(b) of S. Con. Res. 21, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of

the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 1 of the report). This is my first report for fiscal year 2008.

Sincerely,

PETER R. ORSZAG.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2008 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JUNE 8, 2007

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
(In millions of dollars)			
Enacted in previous session:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,050,796
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,450,532	1,390,018	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	419,862	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-575,635	-575,635	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous session	874,897	1,234,245	2,050,796
Enacted this session:			
Appropriation Acts: U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28) ¹	1	42	-335
Total, enacted this session	1	42	-335
Entitlements and mandates: Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	547,255	532,903	0
Total Current Level ^{1,2}	1,422,153	1,767,190	2,050,461
Total Budget Resolution	2,496,028	2,469,636	2,015,858
Adjustment to budget resolution for emergency requirements ³	-606	-49,990	n.a.
Adjustment to the budget resolution pursuant to section 207(f) ⁴	1	1	-17
Adjustment to the budget resolution pursuant to section 207(d)(1)(E) ⁵	-145,162	-65,754	n.a.
Adjusted Budget Resolution	2,350,261	2,353,893	2,015,841
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	34,620
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution	928,108	586,703	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2008-2012:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	11,313,270
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	11,137,725
Adjustment to the budget resolution pursuant to section 207(f) ⁴	n.a.	n.a.	-54
Adjusted Budget Resolution		n.a.	11,137,671
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	175,599
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.
¹ Pursuant to section 204(b) of S. Con. Res. 21 the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, as approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. The amounts so designated for fiscal year 2008, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:
 U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (p.L. 110-28) 605 48,639 n.a.
² Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.
³ S. Con. Res. 21 assumed \$606 million in budget authority and \$49,990 million in outlays from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in P.L. 110-28 (see footnote 1 above), at the direction of the House Committee on the Budget, budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison.
⁴ Pursuant to section 207(f) of S. Con. Res. 21, the House Committee on the Budget adjusts budget authority and outlays to reflect the difference between the amount assumed in the budget resolution for nonemergency supplemental appropriations in fiscal year 2007 and the amount actually appropriated for nonemergency purposes.
⁵ Section 207(d)(1)(E) of S. Con. Res. 21 assumed \$145,162 million in budget authority and \$65,754 million in outlays for overseas deployment and related activities. Pending action by the House Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on the Budget has directed that these amounts be excluded from the budget resolution aggregates in the current level report.
 Source: Congressional Budget Office.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the great giveaway of American land has not occurred. The Amnesty International plan to grant legal permanent residents to 12 to 20 million illegal people from all over the world did not succeed in the Senate, and rightfully so.

The bill that the Senate tried to push off on the American public was too massive, too complicated, too long. It was almost longer than the Bible and had less to say.

Madam Speaker, the American people get it. They understand that the first problem that has to be solved is the border. Border security is the number one issue. The Federal Government, our government, the most powerful superpower that has ever existed, cannot protect the borders. Or is it that they don't protect the borders or refuse to protect the borders?

The American public want our borders secure before we start talking about immigration, whether it's legal or illegal. And that's what our Federal Government should do, simply follow the law that's already existing.

We have enough laws now to protect the border, but for some reason, the law does not get enforced by the executive department. We hear all kinds of reasons why it doesn't occur, but the bottom line is our borders are porous, on the northern border and on the

southern border, and the first duty of government is to protect the people, and that means protect our borders and protect it first. When we solve that problem, then we can move on to the other issues.

And the second issue is not what to do with the people that are here illegally. We first close the gap, close the border, keep people from coming here illegally, but the next thing we have to deal with is the immigration service. It's in chaos, it's in turmoil, and this last week's example is a perfect example.

The passport service. Now, the law requires that all Americans traveling anywhere, including Mexico, Canada and the Caribbean islands, have passports. Congress passed that law 3 years ago. The Federal Government, the executive branch, had 3 years to get ready to make sure that Americans had those passports, and sure enough, 2007 came, Americans were following the law. They started applying for passports, and all of the sudden, there are lines all over the United States for people waiting for their passports. First it was 4 weeks; then it was 6 weeks. Now, it's 3 months to 5 months. The Federal Government cannot even process a simple passport for an American citizen, and it is a relatively simple process to deal with a passport.

And now, what has happened? The Federal Government says, well, since we can't follow the law, we'll suspend the law until we're able to get it together. Now, it's not the fault of those

workers in the passport office. They're working as long as they can, as hard as they can, but those people that run the passport office, the Federal bureaucrats, never were organized enough to make sure that Americans, in a streamlined process, could get passports.

So now the law's not going to be followed until the passport service gets it together, and that's very unfortunate because the problem is we're going to use this same department, the immigration service, to so-called legally legalize the 12 to 20 million people in the amnesty bill, the so-called Z visas which are very complicated to understand, something that will take a lot longer to process than a passport. So the Z visas for 12 to 20 million illegals will take forever to process if we ever go to that service.

What I'm saying, Madam Speaker, is we deal with the border first. Second, we fix and streamline the immigration service so it doesn't discriminate against people who are coming to the United States legally, that we make it efficient for Americans to travel abroad. And once we fix that problem, then down the road we deal with the third issue, the issue of what to do with people that are here illegally.

Until we take it in that order, until Congress addresses those three respective acts with three bills, we will never solve the problem. And a massive, so-called immigration reform bill, the American public is suspect and skeptical of that plan because, frankly, I

don't think the American public trusts the Federal Government to do the job of securing the border and reforming the immigration service.

But we know that the Federal Government does have the capability to grant amnesty to people that are here illegally. So, hopefully, Congress will do its job, get organized, pass three separate bills so that we have border security; that we have an efficient, workable immigration services; and then down the road, we deal with what to do with the people that are here illegally in the U.S.

The American public expect it. They have expected it for a long time, and it's time for us to get about the people's business and resolve these three problems as efficiently and quickly as we can.

And that's just the way it is.

PRESIDENT SHOULD OVERRULE PROPOSED NEW STRATEGY OF GIVING WEAPONS TO SUNNI ARAB GROUPS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, tonight I rise to demand that President Bush take immediate action as Commander in Chief to overrule a proposed new strategy in Iraq, a proposal that may put our troops in even greater danger in the days ahead.

The New York Times reported this morning that our commanders in Iraq are now planning to give weapons to Sunni Arab groups, weapons that may turn around and be used against our very own troops.

In the past, these Sunni groups have been allied with al Qaeda and have actually been suspected of being involved in attacks upon our troops. So why are we doing this? According to the Times, our commanders have reason to believe that the Sunnis have split with al Qaeda and are now ready to fight on our side. Well, it could be true, but this strategy is fraught with terrible peril for our brave men and women in combat.

The Times reports, "Critics of the strategy, including some American officers, say it could amount to the Americans arming both sides in a future civil war. The United States has spent more than \$15 billion in building up Iraq's Army and police force, whose manpower of 350,000 is heavily Shiite. With little sign of a political accommodation between Shiites and Sunni politicians in Baghdad, there is a risk that any weapons given to Sunni groups will eventually be used against Shiites." And I must mention, our troops will be stuck in the middle, dying for what? Because there is the possibility, says the Times, the weapons could be used against the Americans themselves.

Let me repeat that last sentence, "There is also the possibility the weapons could be used against the Ameri-

cans themselves." That's what the Times had to say.

But first, Madam Speaker, we sent our troops into battle without the proper body armor or vehicle armor. Then we put them in the middle of a bloody civil war they were never trained to fight. Then, when many of them got wounded, we gave them terrible medical treatment at home. Now this is the latest outrage.

Madam Speaker, I do not condemn our commanders in the field for making this decision. They are taking this risk because they are desperate to implement President Bush's hopeless, foolish surge policy, but the surge has not worked, is not working and will not work.

As the Times reports, "An initial decline in sectarian killings in Baghdad in the first two months of the troop buildup has reversed, with growing numbers of bodies showing up each day in the capital. Suicide bombings have dipped in Baghdad, but increased elsewhere, as al Qaeda groups, confronted with great American troop numbers, have shifted their operations elsewhere."

There's only one way, Madam Speaker, out of this. We must bring our troops home, and then we must work with the Iraqi people and we must work with them in a peaceful way to reconstruct their devastated Nation.

Last month, a bill that called for starting the withdrawal of our troops within 90 days received 171 votes in this House. Some pundits were surprised that it received that much support. I wasn't. Opposition to this President's failed foreign policy is growing all over America, and those voices are eventually being heard in this body more and more every day.

Madam Speaker, if American troops are harmed by this new war strategy, then the American people will hold the President accountable. But if we in this House condone it as well, or remain silent, then we will be responsible, too.

Our job is to force this administration to fully fund the plan to bring our troops and our contractors home, home where they are not positioned in the middle of a civil war.

SUPPORTING THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE FOR ACCUSED CAMP PENDLETON TROOPS

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, only those who have been to war can truly understand the hell of war. I have not been to war, but I have spoken to those who have served our country in both Iraq and Afghanistan. I know enough to understand that those who serve in harm's way face grave dangers, and they are under extreme pressure.

Most of us cannot imagine the stress that those in uniform undergo when

they have to make a split-second decision whether to fire or be fired upon, to kill or be killed.

In June 2006, seven Marines and one Navy corpsman from Camp Pendleton were charged with murder in an April 2006 incident involving the death of an Iraqi man. The troops were staking out an intersection while looking for insurgents placing explosives along the road.

The squad of eight is accused of kidnapping the Iraqi man from a nearby home, killing him, and then staging the scene to frame him as an insurgent planting a bomb.

Four of the troops struck plea deals and received sentences of 21 months or less in exchange for their testimony against their squad mates. One of the troops also pled guilty to lesser charges but received an 8-year sentence. The three remaining Marines all face courts martial this summer and life in prison if convicted of premeditated murder.

One of these three Marines is a constituent of Congressman BILL DELAHUNT, who brought the details of this case to my attention.

Madam Speaker, 3 years ago, I came to this floor night after night to speak about what I felt was an unfair prosecution of Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, a Marine who was charged with shooting an insurgent in Iraq. Not because of my concern, but because the charges against Lieutenant Pantano were not justified, the Marine Corps dropped the charges.

Because of my great respect for the men and women who serve in the United States Marine Corps, it is my hope that these Marines will receive the due process and justice they deserve as American citizens and as heroes.

President Teddy Roosevelt once said, "A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards. More than that no man is entitled, and less than that no man shall have."

The same men and women who risk their lives to preserve the rights of all American citizens deserve the protection of those same rights. Those who fight for justice deserve justice in return.

Madam Speaker, our military servicemembers, the military family, and certainly these Marines, deserve no less.

And Madam Speaker, with that, I close by saying, God, please continue to bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and please, God, continue to bless America.

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

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

□ 1945

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH PERU AND PANAMA

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, soon President Bush's administration will force upon this Congress consideration of free trade agreements with Peru and Panama under the fast-track process. That means no amendments allowed here in the Congress.

The bills they will bring before us are modeled on the flawed NAFTA model that have yielded growing trade deficits every year the Bush administration has been in office. We have seen how NAFTA sucked good jobs away from Americans, how it ravaged the Mexican countryside and triggered a flow of illegal immigrants, drugs and violence across our southern border.

Our staggering trade deficit with Mexico continues to grow. This year, we already have a \$21.6 billion deficit with Mexico, and it will continue to swell as communities across the continent face job washout.

If we do not construct a new trade model that takes people into consideration and advocates free trade among free people, then it does not matter how many environmental provisions we may add to trade agreements or how unique the administration claims its labor provisions are.

We are simply extending NAFTA to the rain forest and to more sweat shops because there will be no reliable enforcement.

We have seen the NAFTA model fail in Mexico. We have seen it fail in CAFTA countries. Why should we assume it will be any less disastrous in Peru or Panama?

We cannot fall for empty promises again. When we were told that NAFTA would result in a trade surplus, when we were told that NADBANC would help communities that were faced with job loss with reinvestment, when we were told NAFTA would be beneficial for Mexicans, Canadians, and the legislation passed this Congress, what did we see? Billions and billions of trade deficit dollars racked up.

We have never had a positive trade balance with the NAFTA countries or the CAFTA countries. We saw a washout of jobs in our middle-class communities, and we saw huge and growing protests across Mexico. It's a mistake to pass NAFTA, and it will be a mistake to extend it to other countries without comprehensive and effective reform.

This time Congress must be smarter. We must realize the administration is feeding us empty promises without enforceability and clear benefits. We should have no reason to be fooled again.

Even if we succeed with some changes to the core text of these agreements, do we trust President Bush to

enforce them? We are still waiting for him to enforce the flagrant violations in the Jordanian agreement, where such language was included in the core of the trade agreement.

It is bad enough that his administration has the power to avoid any meaningful congressional amendment or any amendment at all. We cannot trust President Bush with fairly negotiating trade agreements, and we certainly cannot trust him to fairly enforce them.

If Congress passes these agreements with Peru and Panama, we only stand to perpetuate the race to the bottom cycle of lowered wages, reduced benefits worldwide, by taking these steps under the slippery slope of the Bush trade agreement that rewards Wall Street and its investors, but penalizes main streets across our Nation.

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

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

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

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

LET'S BRING OUR SOLDIERS HOME

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, earlier today I made mention of an interesting new theory that is being promoted through the Nation's newspapers, and, certainly, let me acknowledge the respect that we have in this Congress for the United States military and their never-ending challenge and acceptance of responsibility in their work in Iraq and certainly, of course, Afghanistan.

We know that both of those regions are becoming more difficult. In Afghanistan, the Taliban is rising, and, frankly, just recently, there was an attempted assassination attack on President Karzai in Afghanistan with a message from the Taliban saying that "We were involved" and, in essence, "We are on the rise."

In fact, that is where the root of terror is. After 9/11, that is where this Congress almost unanimously instructed the President on behalf of the American people to fight the war on terror, to fight al Qaeda, and to find Osama bin Laden. Unfortunately, this administration has failed, failed its duty to this Nation, and not represented itself to the American people and to this Congress as to what its next steps are with respect to fighting terror.

Now we find ourselves muddling around in Iraq, we are almost to the middle of June, and almost 30 Americans have died in Iraq. This is an unending mission without a mission, an unending story without an end.

Now we read in the Nation's newspaper America's strategy in Iraq to arm the Sunnis. But at the same time as we arm the Sunnis, we are in negotiations with them to promise us that they will not shoot American soldiers.

I believe that this may be a reasonable response to arm Sunnis to fight al Qaeda, to arm Sunnis to engage with the Iraqi National Army. But it is not a reasonable response with American soldiers sitting in the line of fire.

Again, I say, having visited with my constituents over the weekend, having visited with constituents in churches and grocery stores, in meetings, in civic meetings, everywhere I go, in religious institutions or houses of faith, everywhere I go in my congressional district, people are asking the singular question. That is, when are our soldiers going to come home from Iraq?

When I get the loudest applause is when I say that this Congress must bring our soldiers home, and that it is my intention to work with every Member of Congress who is willing to stand up to ensure that our soldiers come home, not because of our job has not been completed, not because our soldiers are not strong, not because our soldiers are wimps, but because, in fact, our soldiers are heroes.

I believe, as in my legislation H.R. 930, that we should bring them home under a military success. They have done their job. They have deposed Saddam Hussein. They have discovered that there were no weapons of mass destruction. They have finished the mission.

We should declare a military victory for those soldiers and those who lost their lives and begin to transfer the leadership of the efforts in Iraq to the Iraqi national Army and the Iraqi national police. I cannot understand this theory, this particular strategy, when our soldiers are still on the ground. All I can see is armed Sunnis, armed al Qaeda, armed Shiites, all pointing guns at our soldiers, who are there, simply, to follow the mission of a President who will not listen.

I am interested in military strategy. I want our military generals to be creative. If they believe that this is an effective tool, then this tool must be utilized without our soldiers, in essence, if I might say, without any disrespect, to be shooting targets or sitting ducks.

This does not seem to be the right kind of approach if our soldiers are still going to be in the midst. Even if they relocate the soldiers out of the particular area, they are still on the ground. Armed Sunnis are armed Sunnis. Armed Sunnis and armed Shiites move around. They don't necessarily have to stay in one area.

I expect that we will have a briefing tomorrow. I hope that they will discuss

with us, the Members of Congress, on behalf of their constituents, what does this mean for the lives of our soldiers? What does this mean for the number of those who have lost their lives already and their brothers and sisters may now be in the greater line of fire with people being armed, and armed with what?

What level of weaponry will they have, and how far will this weaponry be able to go, and what will they be able to do with it? It is obviously a challenge.

It is time to bring our soldiers home. If this is what we are doing, let's transfer the fight to the Iraqi national Army and the Iraqi police.

Let's bring our soldiers home.

REPORT ON H.R. 2643, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. KAPTUR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-187) on the bill (H.R. 2643) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

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

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

U.S. TRADE POLICY

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, it's a great pleasure that we are talking this evening about an issue very important to a lot of us in this Congress, and a lot of folks throughout the United States of America, and that issue is trade.

I would like to yield to a colleague of mine. We came in this Congress together, and she has been very active in the trade deal and has established with me the trade working group in this Congress, Congresswoman LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in addressing the House and the American people regarding U.S. trade policy and its effect on working families.

Let me start by saying, first of all, that I am committed to trade. That's

right, I think that trade is good for America and its working families. If we do it the right way, trade can increase the availability of raw materials for production. Trade can also open markets for American goods and can bring exciting new products to American consumers. While I recognize the benefits of trade, not all trade agreements are created equal.

On May 10, the administration and Members of this House announced a "new policy on trade." Well, it's about time. Democrats have been calling for a new direction in trade for years, and I am pleased that the administration has finally taken initial steps to improve its trade policy.

But, alas, it is too little, too late. This new trade policy is little more than a rehash of the same failed NAFTA model that has been hurting U.S. families for more than a decade. According to the administration, the new additions to the Peru and Panama agreements would add long-sought labor and environmental protections to the basic NAFTA framework.

Unfortunately, even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce says that these new worker and environmental protections can't be enforced. That's not very encouraging, is it? Supporting this new deal requires us to believe in two things: number one, the actual benefits of the NAFTA free trade model; and, number two, the promises of the Bush administration.

We are supposed to trust an administration that has demonstrated its commitment to anything but the truth. Having misled us on issues like domestic wire-tapping programs, the war in Iraq, global warming, and the firing of U.S. attorneys, it now seeks our trust. How are we supposed to trust a record like that?

We have also learned some very hard lessons after more than 10 years of free trade failures. As we hear more familiar promise about the new trade deal, let's look at some of the old ones. NAFTA was supposed to solve illegal integration by developing a robust economy in Mexico that would allow hard-working people to provide for their families and stay at home. Well, that didn't work.

CAFTA was supposed to include bold new safety and wage protections for workers, but these protections are disappointingly weak, allowing countries to downgrade their very own labor laws.

In the Oman Free Trade Agreement, the administration actually negotiated a deal with an opportunity that, as our own State Department reported, was experiencing a forced labor problem—forced labor. How are our workers supposed to compete with people who are forced to toil?

Free trade was supposed to increase economic opportunity for everybody, for big businesses, as well as working families at home and abroad. But it simply hasn't happened.

Too many communities have been left to rot because corporations shut

down U.S. plants to chase increasingly cheap labor and weak environmental protections abroad. After decades of living with NAFTA and its clones, real wages for American families are down. Our trade deficit is in the tens of billions of dollars, and our manufacturing base is falling apart.

The American worker is now more productive than ever, but that increased productivity has not led to a corresponding increase in wages. The truth is that the NAFTA free trade model is designed to favor the wealthiest few and corporate bottom lines at the expense of small businesses, workers, families and communities.

In the coming weeks, we will be asked to consider first two of the Bush administration's trade priorities, free trade agreements with Peru and Panama. Despite the long record of failed free trade agreements, the Bush administration and free traders are going to tell us that Peru and Panama agreements are less controversial than the administration's other priorities, free trade agreements with Colombia and Korea, and the renewal of the President's fast-track negotiating authority.

This is a sign of how bad Peru and Panama trade deals are. Their only redeeming value, it seems, is that they are not as bad as the deals with Korea and Colombia. But that argument misses the point. Every bad trade agreement passed, makes it easier for another bad trade agreement to slip by.

When they say "not that bad," we should say "not good enough." Let's keep our eyes on the ball.

The Peru and Panama free-trade agreements are slippery slopes to other bad deals. Passing these deals makes it easier for the Bush administration to push through the Korea free-trade agreement which would gut the American car industry.

□ 2000

It would make it easier for the White House to push through fast track authority, which gives the President a blank check to create additional agreements that gut our communities and our economy.

Passing the Peru and Panama Free Trade Agreements puts us on a slippery slope toward passing the Bush-Colombia Free Trade Agreement, a deeply flawed trade deal for working families in both countries.

I just returned from Colombia, and this was my second trip in 7 months. On these visits I talked with leaders from civil society, indigenous groups, organized labor and the political opposition.

Colombia is a great country with wonderful people, a vibrant culture and a growing economy. However, Colombia remains the most dangerous country in the world for worker advocates. Despite recent progress, the Colombian Government has still been unable to protect labor organizers from being attacked or killed over any specific

amount of time. The Bush-Colombia Free Trade Agreement will only exacerbate those problems. Without real enforceable worker protections, increasing numbers of Colombian workers will be forced into sweatshop conditions.

The Bush-Colombia FTA will gut Colombia's legitimate agriculture sector. Colombian farmers will be forced to compete with subsidized crops from the United States. Many farmers will be forced to choose between leaving their farms and growing more lucrative drug crops, the very drug crops that we see sending drugs up to the United States.

Free traders are going to say that denying Colombia a free-trade package, after giving similar agreements to its neighbors, will destabilize the Colombian Government and give a victory to Hugo Chavez. They are going to say that it sends a terrible message to an important ally that we still regard Colombia as a pariah state.

They're going to say that if the worker and environmental protections were good enough for Peru and Panama, why not Colombia and Korea?

Here's the bottom line. The Peru and Panama Free Trade Agreements are slippery slopes to more downward pressure on wages and benefits, both here and abroad.

You want to hear the surest sign that the Bush Free Trade Agreement is flawed? He couldn't even pass them when his own party was in control of the Congress. The Peru free trade agreement was signed in April of 2006, and yet the White House couldn't get the Republican majority to move it.

Some might say, we can't afford not to sign free trade agreements. After all, they say, globalization is here to stay. Trade and globalization are here to stay. The question remains, however, can we make them work for working families? And I say, yes, we can.

Trade can benefit our economy and the economist of our trading partners. We can negotiate deals that create new markets, bring new jobs and new prosperity. We can achieve significant new foreign market access and reduce our trade deficit. If we stand united for working Americans, we can deliver a real new deal on trade, not warmed-over promises masquerading as caviar.

Minor adjustments to the NAFTA-style deals are just not good enough. No more agreements based on the failed NAFTA model, no more Fast Track promotion authority. We cannot give this administration, or future ones, a blank check on trade deals that devastate our communities at home.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get off that slippery slope and get on the new path toward trade that promotes development and prosperity for all, not just for the wealthy few.

And I thank my colleague, a real leader on this issue, Mr. MICHAUD, for yielding me time.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Representative SÁNCHEZ. And

you're absolutely right. These trade deals are a slippery slope, and we definitely have to make sure that we change that trade model.

As you know, I spent over 28 years at Great Northern Paper Company in East Millinocket, Maine, like my father before me spent 43 years, my grandfather before him for 40 years.

NAFTA has killed our community. We used to have over 4,500 jobs. It's little over 500 jobs. Small businesses have gone under because the economy has been devastated because of a trade deal. We had unemployment that was over 33 percent.

We had individuals who are proud men and women who worked in the mill, made good wages, good health care benefits, they ended up on the food line. They are so many people that went to the food bank that actually the food bank ran out of food. The whole State chipped in and brought food, churches, communities throughout the State to help the devastation.

And it doesn't end there. If you go 30 miles south, another mill had closed its doors. Another 30 miles south of that, another mill closed its doors because of trade.

Yes, they are getting trade assistance, but they want their jobs. And what are they getting trained for, if there's no jobs to get trained?

So this definitely has caused a huge problem, these bad trade deals in the State of Maine, and people are upset, and rightfully so; and that's why it's important for this Congress to get off that slippery slope and head for a new direction, start a new direction; and that new direction is changing that flawed trade policy.

And I agree 100 percent, it's more than just a couple of Band-Aids. We have to look at the broader aspect of trade.

And I really appreciate your ongoing commitment to do what's right for workers, to do what's right for small businesses in this country, and it's the humanitarian thing to do as well. So thank you very much, Representative SÁNCHEZ, for your leadership in this issue, and I'll look forward to working with you as we move forward to deal with these trade issues.

I now would like to recognize a gentleman who I've really got to enjoy in this Congress, a gentleman who has really been a strong advocate for our veterans, who definitely has been a leader in that area on the Veterans Affairs Committee, but also a gentleman who is extremely interested in the trade issues, knowing what trade has done to his State in Illinois, Congressman PHIL HARE.

Thank you for coming to the floor this evening. I look forward to hearing your remarks as they relate to trade.

Mr. HARE. Thank you very much. And I thank my friend from Maine for his leadership. And as you know, you're my subcommittee chairman on Veterans Health. And you lead and you do a wonderful job on that committee.

And I'm just honored to be able to serve with you.

I want to thank you, and I want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ from California, for her great leadership on this whole issue of trade and protecting American workers and standing up for ordinary people.

I don't have a prepared speech tonight, Madam Speaker. I came here tonight just to kind of have a dialogue for a few minutes and talk about some of these trade deals from the perspective of what I'm hearing back in my district from ordinary people who get up every day, worried whether or not they're going to keep their job.

I think we take a look at Korea. Here we have a trade deal that they are asking us to take a look at and support. 700,000 vehicles entered this country from Korea, yet our automobile manufacturers were allowed, allowed to ship 2,500 cars to Korea. Now, someone tell me if that's remotely close to being a fair trade deal.

I don't have a problem in the world with saying to the Korean government, look, I'm not asking for 700 to 700,000. But when we are only allowed to bring in 2,500 vehicles, compared to importing 700,000, that trade deal is dead on arrival as far as I'm concerned.

Plus, if you look what they're doing to our beef production and in terms of importing beef from this country, that issue is basically dead. Oh, they say they'll talk to us about it. But talk is cheap. And the reality of it is we have yet seen this government be able to move on a trade deal that makes any sense.

You look at Colombia. I was at a trade press conference the other day on Colombia. As you know, as my friend from Maine knows, Madam Speaker, I'm a union member, president, former president of my clothing and textile worker local.

If I had been as vocal for my union in the 13 years that I served in that capacity in Colombia, I probably would have been shot. We've had thousands of people who have been murdered, imprisoned, tortured. This is a government that we're supposed to do business with. We're supposed to trade.

Here we are, the United States, greatest democracy on this planet, and they want us to fashion some type of a trade deal with a country that has paramilitary people go out and assassinate trade unionists and their families. We can do a lot better than that.

I notice the President of Colombia was here just last week, and I echo my colleague,

Representative SCHAKOWSKY's remarks, Madam Speaker, when she said to President Uribe in her remarks saying, come back in a year. Come back in a year and prove to this Congress and prove to the American people that you're serious about these violations; that you're going to prosecute more than 39 people, which is all that's been prosecuted under this government.

My colleague from Maine mentions the loss of textile jobs and paper jobs

and steel jobs. I talked to one of my friends, Representative BUTTERFIELD, and he had, at one time, in one county, in one county in his Congressional district, he had 10,000 textile workers in one county. I said, how many do you have today? And he said, I have zero. They're all gone.

We can do a lot better than this. My basic question to those people who want these trade deals is just simply this. I understand the environmental and the labor standards, and I think those are good frameworks. What I want to know is, in every trade deal, what is the ramifications for our manufacturing base, for our workers and for our farmers?

I think it's a fair question to be able to ask anybody. When I do, I'm told by some folks, well, we're going to redo the trade readjustment for those folks who lose their jobs.

That's little comfort to somebody like Dave Bevard from Galesburg, Illinois. 32 years at Maytag. His wife has cancer. Health care runs out.

And one person suggested that I go back and talk to Dave Bevard and explain to him, if you can believe this, Madam Speaker, I'm supposed to explain to Dave Bevard that there's currency manipulation in China that's causing some of these problems.

And I remember saying to that Member, well, when I do, when I go to Galesburg and say that to Dave Bevard, I'd better be putting a catcher's mask on because I think I'm going to get poked. We can't talk to our workers like that, justify this. Currency manipulation.

I'll tell you why Dave Bevard lost his job; I'll tell you why Maytag went to Sonora, Mexico, because this Congress, under NAFTA, that passed NAFTA, helped those jobs to go to Sonora, Mexico, Madam Speaker. They outsourced those jobs, and this from a company that took \$9 million in Illinois taxpayers' money; and the workers gave, not one, but two wage concessions.

And guess what? The people in Sonora, Mexico can't afford those refrigerators that they're making. In fact, they're coming across the border illegally because they're not making enough money at that factory.

So to my friends at Maytag I would say, thank you for nothing.

Look, I'm a card-carrying capitalist. I've said this many times, Madam Speaker. I want to see businesses make money. But I also want to see a system of fairness in this whole trade thing.

I think it's the minimum we can do is to expect this Congress, that when we negotiate a trade deal, and when we're looking at a trade deal, is to stand up for those very people whose jobs are on the line.

These are veterans who fought and defended this country. These are people who want to put their kids through school. They want to see their kids get married and be able to afford a home. They want to spend some time and be able to retire with some dignity.

Instead, we outsource their jobs. We give them a Trade Readjustment Act that isn't really worth the paper it's written on in the final analysis. It doesn't nearly make it up.

Now I want to say one thing about that before I just conclude here. Some of the workers at Maytag were told, well, we know you're losing your jobs to Mexico, but here's what you should do. Go into a thing like health care. Growing field. My colleague from Maine and I probably ought to take a look at that maybe some day.

But they were told, you need to get into a growing field like health care. So 300 workers, displaced workers at Maytag did just that. That was the good news. They went to school for a year. The bad news was, there was only room for 30 of those workers, 30 of those workers to continue in practicums so that they could practice medicine.

So what was the response to those 270 people who were left out?

Have you thought of going into cosmetology?

Well, that's a wonderful thing. That's a great way to treat workers.

No, they don't think about cosmetology. What they think about is what should have been and what could have been. What should have been was this Congress, this House, should have said no to NAFTA.

And when it did say yes, and I wish I was here, I could have voted against it, should have had a moral obligation to say to those workers, we're going to do everything we can to help you hold on. But it didn't.

And I am saddened that some Members in my own caucus think that every trade deal that comes down is something that we ought to take a look at.

Let me suggest this, and I will close by saying this. I ran on this issue for the United States Congress. I talked about it every candidate forum I had. I had four opponents in the primary, and I ran on this issue of trade.

□ 2015

I said I will support trade as long as it does not outsource our manufacturing base and that American agriculture has a seat at the table. I won that primary, and I went on to the general election, and I ran against someone who supported NAFTA, who supported GAT, CAFTA, supported all these Bush trade deals, and I walked out of that election with 57 percent of the vote. Part of that, I believe, is because the people of the 17th District of Illinois know what it is like. I had six clothing and textile plants in my district. I have three with one ready to go, soon to close.

I say, as long as I am in this Chamber, and I don't know how long that will be, I am not going to vote for a trade deal that will outsource one American job, that will take one farmer for granted, that will tell people you really don't matter because you have

to look at the whole picture. So I say this to Dave Bevard and to those people who may be watching tonight, from this freshman's perspective, and I can't thank Congressman MICHAUD enough for his leadership on this. I met him when I was running for Congress, and I remember one phone call I made to him when I was a candidate, and one of the first questions he asked was, "Where are you on trade?" And I told him and he said, "What can I do to help?" And he has been a wonderful leader on this issue.

And this battle will go on. This hour will end, but the battle will go on. And I am not giving up, and the people that believe that our manufacturing base can be saved, we are not giving up. I am going to support the Patriot Corporation, which helps keep American jobs here and stops giving tax credits to companies that outsource overseas. I want fair trade. I will vote for any trade deal that comes down as long as it meets the criteria that it stands up for ordinary Americans.

With that, I am just honored that I was allowed to participate this evening. Thank you, Congressman MICHAUD.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Congressman HARE. I really appreciate your leadership in this whole trade debate. It is very important, very valuable that we hear freshmen class, and the freshmen class has definitely been pretty vocal on the trade deal.

As I mentioned earlier, if you go anywhere in my district, you will see a lot of abandoned mills. What used to be vibrant, a lot of workers working there, they are no longer there today.

The other issue that is very important, and Congresswoman SANCHEZ actually touched upon it, is immigration. I know the Senate has been talking about immigration quite a bit. We will be talking about it soon. But before I vote for any immigration bill, I will look to see if they are taking care of the fundamental problem in immigration, and that problem is trade.

If you look at the reasons why a lot of undocumented immigrants are coming from Mexico to the United States, they are coming across the border to get a job. And the reason why they are coming across the border to get a job is because they are living in substandard conditions in Mexico.

Let's go back a few years to when NAFTA was passed. One of the arguments why we should pass NAFTA was because all boats will rise here in the United States and in Mexico. And by raising the boats in Mexico, the workers that come across the border illegally will stay because they will have their jobs, they will earn good wages, and there is no need to come across the border. As a matter of fact, at the time Madeline Albright made comments and encouraged Congress to support NAFTA because it will help solve our illegal immigration problems, and she went on to say if it doesn't solve them or help solve them, then we know it is a failed policy.

Well, it is a failed policy. It hasn't helped. It has gotten worse. And this is something, when we talk about immigration, we have to make sure we take care of that fundamental flaw, and that is with our trade deals. If it means voting against the rule when immigration comes up, I am prepared to do that because this issue is so important that we need to change the direction. We have got to get off this slippery slope if we are going to make this country continue to grow.

It is now a great pleasure to introduce a colleague of mine who is very familiar with labor issues, who is definitely taking on a leadership role, along with Congressman HARE from Ohio. Congresswoman SUTTON has been a true leader.

I really appreciate very much, congresswoman, all that you have been doing. You are a tireless advocate for working people here in this country, small businesses here in this country, and I really appreciate the way that you have taken on this leadership role, and I look forward to continuing working with you on issues as it relates to trade and other issues.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, I want to thank my colleagues Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. HARE. You have been leaders in this fight for a new U.S. trade policy for many years to benefit and to help our working men and women, our businesses, and our communities, and we appreciate your efforts. On behalf of the people of the 13th District of Ohio, I appreciate your efforts working to craft a new trade model that won't leave our businesses and our workers at a disadvantage.

And, frankly, last November in the election, the American people cast votes that reflect their desire to put an end to the flawed trade model that has had a devastating impact on our families and businesses and workers and farmers and communities.

And yet we recently heard about a new trade deal, and it has been mentioned here today, revolving around the Peru and Panama Free Trade Agreement. And that recent deal between some congressional leaders and the Bush administration seemingly provides that labor and environmental standards will be added to those two free trade agreements. However, shortly after that announcement was made, reports indicated that those standards might be put into side agreements or side letters, and those statements were made by those who represent the multinational interests who have been benefiting under our current failed trade policies. And they have boasted also about how those standards would not be enforced. And based on this administration's abominable record on enforcing free trade agreements, I think we can all agree that that is what will happen under this administration.

It has been mentioned here today that there was a free trade agreement

with Jordan that was entered into by this country, and there were many who support fair trade, like Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. HARE and me. Of those who support fair trade, some of them saw fit actually to support that free trade agreement with Jordan because it had environmental and labor standards in the agreement.

Well, what we saw is that despite those standards, under this administration, despite records indicating documented cases of child sweatshop labor, among other things, there was no enforcement of the standards. So the fact that they are going to be on paper but not enforced really isn't what I believe the American people had in mind when they voted, and I certainly don't think it is all that we need to be doing in Congress to fix our broken trade system.

Now, in an effort to shut down the debate, oftentimes those who are benefiting under the current trade system characterize those of us who are seeking to fix it as protectionists. They insinuate that we are really against trade and don't understand the realities of globalization. Well, that is incorrect. This isn't about being pro-trade or antitrade. It is about the rules of trade and ensuring that they are fair and enforceable. We need a trade model that truly allows fair competition because we know that if provided that opportunity, we will excel in the global marketplace. And that is the trade model that we are fighting for. We are fighting for a trade model that will not reward companies for moving overseas or outsourcing jobs and will put an enforceable end to illegal foreign subsidies and currency manipulation. We are fighting for a policy that will provide incentives to help our businesses, workers, and communities thrive that will require reciprocity of market access and ensure products produced elsewhere are safe for consumption here.

Now, we agree that we must invest in new technology, innovation, and workforce development, and we have to invest in research and development. But it is not an either/or proposition. Unless we also develop a new trade model, our workers, businesses, and communities will continue to be unfairly undercut, and we see that reflected in our soaring trade deficit.

So why is it that the Bush administration and many Members of Congress find it acceptable that other nations engage in unfair trade practices at the expense of those who toil here, whether it is a lack of meaningful and enforceable labor and environmental standards or currency manipulation, tariff and nontariff barriers, value-added taxes, and we could go on and on about the tactics that are used and keep our businesses and workers at a disadvantage? But for some reason it seems that there are those in Washington here who seem to believe that we can continue our current trade policies and that other countries will change. But why would they? It is working for them. Just look at our trade deficit.

Well, those politicians who think this is a good system that we have going should visit Ohio's 13th District. Come and see the places that I have the honor to represent because a lot of people there are hurting from the failed trade policies that have been thrust upon them. Ohio has lost 200,000 manufacturing jobs since 2000. Communities have been hurt and families struggle. Futures have been destroyed. There are kids out there who will not go to college. There are families out there where health care needs are not being met. And it is directly related to our failed trade policies. And unless we make meaningful changes by enacting a truly new trade model, we can't reverse this downward spiral.

So while it is encouraging that these two free trade agreements seemingly provide for the possibility of stronger labor and environmental standards, any enforceability, as I said, relies on the Bush administration, and it appears that it may be a paper victory to have those standards in the agreement even if they find their way into the core part of the agreement, which we are not certain that we will actually see.

One more thing or, I guess, it is the overarching thing: The Constitution of the United States rests responsibility for trade with the United States Congress. I think that we head down a slippery slope as we continue to cede responsibility to the President for trade. It should be understood, as was reflected in our recent elections, that Congress must reclaim its constitutional authority and responsibility and stop ceding its responsibility to the President. It is our job to ensure a vibrant and fair trade policy, and we have to focus our attention on this task before it is too late.

So the inclusion of labor and environmental standards on paper, okay. But, truly, the American people expect more. Our needs are much greater than that. And we must develop a new trade model that is enforceable and comprehensive, not just on paper but in reality. And we have to do it immediately to keep the faith with the American people.

□ 2030

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Congresswoman.

I can see from your comments and from hearing your voice that you truly care about the people in your district. And that's what I think has been missing in this debate from some of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Some think, yes, we have a trade deal; if you don't like it, vote against it. Yes, that's the easy way out. What a lot of our colleagues do not understand is just what you have mentioned; these are people's lives. You've seen it firsthand, Congressman HARE has seen it firsthand, I've seen it firsthand, where people who have lost their jobs, who in

a lot of cases are up there in age, 50, 55, 60, that now have to change their lives, they have to try to get retrained, try to find another job. In the meantime, I know in my district, where we have over 33 percent unemployment, we have seen alcoholism and rape increase, divorce increase. The fact that students at high school, their dreams were shattered because they no longer had the means to further their education. We actually had a high school in my district where the senior class did not know whether they were going to be able to graduate or not because the mill that closed its doors paid 80 percent of the tax base, which they had not paid, so the accreditation was in jeopardy.

These issues are extremely important to each and every citizen in the State of Maine, whether you're a Republican, Democratic, green or independent. But there are also issues that are issues we have to deal with collectively, they're not Republican issues or Democratic issues. No one is to blame. I think there is plenty of blame to go around. Actually, it was a Democratic administration that brought us NAFTA. Now it's a Democrat-controlled House and Senate, that hopefully we will change the model. And that's what it is about. And you hit the nail right on the head; it's not about being protectionists, it's about how do we want that trade model to look.

I hope that the presidential candidates, as they go around this country, will start talking about trade. I am very pleased with a couple of the House Members, Congressman KUCINICH, Congressman HUNTER, a Republican, who has been very vocal on China currency manipulation. He has legislation dealing with China manipulation, along with Congressman RYAN. Congressman HUNTER also has bipartisan legislation with myself and Congressman PASCRELL, who is a lead sponsor, on the value-added tax. He is out there, out front.

I want to know where the other candidates are standing because this upcoming election is going to be extremely crucial to where this country is heading. We have a lot of issues we have to deal with, the value-added tax, currency manipulation. When you look at the whole patent issue, what's happening with that. We have a huge trade imbalance. How are we going to bring that trade imbalance back into line? That's why, Congresswoman SUTTON, I am very pleased to work with you because we're not only working as Democrats, we're working with our Republican colleagues across the aisle, we're working with environmental groups, labor groups. The business community, the United States Business and Industry Council, which has an association of small manufacturing businesses here in this country, has been very vocal on these trade issues, which is important because you have that business community and labor working together. That's what it's all about. Definitely

there are those large corporations who have operations in India and China. These trade deals are nothing but a bottom line for them, but that bottom line for some of them could ruin this country.

We are heading for a perfect storm. We have the largest budgetary deficit in our history. We have the largest trade deficit in our history. We cannot sustain that type of deficit, either budgetary or trade, if we are to maintain our status, if we are to be a world leader. That is why it is very important for the American people to demand that those who are running for higher office, whether it's Congress or the Office of the United States President, they have to demand to know where they stand on these issues and be held accountable. Because so far, from what I have seen, there hasn't been much leadership in that particular area.

If we are going to fund education, health care, issues with childcare, taking care of our veterans, maintaining our super power status of military, we have to have an economy that allows us to do that. We cannot have that economy if we continue to outsource our jobs overseas.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SUTTON. The gentlewoman's points are well taken.

I am glad you brought up the issue of how far-reaching the effects of our failed trade policies go. I mean, the reality is that when we lose these jobs due to our broken trade system and the unfair trade policies that others pursue and we don't stop, what happens is our communities sometimes crumble because when those employers pull out and the jobs are gone, the tax base is gone. And then the city can't deliver services, our schools can't fund our education for our children. So it has these multiple ill effects that are set in motion.

You also raise a really important point, and I think it's worth emphasizing. Oftentimes, Congressman MICHAUD, when we have these discussions about trade, they like to say this is about business versus workers. And as you rightly point out, of course, the U.S. Business and Industry Council has been saying much of the same things that we've been saying here on the floor because they know that the window is closing, that there are many who want to literally "make it in America," but because of the policies that we have in place, it is becoming all but impossible for them to do that. Once that window closes, I don't know how we get it back. So, we cannot allow that to happen.

On that point, I think that while we are sort of focused on this new deal about the Peru and Panama Free Trade Agreements, which of course represent a very, very small, minute portion of trade with this country, we are focused on that and the fact that there will be, at least on paper, some environmental and labor standards. Of course we are

all very much in support of environmental and labor standards. But when we know that they are not going to be enforced and they are then just going to result in two more trade agreements that will result in more jobs being lost in this country, it doesn't really seem like the right place for us to be focusing when we have such a short window of time.

Again, you point out some very important pieces of legislation that are pending here in the House, including the Currency Manipulation bill that Congressman RYAN and Congressman HUNTER have sponsored and I think we are probably cosponsors on. That is an important place that we could be focusing on that could make an important difference in the very near future if we could enact.

The value-added tax, a similar situation. We could be focusing, as Congress is responsible for trade, on these matters that would really make a difference in the way trade plays out for the people who we represent in this country. I think that that would be a much better focus than to continue to cede responsibility to this administration.

It is a critical time. I know that the people back in Ohio are counting on us. And Ohio is going to be in the center of the storm, if past history is any indication, in these upcoming presidential elections. And this is an issue, I can assure you, that will be front and center in the minds of those people in Ohio as it was last year when they cast their vote.

With that, I will yield back to my good friend from Maine.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much. This is, as you said, a very important issue. And we are on a slippery slope currently.

When you look at Fast Track, Congress is giving up our responsibility as elected officials, as a co-equal branch of government if we pass Fast Track. Congress has no ability to amend trade deals under Fast Track, and I think it's taking the easy way out. I do not believe that Fast Track should pass. I will oppose Fast Track because it is not a good deal for Congress and it is not a good deal for the American people. We have to look at how we can change that model.

We have talked, I heard earlier, about the issues of training. Well, if you look at what happens when a mill shuts down because of unfair trade deals, yes, they do get training, as I mentioned earlier, but what are they going to train for, particularly when you have mill after mill after mill close because of trade deals, there's not much you can train. But also, when you look at some of the benefits and some of the problems we have seen because of mill closures. In the Katahdin region, where I am from, when the mills shut down, a lot of individuals actually had to tap into their 401(k) plan just to survive. What happens when they file their income tax? They get

penalized because they had to tap into their 401(k) plan. That's unfair. That's unjust. When they applied for unemployment, guess what? They're taxed on their unemployment. Now, if you want to talk about giving tax breaks to anyone, it's those who are unemployed who actually should have the tax breaks.

You look at what has been talked about earlier as well, the labor and environmental standards that they say will be part of the cortex on Peru and Panama, that is yet to be seen. I think we have seen articles in the paper where the administration is starting to slip out of that deal to try to conjure up some other deal and say, well, we will put it in the side room and what have you. So it will be interesting to see what they finally come up with.

But no matter what you do on labor standards, when you look at the Colombian trade deal, some of our colleagues say well, there are some labor violations. Well, I like the way that they talk about "some labor violations." They are talking about assassinations of trade activists. That's more than just a labor violation. And to say that well, we will put the standards in the trade deal, that is not going to solve the problem.

I met with the President of Colombia and I told him right up front that I want to see results before I support anything. I don't want to see more verbiage in a trade deal to say that they will take care of the problem. If they want to stop these assassinations, they can do a lot more than what they are doing currently today. I met with several elected officials, individuals from Colombia, on a couple of different occasions. And when you look at how some of these people are being assassinated, on two separate occasions, with other Members of Congress, when I was talking to these individuals, what they have done is to set an example of someone who is a union activist. They have actually beheaded them in front of their neighbors, to set an example, and played soccer with their heads. And this is a country we are going to sign a trade deal? That is outrageous, and it is just disgusting to see that sort of thing happen.

Before I do anything on the Colombian trade deal, I want to see the number of trade unionist assassinations drop. I don't want to see writing, I want to actually see results. And that is what is so important, when you look at these trade deals; they are affecting people's lives. These people are more than just numbers on a paper. I wish some of our colleagues could really understand that. I don't think they do. Probably because they haven't been affected like your district, Congressman HARE, my district.

I think it is important for the American people, also, to really focus on what is happening here in Congress. Just because it's a new Congress doesn't mean that we are going to change in a new direction when it

comes to trade. They want to see results like we want to see results, and hopefully we will see results in this upcoming debate on trade.

And there are some issues we can do right now without trade deals. We can pass the Currency Manipulation dealing with China, that can be done right now. We can pass the value-added tax issue, that is a disadvantage to businesses here in this country. That deficit alone is I believe \$379 billion, a tax that is affecting companies here in the United States.

□ 2045

That is not fair. We have to deal with that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, the point is, if we're going to trust this administration to enforce labor standards and environmental standards, this is the same administration who hasn't even administered our own National OSHA program and has had one OSHA standard that they had to enforce, and that was because this administration was sued to get it.

I would hope my colleagues wouldn't just listen to us this evening. I would hope they would listen to the American people. Poll after poll say, if the American people are asked across the country, north to south, east to west, they are asked about these trade deals, the American people want to see that American workers have a right to be competitive.

I wrote down a list of some things: Steel, televisions, camcorders, clothing. The list goes on. It isn't that we don't have the workforce that can manufacture and make these things. They were quality products for years and years and years. Unfortunately, we have had a Government that felt that it was okay to take those jobs and to move them out.

I would also remind some of our colleagues that not every person that gets out of school wants to sit behind a computer terminal. There is great strength in working as a welder. It is a great task to be a fitter. It is a great task to be able to do something with your hands. God didn't create all of us to sit behind a terminal. I am convinced of that, because I am computer illiterate. I am living proof. I cut lining for men's suits for 13 years, and I know this: I know that we manufactured a marvelous product. I know my cutting room was outsourced because you can't compete against 17 cents an hour.

The unionized clothing worker back then was making a whopping \$6.07 per hour when I worked in this factory. So this nonsense about American workers pricing themselves out of jobs because of collective bargaining agreements, that dog, as they say, just isn't going to hunt.

I would ask this body, this House, to pay attention to what the American people said last November. They sent

us here to do something positive for them. I haven't met a worker yet who said, could you do me a favor, PHIL? I hope you do the best you can when you get out there to make sure I can get some TRA funding and lose my job. People want us to stand up for them, and that is what we are here tonight for.

I want to commend the Congresswoman from Ohio, BETTY SUTTON. She has been a tremendous force in this issue of bringing it forward, staying with it and not being afraid to take some lumps, because sometimes we can do that in this business.

But let me tell you, this issue that we are talking about this evening is one of the most important issues this country faces. We are going to be at a crossroads with these trade agreements. We can either decide to stand up and be counted, or we can stand aside and watch these jobs go and bemoan the fact that they are gone down the road and try to solve this by throwing some money at a TRA program that not only needs to be reworked, it needs to be reworked because it isn't working, and it hasn't been working for a long time for American workers who have been displaced.

I just want to close by saying this tonight: I am for trade. I have said it before. I am for any type of a fair trade agreement that works. But I will not vote for a single piece of legislation that comes to this floor that will outsource one more job, not just from the 17th District of Illinois, the 13th District of Ohio, a district in Maine.

But from Maine to California, we have a responsibility. I am here because of the working men and women of my district. I am going to do the very best I can. And I will tell all of them that are watching, I would encourage them to talk to their Representative and to try to tell them just how important this issue is and what is at stake.

Let me again thank my colleague from Maine for his leadership on this issue. He is probably one of the most forceful voices we have in this Chamber to stand up for American working men and women. I am honored to be here tonight, and I'm honored to serve with you, and I thank the gentleman for giving me this time.

Mr. MICHAUD. Well, thank you, very much, Mr. HARE, for your compliments. But we are here as a team. We are here to do what is right for the American people, whether you are an employee, whether you are an employer, because that is very important.

I know that you know as well as Congresswoman SUTTON and a lot in the freshman class who actually ran on this issue, you have seen what it has done to your districts. You have seen what it is doing to our country. It is very important that those who are sitting here get out there and talk to the people who have been affected by this.

It is not that we have to pass trade deals because you want to be good on

business or vote against them because of labor. This isn't a business-labor issue. This is an American issue. It is an issue that is extremely important if we are to sustain our status in the world. We have to make sure that we have trade deals that are fair. It is not about being protectionist. It is about the rules of trade. That is what it is about, the rules of trade. And I think it is extremely important that the majority party and the minority party and the rank and file Members who are dealing with this issue look at it in a comprehensive manner.

We have to do several things, as I mentioned earlier, and there is a lot we can do next week and the week after without any trade deal. The currency manipulation, there is legislation dealing with that. There is legislation in dealing with the value-added tax. If those people who are very interested in trade, the so-called free traders, we can pass these pieces of legislation this month to say, yes, we are serious about trade, and here is a start. Then we can start looking at some of these trade deals that have been negotiated, the Peru and Panama trade deal, what has happened with Korea, and see whether or not we should enact those. But we have to start, and we have to start today.

We are a new Congress, a Congress to which the American people said that we want a new direction in this country. And we have to give them the new direction that they want, because I can guarantee you, in this upcoming election cycle, if we do not make changes in how we deal with the trade issues, we will be on a slippery slope. I don't want that to happen.

I think the American people deserve better. The American people deserve better, and the business community in this country deserves better. Hopefully we will be able to give them that.

Once again I want to close by thanking you very much, Congressman HARE, for your strong leadership, and you, Congresswoman SUTTON, both in the freshman class. You're a breath of fresh air here in this Congress. I look forward to working with you as we move forward in this debate.

THE SUBURBAN AGENDA

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

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, as we begin the work of this Congress, we should follow several key principles. Our first principle, which should be the main work of this House, should be focused on key major issues before the country; the second principle is that we should be effective and enact solutions for the American people; and the third is that we should use this debate to build consensus to deploy bipartisan action on behalf of our country.

One commentator looking at the record of the current Congress said that we are packing two days of debate into a four-day workweek. When you look at the record of this Congress so far, you can see that we have taken action on 13 bills to name a Federal building or post office or to build a road, we have enacted five bills to extend preexisting laws that were already on the books or passed last year, and we have passed eight bills cosponsored by a large number of Republicans or passed entirely without opposition. It is not an impressive record of work so far. And when you look at the actions of this Congress, you can see many pieces of legislation on which there has been no action in this Congress, despite a great need by the American people.

One of the key pieces of legislation that passed in the 109th Congress was the Deleting Online Predators Act. This is a bill which would protect children from online predators, especially those who use social networking sites like MySpace.com, the number one website on the planet, where the Center For National Missing and Exploited Children reports that at any one time there are 50,000 sexual predators online trying to get the attention of children.

This legislation, the Deleting Online Predators Act, passed the House of Representatives last year by a vote of 410-15. It stalled in the Senate, and as of yet in this Congress there has been no action whatsoever.

In the last Congress, we also passed the Student and Teacher Safety Act. The Student and Teacher Safety Act was endorsed by the National Education Association and would say that for any registered full-time teacher in America, that they have complete discretion to search a book bag or a locker to make sure that the classroom was gun-free. As a former teacher myself and as someone who has worked with many teachers, I think it is appropriate for the Congress to use a teacher's full-time professional judgment to make sure that their classroom, their workplace, was a safe place to be, not just for teachers, but especially for children.

When we have seen attacks in places like Winnetka, Illinois, or Columbine, or even Virginia Tech University in Blacksburg, Virginia, we can see that there is a need to fully empower teachers with the right to search to make sure that their facilities are safe. The Student and Teacher Safety Act passed the House unanimously in the last Congress, was delayed in the United States Senate, and no action has been taken this year.

The Congress in the last term also passed the Open Space and Farmland Preservation Act. We have seen throughout America, especially in suburban communities, rapidly disappearing green and open space. It is very important for us to defend the National Park System. In fact, I think the country should set a long-term goal of doubling the size of the Na-

tional Park System. But we also want to make sure that we preserve green and open space close to where Americans live, in the suburbs.

This act would establish new and local grant programs to help protect suburban open space. Without action by the Congress, in 20 years time, many of the areas where we currently see green and open space could be an unending series of strip malls, removing an ambience, hurting our environment and delaying our ability to take effective action on global climate change. This legislation passed unanimously in the last Congress, but this Congress has failed to take any action on it.

One of the critical issues before this Congress is whether to pay Members of Congress who have been convicted of a felony and who have lost all of their appeals and beyond the shadow of a doubt stand condemned before the American people, and yet still collect a pension for their service in the Congress.

We have seen Members of Congress, like Dan Rostenkowski or Bob Ney or Duke Cunningham or James Traficant, all completely convicted by a jury of their peers beyond the shadow of a doubt, Members of Congress who lost or did not exercise any of their appeals, who are currently or have served in jail, and yet today or in months past have collected their congressional pensions from the jailhouse ATM.

In 1996, the Congress passed comprehensive reforms to kill the pension for any Member of Congress convicted of any one of 21 separate public integrity felonies. It was a bipartisan victory, with the full support of Speaker HASTERT and Speaker PELOSI. This legislation, once again, was delayed and killed in the United States Senate.

Today we have seen Members like Congressman JEFFERSON from Louisiana, indicted on 16 felony counts, and, but for this legislation, would have a right as a nine term Member of Congress, if convicted and if losing all of their appeals, to collect a \$50,000 a year pension, even if convicted for betraying the very taxpayers that pay that pension.

□ 2100

The Congress in February passed very limited pension reform legislation which wouldn't kill the pension for a Member of Congress on conviction of 21 felonies, but instead would only kill that pension for conviction of any one of four felonies. And basic felonies like wire fraud and income tax invasion would still allow the payment of a congressional pension.

Despite limited action by the Congress in January both in the House and Senate, legislation to kill the pension of a Member of Congress convicted of a felony has been completely stalled, completely stalled in February, in March, in April, in May, and now in the first weeks of June with no action and potential actions against other Members of Congress convicted of a felony.

In my view, the hundreds of thousands of dollars paid each year to Members of Congress convicted of a felony are a travesty and should be stopped by the elected representatives of the American people to defend the taxpayer.

All of this details the lack of a substantive agenda by this Congress which should be put before the American people working on issues that they care about, on key challenges before their families. As I have outlined, beyond naming some Post Offices, designating some roads, and passing legislation on which there is little to no debate, this Congress has not done much yet and right now is falling beneath its potential as a great deliberative body of one of the world's premier democracies.

What I would like to do tonight is lay out a new agenda, an agenda that would be meaningful to many Americans and taking on key problems before them.

This action was proffered before in the enactment of the suburban agenda last year which took action on a number of key items like the School Safety Acquiring Faculty Excellence Act authored by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER). That bill basically took up the issue of Jessica Lunsford who was killed by someone employed by a school who had never had a background check. Despite his clear and demonstrable criminal record, this man was allowed to be in close contact with children leading to a tragic result.

The School Safety Acquiring Faculty Excellence Act passed the Congress and allowed every school in the country access to national criminal databases in order to ensure that every activity was taken to make sure that people who are put in close contact with children did not represent a clear and present danger to their safety.

The Congress also took on the issue of open space by passing the Charitable Donations For Open Space Act. This improved the treatment of conservation easements and other open space donations critical to preserving green and open space in the suburbs.

We also looked at the issue of helping families with expanding college costs by expanding permanently the charter of so-called 529 college savings account.

In my home State of Illinois, these are called "bright start accounts." And by permanently extending these tax deferred savings plans, we helped Americans with their college savings.

With those pieces of legislation, and the ones I talked about earlier which passed the House in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion but were killed in the Senate, we laid out a work plan for the Congress strongly supported by the American people with overwhelming bipartisan support on the Republican and Democratic side.

But as I detailed, key pieces of legislation remain to be enacted like the Deleting Online Predators Act, like the Two Student and Teacher Safety Act, like the Open Space and Farmland

Preservation Act. Persistence is a value strongly rewarded in the United States Congress, and following on that value, we have laid out a new suburban agenda for this year. The suburban agenda outlines a number of key pieces of legislation that directly meets the needs of American people in bipartisan ways to make sure that we are working on the key issues of the day and move the ball effectively, building bipartisan consensus.

Key items on the suburban agenda include the Gang Elimination Act by Representative REICHERT, which looks at a key problem in the United States which is of internationally connected drug gangs representing major franchises in criminal activity, moving to the suburbs, potentially overwhelming suburban law enforcement communities. While large cities like New York or Chicago have large gang intelligence units and years of experience in dealing with international drug gangs, drug gangs that are now moving to the suburbs can quickly overwhelm a small police force like the one in Waukegan, Illinois, that is facing a criminal empire that comprises thousands of potential gang members, and links to a number of countries.

The Gang Elimination Act calls for the Justice Department to identify the top three national drug gangs and lay out a 4-year strategy for taking those drug gangs down. This is something entirely appropriate, to lay out a mandate for whoever is our next President of the United States to make sure that we remove this threat to the American people.

If you added up all of the documented gang members who are in the United States, it would total the size of the seventh largest army on the planet. The average gang shooter in my State of Illinois is in the 7th grade, and this is a threat that the Federal Government in Washington can help law enforcement deal with.

A second piece of the suburban agenda is the 401 Kids Family Savings Account Act by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT). We look at key figures like 70 percent of Americans fear it will be more difficult for their children to remain in the middle class than it was for them. You have to simply ask the question: How likely or how easy will it be for your children to afford the very house that they are being raised in?

Access to college in our view is a critical step to making sure that your children have a chance to be full and successful members of the middle class. When we have seen universities like George Washington University now totaling \$50,000 a year for tuition, we can see a substantial roadblock in the way of the future success of one's son or daughter.

The 401 Kids Family Savings Account, and previous legislation modeled after it, would allow every American to build success upon success. One of the best things that the Congress

has done is to allow every American working with the opportunity to establish a 401(k) retirement program to build tax deferred savings for their families.

Tens of millions of Americans have now established those 401(k) programs, and we would like every American to have a chance, an opportunity, to establish a 401 kids account for their new son or daughter, from the first day they are born, tax deferred savings for college, for the first-time purchase of a home or for starting a new business.

This would not only help boost the savings of the United States, but it would be a dramatic way to upgrade the financial education of American children because these 401 kids account statements would come into parents and allow each one of them to sit down with their son or daughter and see how a disciplined pattern of savings and investment could build a lifetime of good habits for that child.

One of the other pieces of legislation is the Health Insurance For Life Act by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT). The Health Insurance For Life Act would basically look at a key problem in today's America which is that the average American family, especially in the suburbs, will have seven jobs over their lifetime, and we still have thousands of Americans exercising their COBRA rights to continue their health care coverage. Under Federal law if you have been covered by an employer-provided health care plan, if you lose your job, you can still continue health care and insurance for your family for at least 18 months at your own expense. But many Americans hit the end of that 18-month limit and they will not be allowed to have a safe place to cover their family without extension of these rights.

The Health Insurance Portability Act, otherwise known as the Health Insurance For Life Act of 2007, would allow families at their own cost to continue their health care insurance so there is always in a seven-job career a safe place for their family to be covered. And there would always be an option to maintain that coverage.

As I mentioned before, one of the key parts of our agenda is the Deleting Online Predators Act because throughout America we have not seen a reduction in people who would seek to use the new and powerful tools of the web and the Internet, and especially social networking sites, to reach out and attack children. It is already common knowledge through the culture, and especially through shows like Dateline NBC, that we have seen repeat offenders, even on the same network news show.

The suburban agenda also includes other key items. The one at the bottom is very important for the mid-21st century, and that is the Senior Safety For Dignity Act. The Senior Safety For Dignity Act updates a set of bill of rights for Americans who need nursing home care to ensure that they maintain their dignity. This is legislation

put forward by Mrs. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

The Senior Safety For Dignity Act is very important because in our country the baby boom is aging. The first baby boomer collects a retirement check in 2009. The number of retirees in America will go from 35 million to almost 90 million, and the need for nursing home care in our country will grow. We need to upgrade the bill of rights for Americans in nursing homes because of the large expansion in capability that we will need in our country and to make sure that the quality of care is maintained.

One of the experts in this Congress is my colleague, a physician and a Member from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, who can comment on a number of these key issues.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. It really is a privilege for me to come to the floor tonight and work with you, Mr. KIRK, for a few moments and to explain to our colleagues here in the House and to the Speaker about the suburban agenda, a very important area. I appreciate your leadership in this area. You have been steadfast in making certain that these issues, and they may not be top-tier issues, they may not be headlines in all of our newspapers, but your district, like my district, I have a suburban district outside of Atlanta, and folks there are concerned about what folks all across this Nation are concerned about.

Mr. KIRK. We have seen consistently that while events in Iran or Iraq, while issues concerning global climate change, and of course the immigration bill in the Senate are all front-burner issues, but for American families, education, health care, protecting the environment and saving for college are important issues.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That really is true. When I talk with groups at home, and once we get past the hot button, the headline issues of Iraq and immigration and the like, people are concerned about education for their kids and they are concerned about health care for themselves and their parents. They are concerned about security and quality of life issues in their community to make certain that there is going to be green space and there are places where can take their kids.

I was sitting in my office and I had to come down and join you. These are not Republican issues or Democrat issues, these are American issues.

□ 2115

They're issues that I think all of the House can rally around. And you mentioned the health care issue, and as a physician, I understand as well as anybody I suspect about the importance of being able to provide health insurance for families.

We live in a world now where jobs aren't constant. It used to be that your dad and my dad and other folks, they'd get a job and they'd be with that same company 25, 30, 35 years, and they'd get

a gold watch and they'd move on and they'd take that health care with them. Now, that's not the case. Our children will have 7, 8, 9, 10 different jobs, 10 different employers and oftentimes having themselves as being self-employed.

Mr. KIRK. One solution would be to have the government take over everyone's health care and to make sure we take action that breaks the link between you and your physician and insert a large bureaucracy that currently runs the post office and now put it in charge of your health care.

Many of us think that that may not be the way to go. The way to go is to make sure that for many Americans, they like the health insurance plan that they're on, and then they would like to carry that through the five to seven jobs that they will have in the 21st century.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Exactly. And that hits the nail right on the head. People want to know that their health care is going to be consistent and they have the ability, along with their physicians, to make health care decisions, which is why the Health Insurance Portability Act that Congressman DENT is reintroducing is so important.

It makes it so, as I understand, that if an individual changes jobs, that they're able to provide that COBRA insurance for as long as needed. So it makes it so they can continue that COBRA insurance for a much longer period of time, to tide them over until they're with another employer or they can be able to provide for individual insurance on their own.

It's not the be-all-and-end-all, but it is a particularly important piece of the puzzle that makes it so that people can maintain their own health insurance, and I know that you agree with that.

Mr. KIRK. The need here is to remove the fear that somehow a loss of a job or discovery of a preexisting condition will deny Americans and their families health care insurance. What we want to make sure is you already have a right under Federal law to extend your health care insurance for 18 months. Now, we're not talking about extending it indefinitely, because when an American reaches age 65, you're going to be covered by Medicare, and if you fall below the poverty line, you're going to be covered by Medicaid.

But for large numbers of people, especially looking at an unsure job market, we want to have them assured by this piece of legislation that there's always a safe place for their family to be covered.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Exactly, and that gets to the number of uninsured that we have in this Nation. There are 45, 46, 47 million individuals who at some point during this calendar year will be without health insurance. Those aren't the folks that are on Medicaid. Those aren't the folks that are on Medicare. Those are the folks that are between jobs oftentimes, who are unable to continue the COBRA insur-

ance that they ought to be able to, and this is what this bill would do. It would really, really solve one of the major problems that we have with working Americans who do indeed want to provide health insurance for families.

So I commend you for your leadership on this issue and so many others.

The Senior Safety Indignity Act is extremely important. I served in the State legislature, as I know many folks in this chamber did, and every single year we would hear horror stories about problems of health care workers in the nursing home or extended care facility arena.

And in Georgia what we tried to do was a similar kind of thing to make certain that background checks were available, and this would provide that kind of security and that kind of important information for individuals in the senior centers so that we know that the folks who were going to be assisting seniors and caring for seniors have the appropriate skills and the appropriate background in order to do that.

Mr. KIRK. The gentleman is one of the most respected physicians here in the Congress. The difficulty before this country is that the baby boom began when the troops came home in 1945. So, for an American born in that key year, you're going to be collecting a retirement check in 2009 when you hit your 65th birthday. There are so many Americans that then enter the retirement cohort and that may need nursing home care. That is the critical reason why this Congress may have to work on fewer bills naming post offices and designating roads and more on making sure that we maintain quality senior care as the baby boom generation retires.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate that, and the point that you're making is so vital for all of us in this chamber to appreciate, and that is, that we've now been in session 5½ months, and we've passed and sent to the President about 28 to 30 pieces of legislation. Almost the majority of those are naming a building or naming a post office or renaming a building or renaming a post office.

And these issues here, if you look down the list of those seven issues, from the gang elimination to teacher and student safety, to other education issues with 401 Kids Family Savings Act or the Health Insurance Act that we talked about, the Deleting Online Predators Act, open space, Senior Safety Act, these are the issues that are of vital importance to the American people all across this Nation. These are issues that, frankly, ought to get the vast majority of Members of this chamber on both sides of the aisle's support so that we could move forward with real legislation for real people.

Mr. KIRK. I take the gentleman's point. When you look at our legislative work, in 5½ months, in such promise with the new Congress, what we've done, these are all great Americans

who should be honored, but these actions should not be the sum total of what the Congress has done.

We've named the Gale McGee Post Office; the Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr., Post Office; Scipio Jones Post Office; the Lane Evans, one of my colleagues from Illinois, Post Office. All good Americans that should be honored, but this should not be the sum total of the work of the Congress.

The country witnessed a tragedy in Blacksburg, Virginia, with the attack on Virginia Tech. A number of experienced educators saw some warning signs, as we saw before at Columbine High School, as we saw before in the Winnetka school system when Laurie Dann attacked it.

The Student and Teacher Safety Act is common-sense legislation that this Congress should take up. It says to any full-time teacher, you know the warning signs, you know your children that are in the classrooms, and we want to make sure that you don't have to fear a trial lawyer and you don't have to get a warrant. If you suspect that a threat to your classroom, to your kids has come into a locker or in through a bookbag, and now the classroom is a dangerous place, you have complete authority to remove that danger.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And you're right. The incident at Virginia Tech was so astounding and so horrific for all of us to witness, and our hearts and our prayers still go out to those families.

But I understand, as I know you do, that there were individuals who were reticent to bring that out into the open before it happened, bring that individual who apparently committed that awful, awful tragedy out into the open for fear of potential liability.

That's no way for a Nation to live. That's no way for a responsible people to have to operate, to have to think in the back of their mind, well, can I do what's right or do I have to worry about an attorney, do I have to worry about a lawsuit.

This is the kind of legislation that we, as a Congress, if we adopted these seven items, I suspect that the American people would say this is a Congress that has acted appropriately, and we would all be able to stand proud and with that poster and present it to our constituents and say this is a responsible agenda for the American people.

My concern right now over the next three weeks, as you well know, we're entering appropriations time. It is very likely that none of these things, none of them, will be even brought to the floor during this period of time and that we'll get bound up in the process of spending hard-earned taxpayer money, trying to be responsible in that endeavor. But these issues that are supported by 60, 70, 80 percent of the American people, we ought to be able to take those off the table right away.

Mr. KIRK. I'm worried, too. The gentleman can talk about Atlanta. In Chicago, in the Chicagoland area, we are

now seeing a great expansion of large national gang franchises like the Latin Kings, like the Gangster Disciples, et cetera, moving into the suburbs. A suburban police department has far fewer resources than a big city like Chicago and Atlanta to fight these, and so that's where the Federal Government can come in.

We're particularly concerned about a gang that some Americans have heard about called Mara Salvatrucha, MS-13, which seems to be particularly violent and one in which there are tantalizing clues that there may have been discussions with terrorist organizations with links overseas because the leaders of MS-13 don't have obviously any patriotic feeling toward the United States, and if they could link up to a terrorist organization for money, they would.

In the city of Chicago, we have now seen these gangs moving into places like Waukegan or Aurora or Joliet. I don't know about Atlanta, but it seems like particularly appropriate when you see that the average gang shooter for these international drug gangs is in the 7th grade.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. We have similar experiences in the city of Atlanta and then in the surrounding area. I don't represent any of the city of Atlanta itself. My district abuts the city of Atlanta, but I have small cities, some as small as 8- to 12,000 residents. I have some as large as 80- to 100,000, and then some unincorporated county areas.

But the resources that they have with which to fight gangs aren't the kind of resources that large metropolitan cities have, large urban areas have, and this bill, introduced by Representative Dave Weichert who himself is a hero in the law enforcement arena, having been the sheriff out in Washington State.

Mr. KIRK. With the Green River killer.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Apprehended the Green River killer, and such a hero he is, and we ought to as a House of Representatives and as a Nation recognize that this Act, this would allow police departments and law enforcement officials all across this Nation to know that there are resources being brought to bear to identify, like MS-13, to identify those gangs that are the greatest threat to our communities, the greatest threat to our constituents all across this Nation, that there is a unified strategy that is going to be brought to bear in order to make it so that we prevail in this war.

Mr. KIRK. I'm particularly worried because in the recent failed Senate immigration bill there was an amendment put forward to deny documented members of international drug gangs the chance to enter the pathway to citizenship that the legislation proposed. That amendment failed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. This immigration bill that was just in the Senate last week, many of us had great concerns over, but are you telling me that

there was a portion of the bill that it would allow gang members who had been convicted of a felony, that if they were found to be illegal, that they couldn't be deported; is that what you are saying?

Mr. KIRK. The proposed amendment would have denied any documented member of an international drug gang from the chance to apply for the pathway to citizenship that it proposed, and that amendment was defeated 51-46.

When we came together and proposed the Gang Elimination Act, we at least looked at the several hundred thousand documented gang members in the United States and said how do we deal with this problem.

Sometimes I have to have the concern that this Congress may take action in which that number would increase, making the problem even worse by action of the Federal Government. That's why I think refocusing our work for actions beyond naming of post offices to looking at how small suburban communities are being overwhelmed by large gangs with international links, some of whom may add to members if the wrong legislation should pass the Congress, that is an issue that should be squarely put before this Congress.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I couldn't agree more, and there was such great promise for this new Congress, this new majority, not of which we're a part of, but this new majority that was swept in and began in January and all sorts of wonderful promises about great legislation and being responsive to the concerns of Americans all across the Nation. And what we've had is a legislative agenda that hasn't done that.

And so you and I stand here tonight inviting our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to embrace this suburban agenda, embrace an agenda that 70, 80 percent of the American people would support with common-sense pieces of legislation that address security, that address health care, that address education, that address caring for our seniors, that address green space. It just astounds me that we can't get that kind of support on both sides.

□ 2130

Mr. KIRK. It's okay to criticize, if we find that in 5½ months we haven't done as much as we had hoped. But Americans, I think, at our core, look for solutions. This Congress has 18 months to go. So it's not enough just to criticize. You then have to put forward a positive agenda of not only saying we haven't done enough, and maybe we should not just consider 13 bills to name Federal property and 5 bills to extend preexisting law, but work at these problems. Then the question is, what is your agenda?

To date, I haven't seen a comprehensive agenda for the other side. I know that a vast majority of Republicans and Democrats will join on this agenda. When we look, we have a critical problem with online predators, at any

one time, 50,000 online predators contacting kids. There are hundreds of contacts in each month, in my own congressional district.

Now, people like Julie Wachtheim, the President of Wheeling High School, who, minutes after putting her class photo on a new MySpace page was contacted by a sexual predator using an advanced search engine that obviously showed us that he was contacting not just her, but hundreds of other young girls, in an attempt to find someone. I am not sure if that is the case in the Atlanta suburbs as well, but I think this is beginning to be a real threat to Americans. This was not part of our growing up.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. No, absolutely.

Mr. KIRK. The Internet was largely invented in 1996 after you and I had both completed college. But this is part of our children's growing up. I think this calls for congressional action.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate that. It's not that the Internet is bad, it's just that this is a different world, and the Internet is now like Main Street of 20 or 30 years ago, where you would have to be wary of strangers, and our parents told us about strangers on Main Street and how to deal with them. It's much more difficult when those strangers are able to come literally into your own home and entice young people who may not have their guard up as much.

We have story after story, time after time you will hear law enforcement officers talk about the challenges that they have in even getting young people to admit that, in fact, they have been susceptible or been approached by this kind of behavior. But it is rampant out there. It's absolutely rampant. There is not any reason that we ought not to be able to pass some commonsense legislation like the Deleting Online Predators Act like you have introduced in this House of Representatives, which is something that ought to be supported by 70, 80, 90 percent of our colleagues here, something that ought to go, frankly, in front of the appropriations battles we are about to wage over the next 3 to 6 weeks as we work as diligently as we can to responsibly spend hard-earned taxpayer money. But this is something that we ought to be able to coalesce behind.

Mr. KIRK. I don't know of a single community in my district that hasn't been touched by this tragedy yet.

What we are talking about is laying out a new set of rules of the road in the 21st century to protect children, like advising parents through the Federal Communications Commission, Federal Trade Commission, that growing up in America today means having the computer in the living room rather than the child's bedroom, with a casual look and walk-bys by the parent so you can see who is trying to contact your kids.

Like one Pennsylvania mother said, in the 21st century I have a complete right to all of my children's passwords

to make sure that I know who is trying to contact my young, minor child, and then to make sure that there are protections at school and in libraries. In my district, we have found some predators who are using library computers, school staff that were using library computers to contact kids, to make sure that our schools do not enable virtual hunting grounds to find kids. All of this is exactly what the Congress should work on, a new technology, which has an unintended effect of creating a new danger, and then Congress stepping in to make sure that danger is removed. We are not working on that right now.

With the eight bills cosponsored by Republicans or passed without opposition, five extending preexisting public law or order, and thirteen to name Federal property or to build a road, that action has not been taken. Action has not also been taken to kill the pension for a Member of Congress convicted of a felony.

We have just seen one of our colleagues indicted for 16 felonies. We have seen some of our colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, convicted, and yet they are paid their pension by the very taxpayers they have betrayed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That's the kind of perpetuation of business as usual here in Washington, that the folks at home just say what on earth are you doing when an individual can be convicted of a felony, and continue to get their pension, they just shake their head. They throw their hands up in the air, and they say, what are you doing? Why can't you do something responsible, which is why this positive agenda, suburban agenda, which is all things again that the vast majority of Members of this House ought to be supporting, which is why we ought to be pushing that forward.

I, for the life of me, I can't answer why we ought not to be able to deal with these things before we launch into the battles over the appropriations bills.

Do you have any sense as to why the majority party won't allow these kinds of bills to come to the floor?

Mr. KIRK. I just worry. Right now, the Congress took very limited action to kill the pensions for Members of Congress back on January 23, but then see stalled action. We have taken no action on ethics reform, killing pensions for Members of Congress convicted of felonies in February, no action in March, no action in April, no action in May, no action now for the first few weeks of June.

You worry because senior Members of Congress have the largest pensions, and they are in charge of this place. Why is it that we are delaying action on this critical reform?

I always thought that the most important thing about such a reform is to prevent crime. You know, if you kill the pension for a Member of Congress convicted of a felony, you almost turn their family members, their spouses,

into adjuncts of the Ethics Committee, because they are worried about their future retirement income. That's as it should be, keeping everyone on the straight and narrow.

The State of Illinois is not seen as the cleanest State in the Union. Yet even under our State law, we kill the pension for public officials convicted of a felony, like even Governor Ryan, who just lost his appeal to do that.

I worry, though, that we haven't taken any of these actions. We have stalled actions on all of these items, with an overwhelming number of Republicans, Democrats and independents, wanting action on health care and making sure that we can afford college, and so far this Congress has fallen short of its potential.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Not only fallen short, but I would suggest to my good friend from Illinois that the majority party has seemed to raise hiding and decreasing transparency and accountability in a very important area to a huge degree, and that is the area of earmarks, the area of special projects, pork projects, special projects for Members.

What we have just learned in the past week or so is that the Appropriations chair has said well, we won't be debating any of these earmarks, these special projects on the floor of the House. We won't be debating them. What we will do is parachute them in, air drop them in a conference committee so that there can be no light, no sunshine on these earmarks.

That's the kind of priority that concerns me about this majority party, that they have a priority for decreasing transparency and decreasing accountability for spending, but they also, by the same token, will not address the concerns of the vast majority of Americans all across our Nation.

In the area of security, in the area of education, in the area of health care, in the area of senior security, in the area of green space in our communities, a wonderful, positive agenda that we have put before this Congress and, in fact, it's getting no visibility here on floor of the House.

Mr. KIRK. I am just worried, too, because we have now talked about how George Washington University is talking about \$50,000 for 1-year of tuition, the first university in the country to break that mark. So you look at a 4-year bachelor's degree at \$200,000, post tax, far beyond the ability of a middle-class family to reach that level.

So what should the Congress do? Should we have the government take over all college education? Should the government control prices? Should we have more controls from the House of Representatives so that those who run every other government bureaucracies now run every education institution in the country? I would say no. I would say that we have had too many short-ages and too much waste if a bureaucracy can take control of a college.

On the other hand, could we all join together to increase savings and investment for each American family to build success upon success, the 401(k) program, by authorizing each American family the day that your son or daughter is born to establish a 401 kids tax-deferred savings account.

When we look at how this Congress can sometimes change culture, we have seen that 401(k), an obscure section of the IRS code, has now become part of the lexicon off our country because of how successful it is.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. KIRK. We had a time, probably, when there was a good cigar salesman out there that made it de rigeur that every young father would buy cigars for everyone when they had a new child. That is probably part of the 20th century and not part of the 21st century.

So what is it that we can do that becomes part of the cultural experience of every American when their son or daughter is born? One of the things we can do is pass this bill so that every dad on their way home, or mom, if she is so inclined, can stop by some sort of financial institution or a savings and loan or a credit union, and establish a 401Kids account for their son or daughter.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Wouldn't that be wonderful. What a grand legacy. The bill you are referring to is H.R. 87, primary sponsorship by JUDY BIGGERT. It's something that's near and dear to our hearts in Georgia. As you may recall, Senator Paul Coverdale, the late Paul Coverdale, served in the United States Senate. One of his goals was to make certain that there was an ability by all families to be able to afford a college education for their children. He fought as hard as he could during his tenure in the United States Senate to make certain that happened.

This is an extension of that. This is a wonderful, would provide a wonderful opportunity for families to put aside a little money in a tax-free mechanism to be able to cover college education for their children.

Mr. KIRK. In the State of Illinois, under section 529, which is a charter that allows States to set up college savings program, we call them Bright Start accounts. What does Georgia call its college saving program?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. We have the HOPE Scholarship savings plan in Georgia, which is remarkably successful. But there is no reason we ought not extend it because what we provide in Georgia is you can't use that money out of state.

Mr. KIRK. Right. So the problem we have now is that we have not fully taken advantage of the successes that we have already put in place, that Congress lets each State establish a college charter savings plan like HOPE Scholarship in Georgia or Bright Start in Illinois. But these, each State program, has restrictions and the inability to transfer freely throughout the country.

One of the great things about the 401(k) program is that it allows, not only, for Americans to transfer their accounts between employers, but no difficulty to transfer between States. Should not we give that opportunity to each young son or daughter in America so that we can save and invest for college?

We know, already, with \$70 billion invested in HOPE scholarships or in Bright Start accounts throughout the country, that this has been a great success. How much more of a success will we have if we simply gave the full national charter to 401Kids accounts. I come out of a military background, if you are transferred, or you are part of a large organization, you may live in several States and have the ability to fully transfer these amounts in a national program, bottom line, to make sure that there is much more money available for your son or daughter to be in college.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Absolutely. What a great template to use. What a wonderful model with the 401(k) program, which is familiar to millions, tens of millions, if not over 100 million Americans, who have some type of 401(k) program. They understand how simple it is, how easy it is, how almost painless it is to be able to plan for the future to put that money aside, and to have a vehicle that models itself off of that, after that, as the 401Kids program would do, to allow moms and dads all across this Nation to be able to put a little money aside on a regular basis. When Junior grows up, they will recognize at the age of 15 or 16 that he or she indeed will be able to have the ability to go to the college of his or her choice and realize their his or her potential and their dreams.

Mr. KIRK. We have now seen also with the 401(k) program a change in how Americans look at the economy for the future. There was a time in which most Americans owned no stock and saw the New York Stock Exchange or the other exchanges as something far away, not part of their lives, and maybe for rich people only.

The 401(k) program changed all of that.

□ 2145

And so now we have tens of millions of Americans who are investors, and changing that one cultural attribute that we maybe shouldn't have, which is looking too much for the short term, and helping the whole country change into a new investor mentality, to invest for the long haul, to look at high technology and other investments to see that savings can be built up in a far more substantial way, beyond just a savings account at a bank if they can be put into long term stocks and bonds.

These are habits that have been built for adults, but have not been inculcated in children; that if we start 401 kids accounts with your son or daughter's name on that account, that as your child gets to be 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15

years old, it gives an education opportunity to say to your daughter, look at what we've done in just the last year and how much this has gone up, hoping that this will set an example for the rest of her life, making sure that she has successful habits to save and invest for the future.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. What a wonderful vision and what a wonderful dream. We've all heard the stories of the entrepreneur individual with a significant amount of resources who went into a community and said to a high school or a middle school class that normally wouldn't necessarily have the resources to go to college, any of you that complete your high school education in a way that would allow you to enter a college, I'll fund that college education. This would transfer that, and those kids then do extremely well, so much better than their peers in other classes who haven't been given that assurance.

This is the kind of program that would give that assurance to every young child all across this Nation, to allow their parents to be able to put aside a little bit of money, a little resources over the lifetime of their child so that they can then afford the college education and open the dreams for each and every child.

Mr. KIRK. Just to sum up the key principles that I think we should follow, this Congress, this House should work on the major issues before the American people and especially their families, Number 1.

Number 2, we should take effective action that enacts solutions to problems that American families face.

And Number 3, that we should work to build consensus to sustain bipartisan action. We should not operate this House in a way that, as one person said, packs 2 days of debate into a 4-day work week; that this House can do much more than name Post Offices or designate roads; that we are here not just criticizing, we're laying out an agenda that, based on the last Congress, we know an overwhelming number of Democrats and Republicans will join, like the Deleting On-Line Predators Act that passed 410-15; like the Student and Teacher Safety Act endorsed by the National Education Association that passed unanimously; like the Open Space and Farm Land Preservation Act that also passed unanimously.

If we can join together on these items, key pieces of legislation, already bipartisan cosponsors laid out, I think we would help this Congress reach more of the potential than currently in 5 months of work it's failed to do.

But to conclude, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I know that our time is short, but I just want to commend you once again for your leadership in this area. These are issues that concern all Americans, issues of education, issues of safety,

issues of security, issues of health care, and they are issues that the vast majority of us ought to support.

So I challenge our friends on both sides of the aisle to step forward and support a positive agenda for the American people. It's outlined right here.

I want to commend you for your leadership, and I appreciate the opportunity to join you tonight.

Mr. KIRK. I thank you. And I commend everyone, that if you'd like to learn more about the suburban agenda, you can go on to our website, www.house.gov/Kirk for an outline of the suburban agenda. This is not just an us-only agenda. This is an agenda that we hope will be matched from the other side. But refocusing our work on health care, on education, on environmental protection and on economic growth, so that this Congress can realize it's full potential far better than in the first 5 months of our activity.

HEALTH CARE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BERKLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I want to also thank and commend my friends for their discussion of the suburban agenda. I am coming to the floor tonight to talk about health care, and of course they've already covered a lot of those issues in their discussion that preceded in the past hour.

I want to talk about some concerns we have in the delivery of health care services throughout the country. The future of medical care in this country is going to be front and center over the next 18 months time. The elections of 2008 will be about a lot of things, but they will also be a lot about health care.

Three bills that I want to focus on this evening as well, H.R. 2583, H.R. 2584 and H.R. 2585. The first, H.R. 2583 deals with residency programs. The second, H.R. 2584 deals with loan forgiveness and tax abatements for medical students and newly minted doctors. And the third, H.R. 2585, deals with physicians in the Medicare program who are adversely affected by reimbursement reductions every year under a formula known as the sustainable growth rate formula.

Well, as we go through these next 18 months and deciding which avenue through which our health care system is going to go, we have two choices on the table. We've got a public sector, the government side, which already has about half of the responsibility for health care in this country. And we've got that which is comprised of the private sector, as well as that care which is just simply delivered without expectation of compensation, what used to be known as charitable care.

Under the option to expand the government's role, the government's side,

the government's sector involvement in the delivery of health care, typically that's known as universal health care. In the 1990s we called that "Hillary Care."

But could we also approach it from a standpoint of encouraging the private sector to stay involved and to improve their products and make them more flexible and user friendly in order to provide more for our health care dollar in this country.

My opinion, having worked in the system for well over 25 years, is the United States does have the best health care system in the world, and it is my obligation, my charge to help it remain the best health care system in the world.

Now, I know there's plenty of people in this body who would contest that statement. And there's plenty of issues around to call it into question.

My predecessor in this office, former Majority Leader Dick Armezy used to be fond of saying, you know, the numbers don't lie; but if you torture them long enough, they'll admit to almost anything.

But let's talk about some of the different principles that are guiding the debate about public versus private and the delivery of health care services. And maybe we ought to spend a little time talking about the background. How did we get into this? How'd we get to where we are today?

You almost have to go back over 60 years to go back to the time coming out of World War II when the United States, of course, was the victor; came out of the war with a flourishing economy.

But during the war, President Roosevelt, in an effort to keep down trouble from inflation, put into effect rather stringent wage and price controls across the country. The employers wanted to keep employees, so a lot of employees, of course, had been drafted and were serving overseas, so those employees that were left the employers wanted to keep them working. But they were constrained. They couldn't offer raises. They couldn't offer the money that would be required; they were worried that someone across town might outbid them.

Well, they went and came upon the idea of providing a health care benefit, and, in fact, the Supreme Court ruled that that was okay; that that did not violate the spirit or the intent of the law that Franklin Roosevelt had passed governing the wage and price controls. So during the war, the concept of employer-based insurance was begun.

The war ended. The United States was blessed with the postwar economic boom that started, and what began as a necessity born out of a wartime economy continued. It was extremely popular. Health care insurance provided by the employer turned out to be one of the most popular employee benefits that has ever been seen in this country. And up until the early 1980s it just worked wonderfully.

Contrast that, of course, with Europe. Even the parts the Europe that were victorious in the Second World War, the battles were fought in their back yard. Their economies were devastated. They needed to quickly stand up a health care system that would take care of a population that had been deprived by 5 years of war or longer. And these countries decided to promote the single payer system that you see that's so prevalent in Western Europe and in England today.

But that was born of necessity also, because, again, the country's economies were devastated or, in fact, they had not been victorious in the war, they had lost the war, but they needed to quickly stand up a system that would take care of their citizens.

We go from 1945 to 1965. Presidency of another Texan, Lyndon Baines Johnson. During that time, President Johnson enacted the Medicare statute, a little over 40 years ago. The Medicare and the Medicaid programs were signed into law during his administration. These were large government-run programs that were created to focus primarily on hospital and physician care for elderly and basic health care services for the people who were this poverty.

Decades later, almost 40 years later, it was evident that the government-run Medicare program, extremely slow to change, very difficult to change a large government program; and anything that that caused any change within the program was going to be incredibly expensive.

Already difficult to operate.

But in 2003, in fact, my first year to serve in this Congress, my first State of the Union message that I heard the President deliver in this House, he talked about how the need for, or the time for a Medicare prescription drug benefit had arrived; and this was too important an issue to be left to another President or another Congress. It was work that we were going to take on that year, 2003, and get that benefit delivered to the American people. And indeed we did.

We worked on that bill in various committees throughout the year 2003. Right at the end of the year we passed the bill. There was initially a prescription drug discount card that was available, but over the next 2 years the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services put together the plan that we now know as the Medicare Part-D plan. And in spite of all of the problems that it had getting started, arguably it is one of the better functioning government-run health care programs ever seen to date.

But the government needed to catch up to a private system that was already focused on prevention, timely treatment of disease and disease management. So finally Congress put the Medicare prescription drug plan, that focused on giving seniors access to needed medications forward, and the program has been successful and provided benefits for seniors. It's come

with, obviously, considerable discussion, and a big push for success, a lot of it delivered by the private sector.

So here we sit at the crossroads today. Again, the government pays for half of the health care administered in the country with a current gross domestic product, the GDP of 11 to \$12 trillion.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, through their Medicare and Medicaid services alone, pay \$600 billion. Add to that the VA system, add to that the Federal prison system, the Indian Health Service, and you have about half of the health care expenditures in this country.

The other half of health care is broken down with the primary weight being carried by private insurance. There is some charitable and there is some self-pay accounting for the rest. I think you'd probably include bad debt in that other 50 percent.

Well, as the numbers increase, the overall cost of health care for the entire country, as that number increases the Federal Government continues to funnel the American taxpayers' dollars into these efforts, and we have to ask ourselves, what is the wisest and best use of taxpayer dollars?

Is the government doing an excellent job of managing your money?

It's not their money. It's your money. Do you think the government is better suited for your health care needs?

Whose going to handle or who is better equipped to handle the growing health care problems crisis, if you will, in this country?

The government only or the universal health care system, to me, almost is unsustainable. And it certainly is likely to hamper innovation, and hamper the delivery of some of the most modern health care services that the world has ever known.

Now, two examples of that, one very close to home, that would support the notion that a private-based system is better equipped and more flexible and less expensive than a government system, look to our north. Look at Canada.

Canada boasts a universal health care system. But what it fails to highlight is the tremendous wait for treatment that its patients must endure. In fact, in either 2004 or 2005, the Canadian Supreme Court ruled that access to a waiting list did not equal access to care because the waiting times were so long in that country. Their access to care is limited by the length of time that one must wait for care.

□ 2200

Now, in Canada they actually have a pretty good safety valve, and that safety valve is called the United States of America. One of the longest borders in the world is our northern border with our northern neighbor of Canada. And, in fact, if someone has the means to pay outside the system and feels that the wait is deleterious to their health,

they can leave Toronto and go to Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit and have that MRI, have that CAT scan, have the stent placed in a coronary artery if they don't feel the wait is in the best long-term interest of their health.

So you can take your money, cross the southern border of the United States, and receive care almost immediately, waiting for bypass surgery where you go to the hospital that puts you on a waiting list or puts you in a hospital and put you in a cath lab and gets the problem fixed. When it comes down to your health and a serious health problem, who wants to gamble?

Also, look at the National Health Service in Britain. They really have developed within their country a two-tiered system. Indeed, the wait times are a significant problem within the National Health Service. You can go outside the National Health Service, stay in the country of Britain, go outside the National Health Service and go to one of the private physicians. Physicians work in their offices at the time they are required by the government and then operate a private practice on the side. Some of the most expensive health care in the world is available right alongside the free system in the National Health Service. And the fact that it is able to run, the fact that it is able to go, certainly speaks to the fact that it is serving a need that people want filled.

The other thing you have to ask yourself, if you have someone who is going to have to wait 6 or 8 months for a CAT scan or an MRI, if you have someone who is going to wait half a year or a year's time for replacement of an artificial hip and that person is nearing the age of 80, a year's wait is a significant period of time of the number of days that that person has left in their life. It is a sad reality but, nevertheless, true.

Again, I come back to the notion that the private sector is more nimble and more financially responsible and it is the better way to build the future of our health system. It is a complex relationship. And how Congress should do its job to ensure that we have the best health care system possible is going to be the central part of the debate that we have over the next 18 months. In my opinion, Congress has to promote policies that keep the private sector leading the way with some interaction that leads to a well-run government system.

You can hardly talk about health care in this country without coming up against the problem of the uninsured. The Census Bureau right now estimates that some 46 million people in this country are uninsured.

Now, uninsured does not always mean lack of access to health care because we all have heard stories about people who use the emergency room for relatively modest problems. It is one of the more expensive ways to get care. There is also a disadvantage too in that if you wait until a modest health care problem becomes an emergency,

then you are oftentimes not going to get the best health care bargain or the best bargain for your health care dollar. You are also possibly going to jeopardize the health outcome. So no one would argue that just simply relying upon our Nation's overstretched emergency rooms are a method of dealing with the problem of the uninsured. But I think it is important to point out that doctors and nurses in hospitals on the front lines every day see people and take care of their medical needs, fully recognizing that there may not be a reasonable expectation of payment for those services. And we owe those individuals a debt of gratitude for continuing to do that, sometimes in the face of some rather severe Federal regulations and an extremely hostile medical liability climate.

One of the other things that we will talk about, in fact, we are required to do in this Congress is the reauthorization of what is known as SCHIP, the State Children's Health Insurance Program. This is a program that was started some 10 years ago. It had a 10-year authorization and requires that the Congress reauthorize it this year.

The two gentlemen who were here before me talking about the slow pace of things in this Congress could have added the slow pace of the reauthorization of the current SCHIP language to that list of things that they were concerned about. This is legislation that, again, Congress is required to reauthorize prior to September 30 of this year when the authorization expires. There is no continuing resolution. There is no IOU or Band-Aid we can put on this program. We simply must reauthorize the program if we want it to continue. And it has been a good program, and I would argue that virtually everyone within this body wants it to continue.

Not to say there are not some areas for improvement. A bill that I introduced earlier this year, H.R. 1013, the purpose of this legislation was to ensure that the SCHIP funding that Congress has made available be used to cover children and pregnant adults with this coverage. Right now we have four States that are covering more adults than they are children with their SCHIP funding. That stands the whole program on its head. It is cheaper to cover children with health insurance than it is adults. In fact, the ratio is it costs about 60 cents to provide what otherwise would cost a dollar's worth of health care insurance for adults. So we get a lot of mileage for our dollars when we put that coverage into children. If we take that coverage away from children to then cover adults who otherwise would not belong in the system but get in through some type of waiver, we are not doing a good job with the moneys that we intended to put forward to cover children. And the reality is until we have covered all the children who need coverage in this country, we shouldn't be taking those dollars away from the children to cover

adults in the system. Once we have covered all the children in the country, then perhaps it is time to talk about a waiver. If we want to cover other non-pregnant adults, let's find another program to do that. Let's not steal money from the SCHIP program to provide that coverage.

Another thing that we don't really talk about a lot on the House floor, last year in my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, we reauthorized the federally qualified health center statute. We never got that completely finished in the House. We should take it up again this year. It should be taken up by the Senate, and this is a program that fully deserves reauthorization by this Congress.

The federally qualified health center statute provides in federally qualified health centers coverage for about 15 million uninsureds. That is access to medicines, access to a medical home, access to mental health services, access to treatment for substance abuse, a significant set of services that are available to people who otherwise would not have access to medical care. Federally qualified health centers do a good job. Both SCHIP and the federally qualified health center system deserve to be taken up and reauthorized by this Congress. If there are improvements that we can make, then by all means let's have the debate and make those improvements necessary, but let's not let those two programs languish and by default be sunsetted and not continue.

Now, the two gentlemen that were here talking earlier were talking about some of the problems that people get into when they lose their health insurance and wanting to extend COBRA benefits, a noble exercise. One of the things that I have really thought is a forward-looking way to go with health insurance, and it kind of gets at what they were talking about, that is the individual ownership of an insurance policy.

The point made by Mr. KIRK of Illinois, gone are the days where a person gets out of high school or college, works in one job, one factory, one manufacturing plant for the remainder of their work life, then retires and gets a gold watch and goes off to a well-deserved retirement. People change jobs in today's economy. Their health insurance ought to be able to be flexible to change with them, to move with them. One way to ensure that is to allow an individual to own their health insurance policy.

Back in the days when I was practicing medicine in the middle 1990s, this Congress passed a bill called the Health Insurance Portability Act of 1996, the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill. In it, it provided for a demonstration product for what were then called the medical savings accounts. Bill Archer, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee at the time, was a champion of the old MSA. I had an MSA when I was a practicing physician. It allows you to build a tax-deferred savings account

that is dedicated to your medical expenses. You buy an insurance policy that is yours. You do pay for it with after-tax dollars, but the advantage is that since it has such a high deductible, it typically has a lower premium.

Now, there are some problems with the previous MSAs that were first passed by this Congress. This Congress put a lot of regulations on those insurance policies, and as a consequence, in my home State of Texas, we only had two insurers who were willing to take people on with a medical savings account. When we did the Medicare bill that I referenced earlier in the talk, back in 2003, when we did the Medicare Modernization Act, included within that language was language that allowed for a significant expansion of what we now call health savings accounts. The central concept is still there. It is a high deductible insurance policy owned by the individual, not the employer, or the individual can own the policy. Some employers have now begun to offer health savings accounts. A high deductible policy with a lower premium, and you put money into a tax-deferred savings account. Remember Albert Einstein said there is no power in the universe as strong as the miracle of compound interest. Put that as a pretax expense, and that can be something that grows significantly over time. Imagine that. A health-based IRA or a health savings account, an account that is dedicated only to your health care needs. Start that when you are young. It grows over time, and that can be an incredibly powerful tool to combat problems that might occur with health later in life.

But even if someone has a high deductible policy in their younger years and maybe they don't have quite as much stored up in that health savings account that would cover the deductible, still you get into a catastrophic situation, or it doesn't even need to be a catastrophic situation. In today's environment you have a single car accident and the medical costs can just be astronomical after spending an afternoon in the emergency room, a couple of hours in the CAT scanner, maybe a day or 2 in the intensive care unit, 3 or 4 days in the hospital, and by the time you get out, you have got a bill that will literally shock you. And a health savings account would provide that type of catastrophic coverage.

Why is this important? Say a young person just getting out of college decides they want to go off on their own and they want to be the next Bill Gates. They want to be an entrepreneur. They want to develop their own company. They don't want to work for a large company with its attendant benefits and health care insurance. They just want to go out on their own. Ten years ago you went into the private individual market and said, I want to buy some health insurance because I am going to work for myself and start a small business and be my own boss, you couldn't get anybody to talk to

you for any price. There just wasn't a policy available.

Fast forward to the present time, and with the changes we made with health savings accounts in the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003, you can go on the Internet. You can type in "health savings account" into the search engine of your choice. And in my home State of Texas for a male age 25, just out of college, nonsmoker, you can pick up a high deductible policy in the range of \$65 to \$75 a month. Not an astronomical expense. Sure, there is a high deductible associated with that. So if you want a flu shot next fall, you are probably just paying for that out of pocket. But if you get pneumonia and you end up in the hospital in the ICU for several days, you are going to have coverage for that so-called catastrophic event because, even though it is a high deductible, your medical expenses will quickly exceed that. So that is a good thing to have so that you do have coverage.

For a young family where a husband and wife want to have the coverage, want to do the responsible thing if they have small children, a health savings account may provide the way to do that and have that coverage beginning at an early age. And over time the money will grow in the actual savings account portion of that. It grows tax deferred. It can accumulate quickly. And as a consequence, the specter of having a very high deductible is something that is now not such a big deal because there is easily money within that health savings account to pay for those health care needs. Even the routine care if someone chooses to do that, the dollars are there to be spent for that purpose.

□ 2215

The popularity has grown a lot. When I first got mine back in 1997, my old Archer medical savings account, I worried because they said we're going to put a cap on this; we're not going to allow more than 750,000 of these to be sold in the United States of America. I thought golly, I better get out there and get one fast or they are going to all be snapped up. It turned out I didn't need to worry because those original insurance policies, probably less than 100,000 were sold.

But the health savings accounts, when the conditions changed in 2003, have been significantly popular. The last year for which I have accurate and verifiable data is 2005. But by December of that year, the end of calendar year 2005, 3.2 million individuals had coverage through a health savings account; 42 percent of those individuals had families with incomes below \$50,000 purchasing an HSA type of insurance. Certainly that is indicative that this is an affordable option. In addition, the number of previously uninsured HSA plan purchasers over the age of 60 nearly doubled, proving that the plans are accessible to people of all ages. And again, out of that number, over 3 million, probably about 40 percent of those

individuals were previously uninsured. So it did have the effect of, at least temporarily, bending the growth curve of the uninsured in this country.

Of those 46 million people that we talked about before that are uninsured, over half, 60 percent, are employed in small businesses. Some of these individuals prefer a more traditional health plan. They would like to have what we talked about earlier, an employer-derived health insurance. But their employers, their small business employers look at those premiums going up every year and they say, you know what, I just cannot do it anymore, and so they drop the benefit because it is simply too expensive.

Now, Congress has had before it, over the last 4 years I think we've had at least three votes on this concept; it has always passed the House of Representatives; it always stalled in the Senate. I don't know if we will take it up this year, but I think we should because I think it is fundamentally a good idea. And maybe at some point we will get some cooperation from the other body.

But to unburden small business owners, Congress has devised the concept of what are called Association Health Plans, essentially allowing a group of small businesses with a small business model to band together to get the purchasing clout of a big corporation. It is really not too hard a concept for most people to understand. It is, again, something that has passed this House at least three times that I am aware of. It is a sensible solution. It allows the spread of the insurance risk amongst a larger group. A small employer, say a realtor in your hometown who has 3 or 4 people working in the office, very difficult, very expensive for them to get insurance, if they can find it. Well, imagine if you let all the realtors in Texas band together and form a single group that was negotiating for the sale of insurance. Now imagine that you couple that with the realtors in Oklahoma, Louisiana and New Mexico. Then you've got a group of people that really is beginning to have some significant financial clout and may be able to get a much better price in the group health insurance market. Well, all of this, from the insurance side, is extremely important. You've got to worry though, are we putting the cart before the horse?

About a year and a half ago, Alan Greenspan, just as he retired as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board here in Washington, D.C., met with several groups. He met with a group of us one morning, and he was asked the inevitable question, well, Chairman, what about the ability of the Federal Government to pay for Medicare in the future. He alluded to how that was going to be a problem that was going to have to be faced. But at the end of it all, he felt that Congress would be able to come up with an equitable solution to that. And he paused and he said, what concerns me more is will there be anyone there to provide the services that

you want when you get there. That is a pretty profound statement, certainly something that has stuck with me since that time.

No question about it in my mind, our country faces a crisis in health care manpower, a physician shortage, if you will, in the future. We need to ensure that the doctors who are in practice today, those physicians I like to call "mature physicians" at the peak of their clinical abilities, at the peak of their diagnostic abilities, at the peak of their surgical expertise and abilities, we've got to be sure that they stay in the game, that they continue to practice, that they don't retire early, that they don't wander off and do something else. We need to keep them involved.

At the same time, we need to ensure that the younger physicians, the doctors of tomorrow, those that are in residency programs today, those that might be thinking about going to medical school or into nursing, that those individuals stay involved and in fact pursue their career dream of working in health care.

The first issue that always comes to my mind when I think of what are some of the things that drive doctors out of practice or keep people from going into the practice of medicine, and that is, of course, the conundrum of medical liability. Again, we faced it in this House of Representatives probably four times in the time that I have been in Congress. It is an issue that has never gotten through the other body. Again, I believe we need to continue to push that as an issue because in so many ways we just need some common-sense medical liability reform to protect patients, stop the escalating costs associated with lawsuits that are not well-grounded, and to make health care more affordable, ensure that health care is in fact even available to Americans all across from coast to coast in Alaska and Hawaii, and make sure that those physicians stay in the game and continue to provide the needed services.

I believe we do need a national solution. State to State coverage is always going to be tenuous. My home State of Texas did a great thing as far as medical liability reform is concerned back in September of 2003, but you worry every time the State legislature comes into session every 2 years, is something going to happen that undoes those great steps forward that were taken back in 2003.

I do think that modelling after the concept that was developed, actually originally in the State of California back in 1975, the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975, signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown, a great step forward that put a cap on noneconomic damages in medical liability suits.

Fast forward to 2003, and the Texas plan came forward. Indeed, the basis of the program or the basis of the reform does lie in a cap on noneconomic damages, but I like to say it's got a 21st

century angle to it. There is a \$250,000 cap on noneconomic damages for the doctor, a \$250,000 on noneconomic damages for the hospital, and a third cap of \$250,000 for noneconomic damages from a second hospital or nursing home, if one is involved. In fact, the original cap legislation that worked so well in California, in Texas it has been trifurcated. It is in the aggregate of a \$750,000 cap.

Well, how does that work? Did that fix the problem that the State of Texas faced the year I ran for Congress 2003? Well, in Texas, we've gone from 17 medical liability insurers down to two. My personal situation, running my own practice, really having not had a problem that would take me into the courts, but my rates were increasing by 25, 30, 40 percent a year. Well, in 2003, the Texas legislature passed medical liability reform based off that California law, again, updated for the 21st century, for an aggregate cap of \$750,000. What has happened since then? Well, remember I just said, we dropped from 17 liability insurers down to two because of the medical liability crisis. We are back up to 14 or 15 carriers. And most importantly, those carriers have returned to the State of Texas without an increase in their rates. They have held their rates down.

My old insurer of record, Texas Medical Liability Trust, between rate reductions, rebates and dividend payments to physicians over the 3½ years since this law was passed, the actual net effect is a 22 percent reduction in premiums for physicians across the board in the State of Texas. Again, remember premiums were going up by 20, 25, 30 percent or more a year, now they are coming down, and over the last few years they have come down 22 percent.

One of the most significant, unintended benefits of this was what happened with the small not-for-profit, community-based hospitals, those hospitals that were essentially self-insured for medical liability. They have been able to take money that was in those escrow accounts against the uncertainty of the medical liability climate that they faced in 2001, 2002 and early 2003, now that money has been able to go to hiring nurses, capital improvements, just the very things you would want your smaller not-for-profit, community-based hospital to be able to do. This is certainly one of the good news stories. And again, the smaller hospitals were not the intended beneficiary of this legislation when it passed in the State of Texas.

I took the language of the Texas-passed medical liability reform, worked it into the type of language that we have to have here in the House of Representatives, ran it through legislative counsel and offered it to Mr. RYAN, Paul Ryan, the ranking member of the Budget Committee on the Republican side, when we were doing our budgetary work in March. He had that bill scored by the Congressional Budget Office. And the Texas plan, as applied

through the House of Representatives language, applied to the entire 50 States, would yield a savings of \$3.8 billion over 5 years. Now, not a mammoth amount of money, but when you are talking about a \$2.999 trillion budget, savings is savings. And these are monies that we are in a sense just going to leave on the table in this budgetary cycle that could have gone to some of the other spending priorities, some of which I have already alluded to in the SCHIP and the Federally Qualified Health Center statutes. But anything, even those things not dealing with health, \$3.8 billion, as the old saying goes, you keep leaving that amount of money on the table and pretty soon you're going to be talking about some real dollars.

And also consider this: A study done in 1996, that's over 10 years ago, out of Stanford University, revealed that in the Medicare system alone, the cost of defensive medicine was approximately \$28 to \$30 billion a year. The cost of Medicare, not the entire cost of the health care infrastructure of the United States of America, the cost to Medicare was \$28 to \$30 billion a year 10 years ago. I submit that that number has likely increased today. We can scarcely afford to continue this trajectory that we are on with regards to medical liability in this country.

And again, remember when I started this part of the discussion talking about are we going to have anyone there to provide the services when we want them. And another consideration is that young people today entering college, in college, just getting out of college, who wanted to consider a career in health care, are looking at the crisis that we face in medical liability in this country, and it's keeping them out of the game, and that's not right. One of the obstetrics residency directors from a big New York program was down here actually a couple of years ago now, and I asked her, is the medical liability crisis, is it having an effect on your residency classes that you're recruiting? And she told me that right now we are taking people into our residency program that we wouldn't have interviewed 5 years ago. In other words, we are lowering the class and the capabilities of those people who are willing to go into obstetrics as a specialty. Well, these are our children's doctors, these are our children's children's doctors that are being trained in the residency programs today. I fail to see how it advances the case for patient safety and the well-being of Americans to continue to allow this condition to exist without addressing it.

Again, we voted on the bill several times in this House over the past several years. My understanding is the bill was just recently reintroduced last week. I hope we will have a chance to address it in this House. And I hope we can get some activity from the other body. I am not optimistic, but I believe this is so important that we have got to continue to try to get this done.

This brings me to one of the things I initially spoke about, one of three health care bills, H.R. 2583, the so-called Physician Workforce and Graduate Medical Education Enhancement Act of 2007. There is a Washington-type title that everyone can love. Well, part of ensuring the future health care workforce in this country is going to be to make certain that there are the types of residency programs in the types of communities in which we want doctors to consider going into practice. You know, the funny thing about physicians is they do have a lot of inertia. They tend to stay where they're dropped; that is, they tend to work and have their practice in communities where they trained or close to where they trained.

□ 2230

A lot of us have followed that trajectory, and I suspect there is nothing unique about that. It will continue to be the way physicians behave for probably well into the future. So the bill introduced just last week was designed to get more training programs in areas that are underserved, like rural areas, inner-city areas, to get young doctors-in-training in locations where they are actually needed.

The Physician Workforce and Graduate Medical Education Enhancement Act of 2007 would develop a program that would permit hospitals that do not traditionally operate a residency training program that will allow them the opportunity to start a residency training program and in fact build that physician workforce of the future on site in those communities where they are in fact needed.

On average, it costs \$100,000 a year to train a resident, and that cost for a smaller hospital is clearly prohibitive. Because of the cost consideration, the bill would create a loan fund available to hospitals to make residency training programs where none has operated in the past. The programs would require full accreditation and be focused obviously in rural and suburban inner-urban or other smaller community-type hospitals. I can think of several communities in the congressional district that I represent that might benefit from such a program.

Clearly, it is one thing to say we are just going to educate more doctors, but to get them to practice in the areas where they are needed, and, boy, an area that comes to mind is the area around New Orleans, Louisiana. They have lost doctors. The wholesale loss of doctors since the twin hurricanes of August of 2005, it is going to be very difficult to encourage people to come back to that area. But the reality is if someone trains in that area, the likelihood of them staying in that area is increased.

It is all well and good to create new residency programs, but if you don't have anyone interested in filling that residency slot, it is not going to be really something that does all that

much good. So the second bill, H.R. 2584, the High Need Physician Specialty Workforce Incentive Act of 2007, would help locate young doctors where they are needed to solve part of the impending physician shortage crisis that likely could affect the entire country.

We have got to consider training doctors for high need specialties. This act will establish a mix of scholarships, loan repayment funds and tax incentives to entice more students to medical school and create incentives for those students and newly-minted doctors to help them go into healthcare. The program will have a established repayment program for students who agree to go into family practice, internal medicine, emergency medicine, general surgery or OB/GYN, and practice in underserved areas. It will be a 5-year authorization at \$5 million a year and it will provide additional educational scholarships in exchange for a commitment to serve in a public or private nonprofit health facility determined to have a critical shortage of primary care physicians.

Again, the Gulf Coast area comes to mind, but there are plenty of areas in my home State of Texas, West Texas and in fact East Texas, that would fit the bill for something like that. It is very similar to what used to be called the Berry Plan. The armed services used to offer a scholarship and some loan forgiveness to encourage physicians to go into one of the branches of service. This is modeled after those plans that were so popular in the early 1970s. Again, it is an important step in getting doctors into the communities where they are actually needed.

The third bill of the three that I introduced last week, H.R. 2585, really deals with the heart of the problem, which is stabilization of the current physician workforce.

When we talk about the current physician workforce, discussing things like medical liability, placement of doctors in locations of greatest need and financial concerns, encouraging doctors to remain in those high-need specialties, the next step is to fix on that largest group of doctors in the country and certainly the largest and still growing group of patients, those baby-boomers that you heard MARK KIRK talk about in the last hour.

Baby-boomers are going to continue to age. They are going to retire, and the demand for services has no where to go but up. If the physician workforce trends continues as they are today, we may no longer be talking about trying to fund the Medicare program. We may be talking about trying to find the Medicare physician. We may be talking about the fact that there is no one there to take care of America's seniors.

Year after year, there is a reduction in reimbursement payments from the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services to doctors for services that they provide their Medicare patients. This is not a question of doctors just simply

wanting to make more money. It is about a stabilized repayment for services that are already rendered. It is about a question of fundamental fairness. And it is not just affecting doctors. It is affecting patients, and it becomes a real crisis of access.

Not a week goes by that I don't get a letter or fax from a physician back in Texas who says, you know what? I have just had enough of this, and I am going to retire early. I am no longer going to see Medicare patients in my practice or I am going to restrict the procedures that I offer to Medicare patients.

In fact it happened to me while we were home on the Memorial Day recess. A woman came up to me, someone I had trained with, and said, look, I just can no longer do these long, involved operations and be paid literally a pittance for the service, when I could spend my time doing other things that would actually pay for the cost of running my practice.

I certainly understand that. I certainly sympathize with that. It is a difficult situation for doctors to find themselves in, because they want to do right. These are difficult operations that they trained for years to be able to provide for people. Now, the fact that they are so poorly compensated by Medicare, they are simply having to turn their back on these challenging, technically difficult procedures, and say I will just see the well patient in the office and stay out of the operating room. I saw it happen in the hospital environment before I left the practice of medicine to come to Congress.

But I hear it in virtually every town hall that I do back in my district. Someone will raise their hand and come up to me afterwards and say, how come on Medicare, you turn 65 and you have to change doctors? The answer is because their doctor found it no longer economically viable to continue to see Medicare patients because they weren't able to cover the cost of delivering the care rendered. They weren't able to cover the cost of providing the care.

Medicare payments to physicians are modified annually. They use something called the sustainable growth rate formula. A lot of the people around here call it the SGR rate. Because of flaws in the process, the sustainable growth rate formula, mandated physician fee cuts in recent years have only been moderately averted by last-minute machinations and fixes that the Congress has provided. In fact, if no long-term congressional action is implemented, the SGR will continue to mandate cuts for physician reimbursement as far as the eye can see, cuts in aggregate between 35 and 40 percent over the next 10 years.

Now, unlike hospitals, who are reimbursed under essentially a cost of living adjustment every year known as the Medicare Economic Index, physicians are reimbursed under the SGR, which says there is a fixed amount of money to pay for all of the doctor-derived healthcare in this country, and

there is more demands on that volume, then the slices of that pie are just going to get successively thinner year after year.

Medicare payments to physicians cover only about 65 percent of the cost of providing the patient services. That doesn't figure in anything for the doctor's take-home pay. That is the cost of providing the services. That is the office rent. That is the nurse's salary. That is keeping the lights on. That is paying for the medical equipment. That is buying the syringes and the medicines that might be administered in that office.

Can you imagine any industry, any business, any company that would continue in business if they received only two-thirds of the cost of what it costs them to provide the services? Currently the sustainable growth rate formula links physician payment updates to the Gross Domestic Product, which actually has no relationship whatsoever to the cost of providing those services.

But simply the repeal of the SGR, one of the big stumbling blocks for that is it is very, very costly when figured in the overall Federal budget. But the reality is we have to do it. Maybe if we do it over time, perhaps we can bring that down to a level that is in fact manageable.

Paying physicians fairly will extend their careers for many of those doctors now in practice and those who would otherwise opt out of the Medicare program or seek early retirement or restrict those procedures that they offer to their Medicare patients. It also has the effect of ensuring an adequate network of doctors available to older Americans as this country makes the transition to the physician workforce of the future.

In the physician payment stabilization bill, the SGR formula would be repealed 2 years from now, in 2010. There would be some incentive payments based on quality reporting and technology improvements installed to protect the practicing of physicians against the 5 percent cut that will likely occur each in the years 2008 and 2009. Those things would be voluntary. No one would have to do them. No one would be required to participate in the quality program or the technology improvement, but it would be available to those doctors and those practices who wanted to offset the proposed cuts that would occur in physician reimbursement over the 2 years until a formal repeal of the SGR would be allowed to happen.

Now, for most doctors, that is unacceptable. They say, well, I want the SGR repealed now, not 2 years from now, and I want it repealed this year and I want a positive update or I am going to stop seeing Medicare patients.

The reality is that possibly if we do this over time, we will be able to get it done. The other reality is I wish we had started this when I first got to Congress 4 years ago, and we might be well

on our way or well past the where we would have in fact solved this problem. So, it is time to begin that journey of 1,000 miles with the very first steps, and we do have to focus on the fact that this is a long-term solution.

A lot of people say why do it that way? Why not just bite the bullet and get the SGR out of the way and get it repealed? It costs a tremendous amount of money. The other unfortunate aspect of that costing a tremendous amount of money is it may make the premium for the Part B recipient, it may make that premium go up significantly.

In Congress, we are all required to submit legislation to the Congressional Budget Office to find out how much it costs. If we are going to spend the taxpayers' money, how much are we going to spend, over what time will we spend it?

Because of constraints at the Congressional Budget Office, we are not allowed to do what is called dynamic scoring. We are not able to look at changing a program or a new program and say if we did things this way, we would save money in the future. That is well and good, but we can't claim those future savings to offset the cost of doing it a new way. And that is what static scoring tells us, and that is why dynamic scoring would be so beneficial in a situation like this. But we are not able to use that.

If we look at some of the things we have done already in the Medicare system we can say, you know, if we do it this way, we are actually going to save some money. We are not allowed to capture those savings.

The Trustees Report that came out just a few weeks ago, there were 600,000 hospital beds in the year 2005 that weren't filled because of things that doctors and hospitals are doing better, improvements that have been made in the healthcare system. 600,000 hospital beds that weren't filled. Do we get the financial credit for those 600,000 hospital beds that weren't filled? No, we can't claim that. That is just something that is absorbed by the system, and we go on and reset things for the next year and continue on our merry way with the SGR.

But the reality is if we could capture those savings, if we could aggregate those savings, it is not just in hospital beds, there are other areas where savings are occurring at the same time, if we could capture those savings, aggregate those savings, and use those savings to offset the cost of the SGR repeal, we might very well come down to a much more manageable number.

The old bank robber, Willie Sutton, was famous for saying he robbed banks because that is where the money is. Well, let's go after the procedures where most of the money is spent in CMS, identify where the savings are in delivering the care for people who are in those diagnostic groups, and let's keep that money, capture that money, and use it to offset the cost of the SGR.

I think that is the greatest return on investment that we could expect from those savings that we are likely going to see from Medicare in the future.

The same considerations apply to the Medicaid program as well. Again, it could be a useful exercise to go through and identify the top 10 conditions and see where the easy savings are in taking care of patients with those conditions. How can their care be better managed? How can things be prospectively managed? What types of intervention might keep a patient out of an expensive hospitalization or away from an expensive dialysis unit? These are the times of savings we need to gather.

I see that I am going to run up against some time constraints. I just want to mention health information technology is something that we do have to pay some attention to.

In the SGR reform bill that I introduced, there is some language about moving us down the road on information technology, embracing information technology. I haven't always been a big proponent of that. When I was practicing medicine, if someone had come to me with proposals like that, I would say, you know, that is going to increase the number of hours I spend every day, not increase my payments to any great degree, and I just don't see how it is going to be economically useful to me as a physician.

That was before I traveled to the City of New Orleans for the second time in January of 2006 and was taken into the records room at Charity Hospital shortly after they had gotten all of the water out of the records room at Charity Hospital.

□ 2245

It looked like the records room of any big city hospital. There were rows and rows, perhaps hundreds of thousands of records in this large room, tens of thousand of square feet devoted to the storage of medical records. They were ruined. They had been ruined by the water and by the black mold growing on the manilla folders. There was not enough protective gear to protect someone to go in and pull the charts out of the racks and begin to go through them to get the patient's medical history.

Clearly, the time has come where we need to have the concept of computerized access to medical records. It is something this country needs to embrace.

The old adage when I was in college, you could say, the dog ate my homework. No student today would do a report, a term paper and keep one single paper copy. They have it on a flash drive, on a hard drive, on a floppy disk. They have printed it out several times. They live in the electronic age. It would make no sense to the medical student of today to have a single paper copy of a term paper or lab report that they would have to turn in for a grade. It would never cross their mind.

Some of the other things, the interoperability of our systems is key.

Right after the Walter Reed story broke, I was there visiting. Yes, the physical conditions were one thing; but one soldier told me the biggest concern he has is as he prepares his records, he is on medical hold and as he is looking to go back to join his unit or be discharged, he has to put in order his medical records to make the case for staying in the service or get the disability to which he is entitled if he is discharged from the service.

The biggest fear they have is they will spend hour after hour putting records together and highlighting critical areas, have them sit on someone's desk until they are lost, and then have to start over again. Their biggest concern was the inability of the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration to interact with each other on the transfer of medical records. Clearly, that is a concept whose time has come.

Price transparency. I have talked about HSAs. If we are going to have health savings accounts work for Americans, we are going to have to be able to allow them to access information about price, cost and quality of medical care and procedures. I introduced legislation dealing with price transparency earlier.

My home State of Texas has gone a long way in this regard, providing information up on the Internet about the costs at various hospitals throughout the State and how they compare to other hospitals in the State. There is a lot of information. It is technically complex. It may even be boring to listen to, but nonetheless it is part of an incredibly important story. The story of how the most advanced, most innovative health care system in the world itself is in need of a little attention.

The last chapter should read happily ever after. How do we get there? The last chapter may read private industry leads to a healthy ending. We are in a debate that will forever change the way health care is delivered in our country. The next 18 months will spell that out for us. We have to understand what is working in our system. How do we make it work better, and how do we extend that to areas where we don't find excellence in our system, whether those areas be public or private. We can't delay making changes to bring our health care system into the 21st century.

I believe the only way this can work is to allow the private sector to lay the foundation for further improvements. The pillars of the system we have have to be rooted in the bedrock of a thriving public sector, and a thriving private sector, not in the shaky ground of a public and private system always at war with each other, and many times are inefficient.

We need to devote our work in Congress to building a stronger private sector in health care. History has proven this to be a tried and true measure. We can bring down the number of uninsured, increase patient access, stabilize

physician workforce and modernize technology if we simply have the political and institutional courage to take the steps necessary.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, MAY 17, 2007 AT PAGE H5467

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. ALTMIRE, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1427) to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to rule XXVII, as a result of the adoption by the House and the Senate of the conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43), increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, has been engrossed and is deemed to have passed the House on May 17, 2007.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. GUTIERREZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and June 12.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. EVERETT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. SESSIONS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of taking his son to scout camp.

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:)

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 18.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and June 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today and June 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, June 12.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 18.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 6, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1675. 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. To reauthorize the program of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for loan guarantees for Indian housing.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 12, 2007, at 9 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2112. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Classical Swine Fever Status of the Mexican State of Nayarit [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0104] received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2113. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Emerald Ash Borer Host Material From Canada [Docket No.

APHIS-2006-0125] (RIN: 0579-AC39) received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2114. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-33, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to India for defense articles and services, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2115. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-25, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Japan for defense articles and services, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2116. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-15, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Finland for defense articles and services, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2117. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-23, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Philippines for defense articles and services, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2118. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a review of the C-130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP program), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2119. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisitions, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a review of the Joint Primary Aircraft Trainer System (JPATS) program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2120. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisitions, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a review of the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM) program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2121. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisitions, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a review of the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV) program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2122. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a review of the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T) program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2123. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Vice Admiral Donald C. Arthur, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2124. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Vice Admiral Rodney P. Rempt, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2125. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, De-

partment of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of the acquisitions made from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside of the United States in fiscal year 2006, pursuant to Public Law 109-115, section 837; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2126. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Loans to Executive Officers, Directors, and Principal Shareholders of Member Banks [Regulation O; Docket No. R-1271] received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2127. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 20, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2128. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 20, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2129. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — HOME Investment Partnerships Program; American Dream Downpayment Initiative and Amendments to Homeownership Affordability [Docket No. FR-4832-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AC93) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2130. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Approval of Condominiums in Puerto Rico on Evidence of Presentation of Legal Documents [Docket No. FR-5009-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AI36) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2131. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks [Docket ID OTS-2007-0006] received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2132. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report for Calendar Year 2006 on the country of origin and the sellers of uranium and uranium enrichment services purchased by owners and operators of U.S. civilian nuclear power reactors, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 1015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2133. A letter from the Deputy Chief Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules to Implement and Administer a Coupon Program for Digital-to-Analog Converter Boxes [Docket Number: 0612242667-7051-01] (RIN: 0660-AA16) received April 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2134. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Acquisition Regulation: Technical Revisions or Amendments to Update Clauses (RIN: 1991-AB62) received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2135. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Romney and Wardsville, West Virginia) [MB Docket No. 05-143 RM-11221 RM-11286] received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2136. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2137. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2138. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2139. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2140. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary, White House Liaison, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2141. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2142. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Pay Administration (General) (RIN: 3206-AK74) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2143. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2144. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Security; Prevention of Acts of Violence and Terrorism [BOP-1116; AG Order No. 2878-2007] (RIN: 1120-AB08) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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:

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 473. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2638) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-184). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2641. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDWARDS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2642. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DICKS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2643. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 251. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit manipulation of caller identification information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules with respect to health savings accounts and medical savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2640. A bill to improve the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 2644. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of marriage and family therapist services under Medicare part B, 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. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 2645. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to improve mental health and substance abuse treatment by providing grants for justice system personnel training, treatment programs, and diversion programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 2646. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish grant programs to provide funding for mental health services in response to public health emer-

gencies, for statewide plans for providing such services in response to such emergencies, and for the training of mental health professional with respect to the treatment of victims of such emergencies, and to establish the National Mental Health Crisis Response Technical Assistance Center; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 2647. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve mental health and substance abuse services for juveniles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE:

H.R. 2648. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the reduction in the deductible portion of expenses for business meals and entertainment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2649. A bill to make amendments to the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOYD of Florida:

H.R. 2650. A bill to modify certain water resources projects for the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2651. A bill to require large publicly traded companies and significant emitters of greenhouse gases to report their emissions to the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2652. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to generate renewable energy and encourage novel technologies related to the production of energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 2653. A bill to provide for priority consideration for grade crossing safety improvements where there have been serious collisions; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN (for herself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2654. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 202 South Dumont Avenue in Woonsocket, South Dakota, as the "Eleanor McGovern Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 2655. A bill to provide for a loan forgiveness program for certain individuals who serve as early childhood educators; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAHONEY of Florida (for himself and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 2656. A bill to enhance the ongoing profitability and viability of America's farms, forests, and ranches by making conservation activities more cost-effective and efficient, by creating new revenue opportunities through biofuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2657. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to

ensure that employees are not improperly disqualified from benefits under pension plans and welfare plans based on the misclassification or reclassification of their status; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 2658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for farmers' investments in value-added agriculture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 2659. A bill to treat payments under the Conservation Reserve Program as rentals from real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 2660. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to extend the period for filing charges of discrimination in violation of such title and to provide relief for certain current injuries arising from compensation calculations attributable to compensation decisions made at any time in violation of such title; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 2661. A bill to make careers in public service more feasible for students with high educational debt; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SCHMIDT:

H.R. 2662. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to collect certain data pertaining to cancelled and diverted flights of air carriers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 2663. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to extend a requirement for the prescreening of air passengers to international flights that overfly the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 2664. A bill to require the Federal Government to reimburse a State or local government for financial losses incurred when an employee of the State or local government who performs public safety or first responder duties and who is also a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services is called or ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH of Vermont (for himself and Mr. HODES):

H.R. 2665. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in implementing cultural heritage, conservation, and recreational activities in the Connecticut River watershed of the States of New Hampshire and Vermont; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2666. A bill to provide for the implementation of a system of licensing for purchasers of certain firearms and for a record of sale system for those firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 2667. A bill to provide for the establishment of a disabled farmers' market nutrition pilot program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 2668. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to reduce class size through the use of fully quali-

fied teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Lena Horne should be recognized as one of the most popular performers of the 1940s and 1950s and for her outspoken opposition to racial and social injustice; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCINTYRE (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HAYES, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SHULER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GOODE, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H. Res. 474. A resolution recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H. Res. 475. A resolution congratulating the University of Arizona Wildcats for winning the 2007 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Softball Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MICA, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California):

H. Res. 476. A resolution condemning bigotry, violence, and discrimination against Iranian-Americans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WATT, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H. Res. 477. A resolution recognizing National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 25: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 35: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 82: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SESTAK and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 176: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 237: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 303: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 333: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 464: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 555: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 621: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. HAYES

H.R. 662: Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 675: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 690: Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 715: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 718: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 741: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 758: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 760: Mr. PASTOR and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 784: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 857: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 928: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 943: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 962: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 971: Ms. FOX.

H.R. 980: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 997: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1038: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1043: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1073: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1098: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1102: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1108: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1113: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1115: Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 1187: Mr. VISLOSKEY.

H.R. 1189: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1192: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1239: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 1261: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1280: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1295: Mr. GOODE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1304: Mr. COBLE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HODES, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1338: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1363: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 1366: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1418: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas,

Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 1428: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1441: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1456: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1459: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1475: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1496: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1514: Mr. GINGREY and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 1542: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1551: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1567: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1576: Mr. HARE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 1673: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1705: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1707: Mr. WU and Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 1709: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 1732: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 1776: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1780: Mr. FEENEY.
 H.R. 1783: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 1791: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 1809: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1810: Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 1845: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 1866: Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. FORTUÑO.
 H.R. 1912: Mr. FORTUÑO.
 H.R. 1957: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1975: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1977: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SIRE.
 H.R. 2017: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 2027: Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 2032: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2060: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 2109: Mr. CANTOR.
 H.R. 2111: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2129: Ms. WATERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 2131: Mr. MARKEY.
 H.R. 2164: Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 2165: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. HILL, Ms. CASTOR, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2169: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 2232: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 2265: Mr. DINGELL and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 2287: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 2295: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 2304: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 2341: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2347: Mr. BACA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HODES, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 2349: Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 2352: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 2358: Mr. CASTLE.
 H.R. 2362: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.
 H.R. 2367: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2373: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 2384: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2392: Ms. HIRONO and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 2401: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 2417: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2421: Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 2425: Mr. BLUNT.
 H.R. 2426: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2435: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 2443: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DENT, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2458: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2470: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 2499: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 2503: Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 2508: Mrs. MYRICK and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 2537: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 2593: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. ORTIZ.
 H.R. 2604: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MCNULTY.
 H.R. 2605: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2633: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2637: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BUYER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. EVERETT.
 H.J. Res. 12: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.J. Res. 28: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CARSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WATT.
 H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H. Con. Res. 104: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. CORINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. FERGUSON.
 H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H. Res. 226: Mr. FILNER.
 H. Res. 231: Mr. WELLER.
 H. Res. 257: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Res. 282: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WELLER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. SESTAK.
 H. Res. 287: Ms. MATSUI.
 H. Res. 353: Ms. LEE and Mr. FERGUSON.
 H. Res. 356: Mr. HOLT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Res. 395: Mr. SARBANES.
 H. Res. 431: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 442: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H. Res. 444: Mr. COHEN.
 H. Res. 467: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HENSARLING, and Ms. MATSUI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 SEC. ____ . Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 5.7 percent.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to recruit or hire a total of more than 45,000 full-time equivalent airport screeners.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. LANGEVIN

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 50, line 26, insert “: Provided further, That \$50,000,000 of such amount shall be for cybersecurity research

and development” after “Impact Assessment”.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. DEAL OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 4: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 SEC. 544. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to any State or local government that fails to or refuses to assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. DEAL OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to destroy or put to pasture any horse or mule belonging to the United States that has become unfit for service until the individual trainer or handler of the horse or mule is given the option for the transfer or conveyance of the horse or mule to the trainer's possession.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. TANCREDO

AMENDMENT No. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 SEC. 544. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the visa waiver program under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187).

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. TANCREDO

AMENDMENT No. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 SEC. 544. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. TANCREDO

AMENDMENT No. 8: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 SEC. 544. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the diversity visa program established in section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(c)).

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MRS. DRAKE

AMENDMENT No. 9: Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,400,000)”.

Page 17, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$9,100,000)”.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MRS. DRAKE

AMENDMENT No. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 SEC. 544. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to grant an immigration benefit to any individual who commits manslaughter while under the influence of alcohol and while operating a motor vehicle that has been involved in interstate commerce.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 11: Page 18, line 25, insert before the period at the end the following: “: Provided further, That, of the funds made available under this heading, \$250,000 is for a study to determine how participation in the program under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) can be increased nationwide”.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 12: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 544. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide funds to a State or political subdivision of a State that refuses a reasonable request made by the head of a law enforcement agency of the State or subdivision that the State or subdivision take such steps as may be necessary in order for the law enforcement agency to participate in the program under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. GINNY BROWN-WAITE OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$89,125,000)".

Page 11, line 24, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$89,125,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. GINNY BROWN-WAITE OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Page 15, line 15, insert after the colon the following: "Provided further, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$300,000,000 shall be obligated for the purposes of constructing fencing along the southwest border of the United States:".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. CONAWAY

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. ____ . It is the sense of the House of Representatives that any reduction in the amount appropriated by this Act achieved as a result of amendments adopted by the House should be dedicated to deficit reduction.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. CONAWAY

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 11, line 24, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. CORRINE BROWN OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 17: In title I, in the item relating to "Office of the Chief Financial Officer", after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

In title I, in the item relating to "Inspector General, operating expenses", after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. CORRINE BROWN OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 61, after line 11, insert the following:

(d) Orlando International Airport and Miami International Airport shall be two of the seven airports selected to implement a pilot program to screen airport workers who enter or re-enter secure airport space.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. CORRINE BROWN OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 3, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. CORRINE BROWN OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . (a) None of the funds provided by this Act shall, effective as of April 1, 2008, be used to fund any position described in subsection (b).

(b) The positions described in this subsection are as follows:

(1) Within the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Ombudsman, the

Deputy Chief of Staff (Policy), the Policy Advisor (Office of the Chief of Staff), and the Director of Public Liaison (Office of the Assistant Secretary of Public Affairs).

(2) Within the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Assistant Secretary (Policy and Planning), the Director of Policy and Program Analysis, and the Regional Administrators.

(3) Within the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, the Chief of Policy and Strategy.

(4) Within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development.

(5) Within the Office of the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response, the Director of Policy.

(6) Within the Office of US-VISIT Program, the Chief of Staff and Senior Policy Advisor.

(7) Within the United States Customs and Border Protection, the Policy Advisor.

(8) Within the Transportation Security Administration, the Director of Special Projects for Transportation Security Policy.

(9) Within the Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security, the Director of Transportation Security Policy for Border and Transportation Security.

(10) Within the Office of the Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection Policy.

(11) Within the Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, the Special Assistant for Science and Technology.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. CROWLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$35,000,000)".

Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 40, line 8, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. GINGREY

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Strike section 527 (page 65, beginning at line 17).

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Sec. ____ . Any reports required in this Act and accompanying reports to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations and the Department of Homeland Security's annual justifications of the President's budget request shall be posted on the Department of Homeland Security's public website not later than 48 hours after such submission unless information in the report compromises national security.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 24: On page 39, line 9, before the period, insert the following:

Provided further, That funds be used to increase outreach to encourage emergency preparedness efforts for vulnerable communities, including racial and ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, the elderly, and the economically disadvantaged.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 25: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PIPELINE AND REFINERY VULNERABILITY.

That not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a classified report describing the security vulnerabilities of the nation's pipelines and oil refineries to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. ISSA

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 544. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with an entity that employs individuals unless the entity agrees to elect to participate in the basic pilot program described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note).

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. SHAYS

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 7, line 16, after "which" insert the following: "\$100,000 is for sharing counter-terrorism and stolen and lost travel document information between the Department and Interpol and".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. POE

AMENDMENT NO. 28: At the end of title V, add the following new section:

Sec. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement a plan under section 7209 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 8 U.S.C. 1185 note) that permits travel into the United States from foreign countries using any document other than a passport to denote citizenship and identity.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. CARTER

AMENDMENT NO. 29: Page 14, line 16, strike "Office:" and insert "Office.".

Page 14, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 16, line 2.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. ELLSWORTH

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 544. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to enter into a contract in an amount greater than the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract that the contractor owes no Federal tax debt. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the certification requirement of part 52.209-5 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall also include a requirement for a certification by a prospective contractor of whether, within the three-year period preceding the offer for the contract, the prospective contractor—

(1) has or has not been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against the contractor for violating any tax law or failing to pay any tax;

(2) has or has not been notified of any delinquent taxes for which the liability remains unsatisfied; or

(3) has or has not received a notice of a tax lien filed against the contractor for which

the liability remains unsatisfied or for which the lien has not been released.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 31: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Secretary and Executive Management", after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced By \$138,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 32: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Secretary and Executive Management", after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced By \$300,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 33: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Secretary and Executive Management", after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced By \$1,241,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 34: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Under Secretary for Management", after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced By \$142,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 35: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Under Secretary for Management", after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$350,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 36: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Under Secretary for Management", after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,160,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 37: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Under Secretary for Management", after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,467,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 38: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Under Secretary for Management", after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,212,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 39: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Chief Financial Officer", after the dollar amount insert "(reduced By \$6,045,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 40: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Chief Financial Officer", after the dollar amount insert "(reduced By \$400,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 41: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Under Secretary for Management" after the dollar amount insert "(reduced By \$13,331,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 42: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Chief Financial Officer", after the dollar amount insert "(reduced By \$79,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 43: In title I, under the heading "Office of the Chief Financial Offi-

cer", after the dollar amount insert "(reduced By \$9,961,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 44: Page 31, line 13, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$16,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 45: Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 39, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 46: Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$300,000,000)".

Page 39, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$300,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 47: Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 40, line 23, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 48: Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$190,000,000)".

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$190,000,000)".

Page 40, line 10, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$190,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 49: Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$225,000,000)".

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$225,000,000)".

Page 40, line 17, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$225,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 50: Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 41, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 51: Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$58,000,000)".

Page 42, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$58,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 52: Page 39, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 42, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 53: Page 42, line 25, after each dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$270,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 54: Page 42, line 25, after each dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$23,000,000)".

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 55: Strike Section 512.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 56: Strike Section 514.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 57: Strike Section 536.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 58: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for use in high threat, high-density urban areas may be used to support dance classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 59: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for use in high threat, high-density urban areas may be used to support puppet shows.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 60: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for use in high threat, high-density urban areas may be used to support bingo games.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 61: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for use in high threat, high-density urban areas may be used to support yoga classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 62: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for use in high threat, high-density urban areas may be used to support art classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 63: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for use in high threat, high-density urban areas may be used to support theater workshops.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 64: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for terrorism prevention activities may be used to support dance classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 65: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for terrorism prevention activities may be used for puppet shows.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 66: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for terrorism prevention activities may be used for bingo games.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 67: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for terrorism prevention activities may be used for yoga classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 68: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for terrorism prevention activities may be used for art classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 69: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for grants for terrorism prevention activities may be used for theater workshops.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 70: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for interoperable communications grants may be used for supporting dance classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 71: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for interoperable communications grants may be used for supporting puppet shows.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 72: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for interoperable communications grants may be used for supporting bingo games.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 73: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading

"Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for interoperable communications grants may be used for supporting yoga classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 74: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for interoperable communications grants may be used for supporting art classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 75: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and local programs" for interoperable communications grants may be used for supporting theater workshops.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 76: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—emergency performance grants" may be used for supporting yoga classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 77: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—emergency performance grants" may be used for supporting bingo games.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 78: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—emergency performance grants" may be used for supporting puppet shows.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 79: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—emergency performance grants" may be used for supporting dance classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 80: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—emergency performance grants" may be used for supporting art classes.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 81: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act in title III under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency—emergency performance grants" may be used for supporting theater workshops.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 82: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the alteration or removal of the Galveston Causeway Bridge in Galveston, Texas.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 83: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the alteration or removal of the Burlington Northern Railroad Bridge in Burlington, Iowa.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 84: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the alteration or removal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Bridge in LaCrosse, Wisconsin.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 85: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the alteration or removal of the Chelsea Street Bridge in Chelsea, Massachusetts.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 86: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salary of a Department of Homeland Security Director of the Office of Multimedia.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 87: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase a Louis Vuitton handbag.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 88: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay for adult entertainment.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 89: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay for a parking ticket.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 90: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase jewelry.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 91: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay a bail bond.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 92: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 Federal employees at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT No. 93: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. __. Total appropriations made in this Act (other than appropriations required to be made by a provision of law) are hereby reduced by \$362,540,000.

H.R. 2638

OFFERED BY: MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA
AMENDMENT NO. 94: Page 31, line 13, insert after expended "Provided that, of the funds

made available under this heading, at least \$3,000,000 is for the establishment of a National Transportation Security Center of Excellence."