United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 22, 2007 No. 102

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 22, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ELLEN O. TAUSCHER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

In biblical times, after You proved victorious over Your people's enemies, Gideon was revered and the people wanted him to be their ruler. But Gideon replied: ''I will not rule over you, nor shall my son. It is the Lord you should seek to rule over you.''

Even today, Lord, we honor our veterans of war. We are proud that throughout our history in America, many veterans of war have served and presently serve here in Congress. But, in such a democracy as ours, it is You, Lord, we seek. It is You, Lord, who will rule over us, in and through Your servants.

Today we ask You to bless and reward those serving in the armed services of our country. Grant health, peace and consolation to all our veterans and those missing in action. Continue, Lord God of revelation and our history, to guide and direct this Nation in the path of peace 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 South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

NEW OMB DIRECTOR

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, this week President Bush nominated former Congressman Jim Nussle to run the Office of Management and Budget.

Just before Mr. Nussle and President Bush took charge of America's books, we had a $236 billion surplus, the largest in U.S. history 3 years running. Under President Bush's watch and Jim Nussle's, in 5 short years we had a $318 billion annual deficit and $300 trillion in new debt owed to the Chinese and other foreign countries.

We have heard a lot from this President and the GOP Members about the importance of fiscal responsibility. We Democrats couldn't agree more. Unfortunately, when it comes to George Bush and the Republican Congress, we will forever be in their debt.

Mr. Nussle once said, can we continue to fund our war efforts on this type of ad hoc basis? I believe most of us would agree that we cannot and should not. We continue to give President Bush a blank check costing us nearly $1 trillion on credit card funding for this war.

Mr. Nussle and President Bush came to change Washington, and Washington changed them. Nominating Mr. Nussle tells Americans a lot of what they can expect from a Republican administration.

''DRAIN THE SWAMP'' MENTALITY IS DISAPPEARING

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, almost 6 months into the new Congress with a new majority, the ''drain the swamp'' mentality is disappearing as quickly as the Democrats' approval ratings in Congress.

A new Gallup Poll has the latest congressional approval rating at 14 percent, which is the lowest it's been since the Democrats took charge and the lowest of all time. This makes sense when you consider that the Democrat leadership continues to backpedal at every opportunity on the promises they made to the American people, whether it's a failure to enact openness and transparency to increase accountability for earmark reform, their failure to enact their 100-hour agenda, or the increased infighting that's being seen on the other side as it tries to cope with how to spin another broken promise to their constituents.

Enough is enough, and it's time to get down to the important business the American people elected us to do.

Printed on recycled paper.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLF TOURNAMENT

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, for over three decades, there has been a positive bipartisan tradition in this House to have Democratic Members of the House and former Members challenge Republican Members of the House and former Members on the battleground of the links of Andrews Air Force Base in a friendly golf tournament.

As the chairman of the Democratic golf team, I am proud to say that for the second year in a row, this week the Democrats eked out a close victory over our Republican colleagues led by Congressman ZACH WAMP. I want to pay a particular salute to my colleague, JOE BACA of California, the medalist in the tournament, who shot an even par 70. The rest of us, Madam Speaker, let me say that it's probably well advised that we not give up our day job based on our abilities on the golf links.

In this day of bipartisanship, it's, I think, rather positive to have a day where we can all get together on a bipartisan basis on the friendly links of Andrews Air Force Base golf course.

Mr. WAMP. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAMP. I just rise as the captain of the Republican team to say that these recruiting classes that you all continue to bring to Washington are a problem for us. Hopefully, the American people will weigh in the near future and send us an athlete or two in a larger class.

But congratulations to you. There is not enough of that comity, cooperation and fellowship around here.

Monday was a great day. To the captain of the team, CHET EDWARDS, and to JOE BACA, the low man, we did our best; they played their best and deserve their victory.

Mr. EDWARDS. I want to thank the gentleman for his comments, his great sportsmanship. I should have given credit to Congressman RAHM EMANUEL for his great recruiting class this year. He did a good job and brought our team over the top, just barely.

CRIMINAL ILLEGALS ARE SET FREE

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, new Colorado State law requires local law enforcement agencies to report illegals to Immigration and Customs Enforcement authorities when those individuals are jailed for crimes. Then the Feds are to deport these criminals back to their countries after they serve their sentences, but there is a problem.

The Federal Government doesn't deport these criminals. According to a Colorado newspaper, 37 out of every 38 illegals that are convicted and are reported to ICE for deportation are just released back on the streets of those towns. What does this mean for homeland security, for citizens and law-abiding legal immigrants? It means criminal illegals, instead of being sent home by Uncle Sam, are set free to roam our communities, to continue to steal, rob and hurt people.

Colorado police are doing their job, but, once again, when it's time to ante into the pot, the Federal Government folds its hand.

Instead of our Government trying to figure out ways to keep illegals in the United States with these amnesty giveaway plans, it ought to figure out ways to deport criminal illegals back to where they came from. Once again, our Government is missing in action.

And that's just the way it is.

IN RECOGNITION OF KIM OLIVE

(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, since July of last year, Kim Olive has served as the communications director for the Second Congressional District of South Carolina. I am grateful to say that she has done an excellent job serving on the staff. Kim has consistently been innovative in doing her duties, and her creativity, dedication and tenacity will be difficult to replace.

Kim began her time in Washington, DC, interning for Cassidy & Associates. She then came to Capitol Hill and interned for Congressman ROY BLUNT and worked for Senator RICHARD SHELBY and Congressman SPENCER BACHUS, both of Alabama, Kim's home State. After serving the people of the Second Congressional District for nearly a year, Kim will be leaving for the west coast to work in California.

An honors graduate of the University of Alabama, Kim is one of two children of Larry and Norene Olive of Florence, Alabama. She is a credit to the people of South Carolina and Alabama, and I wish her Godspeed.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 502, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 502 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 502

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2771) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2771 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 502.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 502 provides for consideration of H.R. 2771, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2008, under a structured rule.

The rule provides H.R. 2771 with 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill and its consideration except for those arising under clause 9

or 10 of rule XXI. The rule also waives points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule makes in order and provides appropriate waivers for three amendments, two offered by Republican Members and one bipartisan amendment.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, the legislation we will consider today, H.R. 2771, funds the legislative branch of our government. This includes funding for the House of Representatives so Members of Congress have the resources we need to serve our constituents.

It includes funding for the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, the Office of Compliance and other government agencies.

□ 0915

The bill also takes a bold step forward and begins implementing the Speaker's Green the Capitol Initiative. For the first time ever, the House of Representatives will take steps to address the threats of global warming by ensuring the House operates in a carbon-neutral manner.

The bill provides initial funding to Green the Capitol by switching to 100 percent renewable wind energy for the House's electricity needs, increasing the use of cleaner-burning fuels, and making congressional offices more energy efficient.

This is necessary as Members of Congress must set an example for our constituents by being as environmentally friendly as possible, especially as we ask them to do the same in their own homes.

Most importantly, however, this bill shows the Democratic majority's commitment to change the way our government is run. This bill demonstrates a commitment to fiscal responsibility, increased oversight and increased accountability.

Madam Speaker, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have attested to, this bill is fiscally responsible. It provides an increase of only $122 million, or 4.1 percent over the 2007 enacted level. This is significantly lower than the 13 percent increase requested by the President. And much of the increase is attributable to unavoidable expenses that come in a Presidential election year.

Reducing the President's budget request by nearly one-quarter of a billion dollars shows that the Democrats are committed to holding the line on unnecessary spending, while ensuring that government is still able to deliver services to the American taxpayer.

While funding is increased by 4.1 percent over the 2007 enacted level, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee chose to invest heavily in critical life and safety and security measures for the Capitol complex.

The world changed on September 11, and we now know that the United States Capitol will forever be a target of a terrorist attack.

We owe it to our staff members, our visitors, our constituents, our distinguished guests, and to ourselves to ensure that the Capitol complex is as safe and secure as possible.

In a post-9/11 world, we cannot be too lax when it comes to securing the Capitol complex. Security enhancements are no longer an option. They are a necessity.

The Legislative Branch appropriations bill provides almost $50 million for security and lifesaving projects, including $5 million for new, interoperable police radios, $275,000 for utility, tunnel, health and safety process, $1.2 million for visitors escape hoods, $16 million for building security enhancements, $1 million for emergency exit signs and lighting in the Capitol, and $4.4 million in emergency lighting upgrades for the Rayburn Building.

The bill also provides a 7.7 percent increase for the Capitol Police Department and a 23 percent increase for the Office of Compliance so they can ensure health and safety of the Capitol complex.

Finally, Madam Speaker, one of the defining traits of the Democratic Congress has been increased government oversight. As such, this bill provides the tools Congress needs to hold the government accountable to the American taxpayer.

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee is determined to crack down on unnecessary spending by government agencies. The subcommittee held 11 agency budget hearings and is requiring government agencies to reexamine their needs based on priority, cost effectiveness, and fiscal responsibility.

The bill provides for additional staff at the Government Accountability Office to enable the GAO to better support congressional oversight efforts and address important issues such as health care, changing security threats, education, and continued audit work on the war in Iraq.

The Congressional Budget Office receives an increase in funding to better advise Congress on controlling runaway health care spending.

Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and I discussed CBO staffing in a colloquy during a Rules Committee hearing on Wednesday. We both agree that the current funding staff levels are insufficient to meet our needs. We'll work together with CBO Director Orzag to address the staffing and enhance this important agency's efforts in the future.

The bill increases support for the Inspector General overseeing the Capitol Police Department. It also establishes a statutory Inspector General at the Architect of the Capitol. It is absolutely essential that there is stringent oversight of the Architect's office to improve its financial and management practices.

The subcommittee is 100 percent committed to improving the oversight and completion of the Capitol Visitors Center. I have personally toured the Visitors Center, and it is a beautiful addition that, when finished, we will all be proud of. However, no Member of Congress is proud of how this edifice has been produced. The project has spiraled out of control due to an inexplicable lack of oversight and accountability in prior Congresses, resulting in unnecessary delays and massive cost overruns. This bill assures that there will no longer be a blank check and no questions asked.

The subcommittee has held, and will continue to hold, monthly hearings, and the Architect will be required to submit a detailed plan to the House and Senate before one cent can be spent.

Madam Speaker, this bill delivers on the promises that Democrats made. It's fiscally responsible. It focuses on life, safety, and security measures, and provides much needed accountability to the process.

I would like to thank Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee for all their hard work and thoughtful work that went into this legislation.

In particular, I want to thank the gentlelady from Florida, Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. She has been a true champion for the Democratic majority's efforts to bring efficiency, fiscal responsibility, accountability to the Federal Government, and to this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, this bill is well thought out, well crafted, and sets the right priorities. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this unnecessarily and uncharacteristically restrictive rule. On Wednesday night, despite the protests and objections of Republicans on the committee, the Democrat majority on the Rules Committee did its level best to solidify the committee's status as the Graveyard of Good Ideas in this House by passing out the most restrictive rule for a Legislative Branch appropriations bill in recent history.

Last year, when the Republicans ran the Rules Committee, we reported out a rule for consideration of the 2007 Legislative Branch in which we made in order all seven, that's seven out of seven, amendments submitted by Members of this body so that they could be considered and debated on this House floor. These amendments included four sponsored by Democrats and three sponsored by Republicans, making the rule and that process a completely inclusive and bipartisan product.

The year before that, the Republican-run Rules Committee, nearly half of the 11 amendments submitted in it were made in order under the rule, with both bipartisan and Democrat-

sponsored amendments allowed to be debated there on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, I wish I could claim to be stunned by the majority's enormous departure from the Republican-led precedent to increase inclusiveness and dialogue in the House on this particular appropriations bill which is, by convention, the only bill to come to this floor under a closed process.

However, rather than honoring this tradition, on Wednesday the Democrat Rules Committee produced the most restrictive and closed rule in recent history. Earlier this week, 24 Members of this body submitted thoughtful and earnest proposals to improve this legislation to the Rules Committee. Additionally, Members tried to have their constituent voices be heard also by the committee, but they were turned away at the door because their amendments were submitted shortly after the arbitrary deadline.

And out of these 24 amendments, only three were given the opportunity to be debated on the floor. In passing this rule, Democrats made a calculated decision not to make every single amendment in order like Republicans did the year before. They even voted to abandon the more relaxed standard of 2 years ago, when half of the amendments were made in order.

So instead of making 100 percent of their colleagues' amendments in order, or even 50 percent of the amendments in order, this rule makes only 12 percent of the amendments submitted in order. This seems pretty meager in comparison to the grand promises made during last year by Speaker PELOSI to run the ''most honest and open Congress'' in history.

Among the amendments rejected by the committee on Wednesday were two amendments offered by someone with more knowledge of the legislative appropriations than perhaps any other Member of this body, my friend and the former chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia, JACK KINGSTON; an amendment by a Member of the Democrat majority, Mr. CLEAVER of Missouri, that was made in order last year by the Republican majority, not this year; and a number of friendly taxpayer amendments by my good friend and colleague from Texas, the gentleman, Mr. HENSARLING, that would have reduced the overall cost of this bill to the taxpayer.

Madam Speaker, I do understand that the majority Democrats outnumber Republicans and have enough Members on the committee to win every single vote in the Rules Committee. And I understand that, as the majority, it is their responsibility to run the committee and the floor as they see fit. So all things being equal, I will not take exception to their new, heavy-handed approach to shutting down debate.

However, the second-ranking member of this body, the majority leader, Mr. HOYER, crowed to the media on December 5 that Democrats would ''have a Rules Committee that would give opposition voices and alternative proposals the ability to be heard and be considered on the floor of the House.''

Obviously, that is not happening. I believe every single Member of this body and, more importantly, the American people who send us here every 2 years have the right to know that when these grand promises are not being lived up to that those things will be noted on the floor. And they are, again, today.

So while my service in the Graveyard of Good Ideas in the House may prevent me from being surprised when these campaign pledges are broken on a daily basis by the Democrat majority on the Rules Committee at the direction of Democrat leadership, I hope that the American people are still shocked and appalled that promises delivered in November and December were promptly forgotten in January, and that they continue to be ignored today.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to send a message to this new Democrat leadership that this restrictive debate in the people's House is completely unacceptable. Join me in voting ''no'' on this rule so that the Rules Committee can live up to the standards set by the Democrat leadership and pass out a rule that allows for debate on the issues and ideas of every single Member of this body, not just the ones that the Democrat leadership find politically convenient.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I enjoy the comments and the colloquy that my colleague from Texas and I and the rest of the committee engage in. We seem to have this conversation quite a bit these days.

I'd like to remind the gentleman that, while it's true that we have made three amendments in order this year, two Republican and one bipartisan, last year there were four Democratic amendments made in order on this particular appropriations bill. The prior year, however, there were 11 amendments offered in committee, and only one Democratic amendment was offered in this bill.

Why I raise this number, I want to point out that this is not unusual for this Legislative Branch appropriations bill to be a structured rule in prior years. And, in fact, there's good reason for that. My distinguished colleague from California, Mr. DREIER, mentioned in committee yesterday, in fact, that there is potential for demagoguery on both sides of the aisle on this Legislative Branch appropriations bill, and that he has agreed in the past, and this year, on a structured rule.

Now, honorable men and women can disagree on the merit and the substance of particular amendments, the number of which are not as important as the fact that we are arguing about substantive language, about health and safety, about meeting our constituents' needs. And I think it's important that we talk about that substance, rather than just the number on the bill.

And so, Madam Speaker, I think that we've done a good job producing a fiscally accountable bill for the Congress. In fact, the President asked for $275 million more than our subcommittee is providing under this legislation. The President asked for a 15 percent increase in this appropriation, and Congress saw fit to only offer 4.1 percent. I think the subcommittee has done a good job crafting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from San Dimas, California, the Honorable DAVID DREIER.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from the Big D recognizing me, and I thank both of my friends for their management of this rule.

I have got to clear my throat, Madam Speaker, because it was last night and early this morning that we had a freewheeling, very passionate, vigorous debate that took place on the Foreign Operations appropriations bill, as we all know. And we are here this morning addressing an issue which traditionally has, in a bipartisan way, been recognized that, as a measure to avoid demagoguery, should be brought up under a structured rule. It is the only appropriations bill that both Democrats and Republicans alike have recognized all along that we should do, and I am happy to say that we are proceeding with the other appropriations bills under an open amendment process.

I will say that I am very, very troubled, very troubled, with the way that this has been handled. My friend from California has just said that this is a discussion that has been going on and on. We seem to have this same discussion back and forth. And I will tell my friend we could end it right here, we could end it right here if, in fact, as the gentleman from Dallas has just said, the promises that were made in last year's election were, in fact, kept. We don't have to continue to have this kind of debate over the rule if we would see the kind of compliance with the commitments that were made to the American people.

Now, let me just say what did happen in the past on the issue of the Legislative Branch appropriations bill. As Mr. SESSIONS has just said, 100 percent of the amendments that were proposed last year were, in fact, made in order. And the year before, the gentleman is absolutely right, there were 11 amendments submitted, but the gentleman said only 1 amendment was made in order. No. One Democratic amendment was made in order of the 11 amendments, but there were Republican

amendments proposed, too, and there were 4 amendments made in order. So what I am saying is that this notion that somehow 11 Democratic amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules and only 1 Democratic amendment made in order? That is wrong.

The fact of the matter is we have worked very hard to ensure that every Member who has come forward with a responsible, thoughtful amendment that should be debated on the legislative branch appropriations bill could, in fact, have that opportunity. And that is what has happened in the past. I am very proud to say that last year every single amendment submitted to the committee was made in order. This year 23 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee, 23 amendments. And how many were made in order? It is very sad. Only three amendments were made in order.

Now, let's look at some of the amendments that were denied, Madam Speaker. The distinguished chairman, former chairman, of the Legislative Branch appropriations subcommittee, Mr. KINGSTON, is here, and he came before the Rules Committee with some very thoughtful amendments.

Now, my friend from California has just talked about the issue of the Visitors Center. Mr. KINGSTON, who has consistently raised very important questions about that in the past, said that we don't need to put $16 million, which, as was said in the dissenting views on this issue, is the tip of the iceberg, creating a chance to spend well in excess of $50 million, at the minimum of $55 million, for another building with an additional 200,000 square feet behind the Ford Building over here.

Now, Madam Speaker, we are going to have an additional half a million square feet when we see completion of this Congressional Visitors Center. We all hope that it happens in our lifetime, but I will say that we are going to have an additional 500,000 square feet. And I know my friend from California said he has just been there.

And, by the way, I should extend congratulations to the gentlewoman from Florida for the great job that she has done in working closely with Mr. WAMP on this issue. She testified, Madam Speaker, before the Rules Committee, and I appreciate her diligence on this, and I suspect that she would be somewhat concerned as well that the opportunity for an amendment process like the one that we have had in the past is being denied to a number of our Members, both Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. KINGSTON, the former chairman of the appropriations subcommittee on the Legislative Branch, also offered an amendment calling for the Basic Pilot Program to be included, dealing with this notion that we impose on everybody else, Madam Speaker, the requirement that they comply with the Basic Pilot Program when it comes to this very serious issue of illegal immigration, and yet we are free of having to comply with that within the first branch of government. I think that is an absolute mistake, and that is what Mr. KINGSTON has been trying to address with his amendment.

One of the amendments that troubled me most that was not made in order came from a very distinguished Democratic Member of this institution. I am proud of the fact that he represents my parents in Kansas City, Missouri. It is Reverend EMANUEL CLEAVER, who came before the Rules Committee, Madam Speaker, and he said that he had been told by staff not to offer the amendment. He was very concerned about being there, and he said that he was somewhat confused, and, understandably, that does happen on occasion. I just told one of my staff members that the moment they tell me to do something, I automatically and instinctively do the opposite. But what happened in his case was that he felt somewhat concerned about coming before the Committee on Rules when so many people had told him not to do it.

I have never seen a situation like this, Madam Speaker. The Chair of the Rules Committee Ms. SLAUGHTER had to say to Mr. CLEAVER that he was welcome at any time to come before the Rules Committee and offer an amendment. I thought that that was just a right that every Member in this institution had. And, unfortunately, while we made Mr. CLEAVER's amendment in order in the last Congress, this new majority refused to allow Mr. CLEAVER the opportunity to even have his amendment heard, even have it debated here, Madam Speaker.

And that is why Mr. SESSIONS is going to offer an opportunity, if we can, to defeat the previous question, to take the Cleaver amendment, which deals with the very important priority that has been set forth by our Speaker that looks at the environmental standards for this institution. Mr. CLEAVER simply says that prospectively we should have flex-fuel or hybrid vehicles purchased through the Members' representational accounts. It is an issue that should be debated here on the House floor. Again, we made that amendment in order last year, and it has been denied the opportunity this year.

One other thing that I will say again that is very troubling about this so-called new era of openness. Our colleague from West Virginia, a very distinguished former member of the Committee on Rules, tried to submit an amendment to the Rules Committee, and SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO was denied that opportunity at the door to even submit her amendment, recognizing that she was a few minutes, I think right around 30 minutes, beyond the imposed deadline. I think the flexibility for Members is something that we always recognized, but has been denied here. But to have a former member of the Rules Committee denied an opportunity to even submit the amendment is, to me, Madam Speaker, undermining this entire spirit of openness.

So, Madam Speaker, let me say I am going to encourage my colleagues to support Mr. SESSIONS in his quest to defeat the previous question so that we can give EMANUEL CLEAVER an opportunity to offer the amendment that was denied him by the Rules Committee.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from California and I agree on one thing absolutely, and that is that Mr. CLEAVER is a great Member of Congress and offers thoughtful amendments.

The problem with his amendment was that it was simply unworkable. It required that vehicles be E85 ethanol-compliant. And, for example, in California, in Mr. DREIER's and my own State, there are only two gas stations that provide E85 fuel.

I drive a hybrid. I think it is an important thing for Members of Congress to lead on this issue, but the fact is that the amendment was unworkable. We discussed that in Rules Committee yesterday. I discussed that with Mr. CLEAVER, and, in fact, the committee did see fit not to make that amendment in order.

The gentleman raises a number of other points, but I would like to talk about the $16 million and the FDA building that the gentleman raised and the fact that the appropriations subcommittee is, in fact, bringing fiscal accountability and better standards to the construction process of the Capitol, and that this proposal that the gentleman from California refers to was actually initially brought to the House by former Speaker HASTERT. And, in fact, we are continuing the prior administration's priority in this area.

The subcommittee has changed the way this building will be managed and procured in that the GSA will manage the construction and retrofit of this new building that is being acquired in order to provide swing space and allow the operations of Congress to continue as we revamp other buildings here in the Capitol complex. The $16 million in security enhancements this bill provides for the FDA building are critical if we are to use the building for additional House office space. The project was originally approved, as I said, by former Speaker HASTERT and is now being carried forward in this bill. It is critical so that we can get the swing space ready for the House to use when we begin the badly needed renovations to the Cannon Building, which is nearly 100 years old, and to the Longworth Building, which is nearly 75 years old. We need flex space to move offices while those buildings are being renovated. The FDA building fits the bill.

GSA is ready to invest $150 million in the renovations of this building. This additional funding is to bring security from the generic government building level up to meet the requirements of congressional office space. This is a long-term investment. If we don't put

this money into getting the FDA building ready now, we will have to delay much-needed renovations to our existing buildings.

I would also say that I believe it is important for our staff to get the same kind of security that we would get as Members. We know that in the post-9/11 world, as we have talked about many times on the floor before, Members of Congress and this Capitol complex are targets, and it is imperative that we provide our staff with the same security that we ourselves demand.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

And let me, if I could, just respond to a couple of his points. First of all, the gentleman has offered some very thoughtful arguments on this issue, and I think that the fact that he has made these arguments underscores why the Rules Committee should have, in fact, allowed a debate on these issues to proceed.

He began by talking about how unworkable the amendment that Mr. CLEAVER has put forward by virtue of the fact that California has only two of these E85 stations. I know that the Cleaver amendment provides options, a hybrid vehicle, which the gentleman drives and obviously is able to get fuel very easily, and the option of looking at the flex-fuel vehicles. And, obviously, if it is a flex-fuel vehicle, it has the ability to use others. They don't have to go to those two stations that exist in California.

And I think that, again, that underscores the fact that we should be having this debate. We made it in order in the last Congress, and, unfortunately, they chose not to make it in order.

And on the issue of the additional building, he has raised a lot of interesting arguments about that. Mr. KINGSTON would simply like to have a chance, as a former chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to debate it.

I thank my friend for yielding, and I will just say that I wish we would have a chance to have a free-flowing debate on this.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I want to point out that this discussion is interesting, and, as Mr. DREIER has said to Mr. CARDOZA, it is worthy of debate.

I want to ask my friend, were you here during the anthrax threat?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARDOZA. I was not.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, it is important because there is a little history here, Madam Speaker, but during the period of time in which much of the Longworth office was shut down and evacuated right in the wake of 9/11, I don't know how many Members, and perhaps Mr. DREIER knows, but we all had temporary offices in a building downtown, and I do not remember which building that was. But it was interesting. That was a direct threat to the United States Congress, and some of the offices were closed down for maybe a couple of months.

□ 0945

I moved my entire staff off premises. And so to say now that we have to construct expensive, unnecessary swing space just to fill in a gap is ridiculous.

I want to point out that I think it's important for newer Members to realize there is a history, there is a precedent. And because of the Rules Committee shutting down this amendment and free speech, most Members won't know that we are trying to prevent something that we've already gone through before, and that is temporarily locating elsewhere in a secure premises.

I wanted to commend Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, the Chair, and the ranking member, Mr. WAMP, for what they have done on the CVC, the Capitol Visitors Center. It is a monstrosity; something we're all very disappointed in. When I was Chair of this committee, we tried our best to get our arms around it. One of the things that we all discussed is unfortunately it's kind of a bicameral problem. You don't have one head of the snake, one committee, one Chair who was fully responsible from alpha to omega.

I commend the committee on what they've done on this. I do think that with this FDA building we are creating another CVC boondoggle, as already outlined and debated in the committee. Since 2002, we've been debating this unnecessary additional office space, this swing space. And at the same time, the committee of the same government agencies are involved in it that have given us the CVC. So not to allow that amendment on the floor is something, in my opinion, is worth voting ''no'' on the whole rule debate.

The other amendment that I offered, among the many amendments that were turned down by the Democrats, it's very important to say the people who talked about sunshine so much are now denying it on the bill that tells this institution and the public so much about ourselves. No one gets elected or unelected on leg branch politics, except it does show what your culture of leadership is. If you don't allow sunshine, if you don't allow an open rule, if you don't allow open debate on your own piece of legislation that governs the House, then how can you go around and pontificate from coast to coast what an open government you're going to bring the United States people?

I know that the members of the Rules Committee and the members of the Appropriations Committee have somewhat been under a mandate, maybe even a gag order, by the leadership, but I would say there is huge hypocrisy and irony in this.

Another important amendment that I offered has to do with the Basic Pilot Program. And I'll ask you this: Do you think that people who do construction for the Federal Government should have legal employees, or should they be allowed to have illegal aliens? Well, we know and the Chair would be interested to know about the situation in California, because it's been such a hot debate out there, and the folks who have been building the fence, that the folks who are constructing the fence were busted for having illegal aliens to build a fence to keep illegal aliens out of the country. That is absurd. Similarly, we see this all over the place on Air Forces bases and Federal institutions, where contractors come in, and after close scrutiny we find they are hiring illegal aliens.

What the amendment would have done, which I believe would have wide bipartisan support, simply says that you need Social Security verification if you're going to do business with the Federal Government. No big deal, except for in this town and in this Chamber somehow that might offend some of our K Street friends, or should I say some other people's K Street friends. Because folks I know back home, they want Social Security verification. Unless you attack the job magnet, you're always going to have the attraction for illegals to come into the country.

This would give us an opportunity to lead by example to say we're not going to let you do business with the Federal Government unless you have verified Social Security. And the program is run by ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency. It's called the Basic Pilot Program. Nothing controversial whatsoever. However, the Rules Committee is not even going to allow us to have a vote on it.

I cannot believe that the people one year ago, indeed, 7 months ago, were campaigning out there, telling Americans the Democrats are going to deliver open and honest government, because this rule is anything but that.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I will say that it seems ironic to me that they blame the Democrats for everything, yet this proposal that is being put forward by the gentleman from Georgia was originated under the speakership of Mr. HASTERT and was planned during that period of time. And, frankly, it was a good idea. It's something that needs to be done.

The other point I would just like to make at the outset of my discussion here.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDOZA. No, I will not yield.

Mr. KINGSTON. I just want to know, is it in the Democrat budget?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. CARDOZA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also want to point out that Mr. KINGSTON is talking about immigration and the lack of accountability with regard to illegal workers on government projects. I would like to remind the gentleman that it is his President that is in charge of enforcement, it is the administrative branch of government that is in charge of adjudicating and prosecuting illegal aliens, and that it is their Department that is awarding the contracts. And so if the gentleman is concerned about this, he should talk to his President down the street. And with a single conversation, he should be able to get the administration to do what he wants, since he is of the same party.

With regard to this building that we're talking about, when we had the anthrax scare here in Congress, I am aware that they actually had to displace Federal workers to house congressional employees in that building. That was only for a couple of weeks. To do this for months on end while a building is being renovated is simply unacceptable.

Further, Mr. KINGSTON's amendment was argued in the subcommittee and it was put forward in the subcommittee and it was rejected by the subcommittee on a bipartisan basis. We need this swing space to be able to do the renovation. And I think this goes back to a very simple thing that Mr. DREIER said, that this can be demagogued.

Clearly, we can have disagreements, but we need to do the right thing by the American people to provide for the safety of Congress. This $16 million appropriation is for Capitol security. Either you support security for Members, for the staff and for the general public, or you don't. You either support security or you don't. And I say that the bipartisan workings of the committee were the correct action and that the amendment that the gentleman offered was previously rejected in committee.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman now seems to want to duck what Republicans have done for 12 years, and that is, take responsibility for that, which they should do. The fact of the matter is we're here asking for and we're in the Rules Committee asking for the ability to be able to debate these. We're not blaming anybody, except to say that we believe there should be a debate, an open and honest debate that would be good for the American people, which would avoid the gentleman having to be concerned about who is blaming who.

Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I want to thank my friend from Texas for his leadership on the Rules Committee and on this issue of wanting and demanding what the American people want, and that is an open process.

I oppose this rule because I believe, Madam Speaker, that it stifles the ability for Members of this House to represent their constituents. The reason that it stifles them is because it doesn't allow for the kind of debate and the kind of voting on issues that we've just heard about.

This is a good bill. I want to commend my classmate, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Representative WAMP for their work; but it's not a perfect bill. And so we ought to move in the direction of making it a more perfect bill by allowing amendments, other ideas from this House to come forward.

Madam Speaker, I'm sorry to say that this is just another example of what I have come to know and phrase as ''Orwellian democracy'' by this new majority. It's Orwellian democracy because they say one thing and they do exactly the opposite.

What did they say? Well, what they said is that they would assure a fair and open process. Before the last election, Speaker PELOSI said, ''Because the debate has been limited and Americans' voice is silenced by this restrictive rule, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.''

So what's different now, Madam Speaker? Is it political expediency, or is it a broken promise?

The chairman of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, said before, ''If we want to foster democracy in this body, we should take the time and the thoughtfulness to debate all major legislation under an open rule.''

So what's changed, Madam Speaker? What's different now? Is it political expediency, or is it a broken promise?

Mr. MCGOVERN, a member of the Rules Committee, said, ''I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if you want to show some bipartisanship, if you want to promote a process that has some integrity, this should be an open rule. All Members should have an opportunity to come here and offer amendments to this bill to improve the quality of deliberations on this House floor.''

So what's different now, Madam Speaker? Is it political expediency, or a broken promise?

Democratic Caucus Chair, Mr. EMANUEL, said before, ''Let's have an up or down vote. Don't be scared. Don't hide behind some little rule. Come on out here. Put it on the table. Let's have a vote. So don't hide behind the rule. If this is what you want to do, let's have an up or down vote. You can put your votes right up there, and then the American people can see what it's all about.''

So what's different, Madam Speaker? Political expediency, or a broken promise?

I offered an amendment that would be debated on this floor that would have reduced the amount of spending by 1 percent. It would have saved the American taxpayer $31 million. Now, $31 million may not seem like a lot in Washington, but back where I come from and across this Nation, $31 million is a lot of money. It would say to the American people this is a step in the right direction for fiscal responsibility. That was said before, what was said before by the now majority leader, STENY HOYER, who said, ''We want to get the budget deficit under control. We have said fiscal responsibility was necessary, but we're not going to be hoisted on the torrent of fiscal responsibility.''

Madam Speaker, rules aren't rules if you only follow them when you want to, and choosing when to do so is breaking a promise. An open promise shouldn't just be something that you talk about on the campaign trail.

Madam Speaker, Americans understand that promises made on the campaign trail and promises that aren't kept in the heat of debate on the House floor are broken promises. And the American people are paying attention.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I would just like to respond to the gentleman from Georgia by saying that, in fact, the Rules Committee did offer Mr. JORDAN's amendment from Ohio that one-ups the gentleman from Georgia. In fact, the gentleman from Georgia said he wanted to cut overall the entire operations in Congress and legislative branch by 1 percent. Mr. JORDAN offers a 4 percent cut. And so we made that in order so that the Congress can have the debate that Mr. PRICE from Georgia has indicated that he wants to have on the House floor.

It is a very open process. And, in fact, I will tell you that this is a very bipartisan bill. Mr. WAMP and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ came to the Rules Committee and indicated absolutely that they had worked on a bipartisan basis on this bill and that they thought that they had done a good job working on a bipartisan basis.

We have, in fact, offered the debate. We will, in fact, have a debate on cutting overall administration. In fact, this is a responsible bill in that we have cut $275 million from the President's request, 11 percent less than the administration asked for the operations of the legislative branch. This is a fiscally responsible bill. The committee has worked together to craft it in a bipartisan way, and I think that we in fact have a very good piece of legislation before the Congress today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

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

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, I do rise as the ranking member of the subcommittee in reluctant opposition to the rule. I say that because I am very

grateful for the work that the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) have done on protecting the Appropriations Committee's prerogatives in this bill, particularly with, I think, the important recommendation to name the largest space in the new Capitol Visitors Center Emancipation Hall. We will talk more about that during general debate.

But I am in opposition because only three amendments were ruled in order; that is, three out of 23, which is 13 percent. Last year it was 100 percent; the year before last it was 45 percent. And that is not enough. Therefore, I am actually going to support the amendments that are offered.

But I am going to support the bill. We did work in a bipartisan manner. This is a good bill. I am going to support the bill, but the rule is just not quite enough, to be honest with you. We should have had these amendments ruled in order. I say that respectfully because I think it is important that we try to open this up as much as possible.

The structured rule is not a problem, but only three amendments being ruled in order is a problem. So I reluctantly rise in opposition to the rule. I look forward to the general debate. I look forward to the passage of the bill with the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Mr. CARDOZA. I would just like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) for his hard work on the bill. Clearly he and our chairwoman, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ of Florida, have done a good job working together on a bipartisan basis to craft a bill that will work for Congress and work for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, we are quite open about what we wanted today. We wanted the rule to match the promise that the new Democratic majority had made. They asked for the ability to lead this country and to make this the most open, honest Congress in history. Yet we find at this time that the Rules Committee does not do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say I am somewhat concerned with the whole tenor of this debate. My California colleague has stood here through the entire debate not yielding time to a single Member, talking about the fact that we are going to have this freewheeling debate. I asked him to yield to me, when he obviously has a great load of time. Madam Speaker, he chose not to yield. That is clearly his right. But if we are interested in at least a modicum of civility in the debate, I always try my darnedest to yield to any colleague who asks me to yield during debate, because I think that is what we should do around here.

I was simply going to respond when my friend said that Mr. PRICE was here decrying the fact that his amendment was not made in order, which had a more modest cut than the one that has been made in order under the Jordan amendment, that maybe some Members would determine that the $275 million figure to which my friend referred earlier, being below the President's request, is not quite enough, but that maybe the Jordan amendment is too much.

Mr. PRICE simply wanted to have a chance, Madam Speaker, to say, gosh, maybe a little more modest cut than the one that is in the Jordan amendment should be considered.

So, I just want to say that I, again, as Mr. PRICE said so well during this debate, promises were made about a new sense of openness. It is very, very unfortunate that those promises have not been kept, Madam Speaker.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I would just like to remind my friend, the gentleman from California, that I, in fact, did yield to him earlier in the debate for quite some period of time and let him speak on my time prior. So, with that, I think we have, in fact, worked on a bipartisan basis. I am also willing to work and discuss with my colleagues.

But, in fact, as the gentleman said, this legislative branch appropriations bill is one where you can, in fact, have shenanigans, or I think his word was ''demagoguery,'' and, in fact, we have a structured rule so that we limit that. We are, in fact, trying to have the most open process. I think we have succeeded in doing a better job than happened in the prior Congresses.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. If I could inquire of the time remaining on both sides, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes. The gentleman from California has 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the Republicans are here today to say we believe the process should equal what the Democrats had said they would do. It did not.

Secondly, we have problems with the bill because of the more than 7-percent increase in spending over last year's level. We believe that that is excessive, at a time when we thought both sides agreed that fiscal sanity would be in order, especially in dealing with this body. So, the Republican Party is here today to say we think that is too much money.

Madam Speaker, I will be urging my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that I may amend the rule to make in order the very thoughtful amendments of my Democratic colleague from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), which was made in order by the Republican-controlled Congress in the Republican Rules Committee last year.

The amendment would encourage House Members to lease hybrid and other more economical vehicles. In this time of high gas prices and our need, the national desire, the need to reduce the reliance on foreign sources of energy, this House should have at least have the opportunity to debate such a thoughtful amendment.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and the extraneous material printed just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, at this point I would like just to yield briefly to our distinguished chairwoman, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, to respond.

Mr. SESSIONS. If the gentleman will yield, we were advised that the gentleman did not have any additional speakers.

Mr. CARDOZA. The gentleman is correct. I will yield him additional time to respond.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate that.

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I just want to address my comments to the remark by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) where he indicated that there is a 7-percent increase in the legislative branch appropriations bill. That is factually inaccurate.

If you take into consideration the $50 million rescission that we had in the CR for 2007, we are actually at a 2.4-percent increase. Not taking that $50 million rescission, which came out of the Library of Congress, we are actually at a 4.4-percent increase in this bill. So that is factually inaccurate. I want to make sure that we are dealing with facts. My colleague is incorrect.

We have really made an effort, both Mr. WAMP and myself, at being fiscally responsible, recognizing that we are in a difficult fiscal situation and constraining our spending, but at the same time making sure we can focus on life, safety and security needs, and the protection and oversight responsibilities that we need to make sure we can do in this institution.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, without getting into an argument with the gentlewoman, we would just state the facts of the case. It is over $4 billion additional spending, this year over the last, and $4 billion is a lot of money to run this ship.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would simply like to ask my friend, if a $4 billion increase

is, in fact, a 6.76-percent increase over last year's funding level, which does round out to be a 7-percent increase in the spending over last year's funding level, I just ask my friend from Dallas if that, in fact, is correct?

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I believe it to be correct, but the fact of the matter is, whether it's a 6-percent increase or a 4-percent increase as the gentlewoman subscribes to, we believe that is not the proper way to grow this government.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to, again, say that I hope very much that my friends on both sides of the aisle will join in supporting Mr. SESSIONS in trying to defeat the previous question so that we can make in order the very thoughtful, environmentally sound amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, there were several misstatements of fact in the last statements that were made here on the floor by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

This bill actually does not provide $4 billion for legislative branch appropriations, as the gentleman indicated, but $3.1 billion for the legislative branch. The actual spending for fiscal year 2007, including the supplemental but not rescissions, this bill is a $122 million increase, which is 4 percent of that amount. If the $50 million rescission in the fiscal year 2007 CR is included, the bill is only $73 million, or 2.4 percent, above the prior year.

We have provided in this measure fiscal responsibility, accountability, and security and life safety for the Members of Congress, for the general public and for our staff.

I would also like to make a point that this bill represents a $276 million reduction from the Republican administration's request on this matter.

Madam Speaker, three principles guided the development of the underlying legislation: fiscal responsibility, security and life safety, and accountability.

This bill makes smart decisions with taxpayer dollars. It provides the necessary resources for Congress to carry out its constitutional oversight responsibilities, something we saw sorely lacking in the last Congress. It ensures the Capitol complex is safe and secure. Most importantly, it allows Members of Congress to represent and serve our constituents in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 502 OFFERED BY REP. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 4 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Cleaver of Missouri or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''House of Representatives—Salaries and Expenses—Members' Representational Allowances'' may be used directly to provide any individual with a vehicle which is not powered in whole or in part by alternative fuel (as defined in section 301(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13211(2)), except under a lease in effect prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 179, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)

Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—179

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

NOT VOTING—36

Baker
Barton (TX)
Bonner
Boucher
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Clyburn
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Doolittle
Everett
Gillibrand
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Israel
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
McGovern
McHenry
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Oberstar
Ortiz
Paul
Platts
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Young (AK)

□ 1033

Messrs. TIBERI, GARY G. MILLER of California, and MANZULLO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. WEINER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. UPTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE HONORABLE GUY VANDER JAGT

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I regret to inform the House today of the passing of Guy Vander Jagt, who died this morning. He served 18 years in this body representing most of west Michigan, a longtime member of the Ways and Means Committee, a very good friend of all of us, both in the Congress and after he left.

I talked to his wife Carol last week. This was his cancer's second occurrence. He also leaves a beautiful daughter, Jinny, and I yield to Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend for yielding.

This is a great loss to the country. Our friend, Guy Vander Jagt, was a distinguished Member of this body, a great public servant, and a friend of most of us here.

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RANGEL. The tear that you hear in the voice of the gentleman from Michigan is felt by everybody that knew Guy Vander Jagt. I was with him on Tuesday morning with his beautiful wife Carol, and I would want everybody who knew this man to know that there was a big smile on his face, that wonderful voice of his was resonant, and even though he did not stay lucid for long periods of time, the only thing, the only thing that he talked about was his House of Representatives.

I really sincerely hope that those Members, Republican and Democrats, that had an opportunity to see a true Republican with the compassion and sensitivity and understanding that it takes all of us to make this Congress and this country work, that maybe those of us who knew Guy would make some kind of special effort to be tolerant with each other, which is what he was talking about, in hopes that new Members that never had the opportunity to enjoy that type of camaraderie will move in that direction.

We will miss him, but those who knew him, we have a constant reminder that when things get rough for us on this floor, there was a guy like Guy Vander Jagt, and as strong as a Republican as he was, that he cared enough about this House to care for all us.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I would ask that we stand for a moment of silence in honor of Guy Vander Jagt.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 179, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

AYES—222

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

Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—179

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

NOT VOTING—31

Baker
Barton (TX)
Bonner
Boucher
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Doolittle
Everett
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Radanovich
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1045

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2771, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 502 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2771.

□ 1046

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2771) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Ms. BALDWIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Chair and members of the Committee, I am pleased to present the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch appropriations legislation for the fiscal year 2008.

The Legislative Branch bill is unique in that it appropriates funding for the entire Capitol Building and Grounds as well as nine legislative branch agencies and the 435 Members of this body and their offices. As a new member of the Appropriations Committee serving as a subcommittee Chair, I recognize the tremendous responsibility that comes along with being steward of this great institution, and I am honored by the confidence and trust that Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, and my colleagues have placed in me.

Historically, the Legislative Branch bill has enjoyed the bipartisan spirit that has come to define the Appropriations Committee and my experiences in working with the ranking member have been consistent with that spirit. Over the past several months, I have worked with Ranking Member WAMP, the gentleman from Tennessee, and other members of the committee from both parties to shape and determine the appropriations for the people's House. We held 14 oversight hearings prior to developing this bill, and I am very proud of our accomplishments.

I want to thank the members of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee for their help and input, Vice Chair LEE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. GOODE. The vast majority of our committee is new to the full committee, and we approached our task with zeal and with dedication.

I would particularly like to thank Ranking Member WAMP for his work on this bill. He has been a good partner, and I appreciate his cooperation and friendship. While we have not agreed on every issue, we worked in partnership to address our differences; and notwithstanding a few issues, they were resolved. I would also like to thank Chairman OBEY for his guidance during this process and Ranking Member LEWIS for his efforts as well.

Madam Chair, the bill provides $3.1 billion for the legislative branch, not including Senate items. That's an increase of $122 million, or just 4 percent, over the actual spending level in fiscal year 2007. This reflects a $276 million reduction in the total amended budget request, and I think that's an important point that Members should note. We are bringing this bill in under the original request.

We used three guiding principles to develop this bill: fiscal responsibility, security and life safety, and accountability.

In terms of fiscal responsibility, we've emphasized that we need to keep this bill tight with a view towards the long term. We've funded the must-haves over the nice-to-haves and have focused on critical investments. We've held the actual spending increase in this bill to only 4 percent, $122 million, compared to the 13 percent, or $398 million, which was the increase that was requested.

In terms of security and life safety, we've made sure this bill makes the Capitol complex as secure and safe as possible. To this end, the bill includes $50 million worth of critical security and life safety projects, including, at the suggestion and urging of my good friend from Tennessee, interoperable radios for the Capitol Police. It also provides substantial increases to agencies with a direct role in the health/safety of the complex. The Capitol Police receive an 8 percent increase, while the Office of Compliance, which ensures that we protect our visitors and our employees in a safe environment, receives a 23 percent increase.

Finally, in terms of accountability, we've crafted this bill to provide Congress with the resources it needs to perform its constitutional oversight role and hold agencies accountable. We've fully funded House committees and included resources to bulk up GAO to better support our congressional oversight efforts. We've also beefed up

the Capitol Police IG office and established a statutory IG office at the Architect of the Capitol to improve oversight within those two organizations.

In closing, we've kept this bill tight so that we're fiscally responsible. We've done so by prioritizing investments for critical life safety and security needs while providing Congress with the tools it needs to hold the government accountable to the American taxpayer.

Madam Chair, we have a wonderful staff. I'd like to thank my committee staff, my personal staff, and Mr. WAMP's staff: Ms. Tracie Pough and Ian Rayder on my personal staff; Mr. Tom Forhan, our clerk; Rob Nabors, the full Appropriations Committee clerk; Chuck Turner; David Marroni; and Mr. WAMP's staff, Jeff Shockey and Liz Dawson, for their assistance. They have assisted both myself and Mr. WAMP as a new Chair and ranking member with our learning curve and worked countless hours to help produce this product.

Finally, I want to thank, Madam Chair, my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their guidance, patience, understanding and encouragement as we endeavored to craft a bill that was fiscally responsible with an eye toward ensuring that our employees and visitors have a safe and secure environment in which to function, as well as make sure that Congress has adequate resources to engage in our oversight responsibilities.

Madam Chair, it is an honor to serve in this role.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2008 (H.R. 2771)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Salaries and Expenses					
Payment to widows and heirs of deceased Members of Congress	330	---	---	-330	---
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker	4,614	4,761	4,761	+147	---
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	2,108	2,188	2,188	+80	---
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	3,953	4,090	4,090	+137	---
Office of the Majority Whip	1,813	1,894	1,894	+81	---
Office of the Minority Whip	1,358	1,420	1,420	+62	---
Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities	487	499	499	+12	---
Republican Steering Committee	915	943	943	+28	---
Republican Conference	1,562	1,631	1,631	+69	---
Republican Policy Committee	310	325	325	+15	---
Democratic Steering and Policy Committee	1,232	1,295	1,295	+63	---
Democratic Caucus	1,555	1,604	1,604	+49	---
Nine minority employees	1,459	1,498	1,498	+39	---
Training and Program Development:					
Majority	290	290	290	---	---
Minority	290	290	290	---	---
Cloakroom Personnel:					
Majority	438	460	460	+22	---
Minority	438	460	460	+22	---
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	22,822	23,648	23,648	+826	---
Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail					
Expenses	554,716	610,616	581,000	+26,284	-29,616
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select	124,406	129,662	133,000	+8,594	+3,338
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	25,866	27,113	29,800	+3,934	+2,687
Subtotal, Committee employees	150,272	156,775	162,800	+12,528	+6,025
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk	21,676	22,881	22,881	+1,205	---
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	6,295	7,024	7,024	+729	---
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	106,064	120,612	116,891	+10,827	-3,721
Office of the Inspector General	4,016	4,457	4,457	+441	---
Office for Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Operations	4,010	4,242	3,111	-899	-1,131
Office of General Counsel	968	1,202	1,202	+234	---
Office of the Chaplain	163	166	166	+3	---
Office of the Parliamentarian	1,778	1,828	1,828	+50	---
Office of the Parliamentarian	(1,415)	(1,455)	(1,455)	(+40)	---
Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives	(363)	(373)	(373)	(+10)	---
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	2,472	3,046	3,046	+574	---
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	7,025	7,406	7,406	+381	---
Office of Interparliamentary Affairs	724	752	752	+28	---
Other authorized employees	548	170	170	-378	---
Office of the Historian	408	596	459	+51	-137
Subtotal, Salaries, officers and employees	156,147	174,382	169,393	+13,246	-4,989

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2008 (H.R. 2771)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	4,704	3,688	3,688	-1,016	---
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House	410	410	410	---	---
Government contributions	226,904	239,447	237,410	+10,506	-2,037
Capitol Visitor Center	3,410	2,308	2,308	-1,102	---
Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery	17,631	23,065	17,200	-431	-5,865
Emergency appropriations	6,437	---	---	-6,437	---
Miscellaneous items	703	703	703	---	---
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses	260,199	269,621	261,719	+1,520	-7,902
Total, Salaries and expenses	1,144,486	1,235,042	1,198,560	+54,074	-36,482
Total, House of Representatives	1,144,486	1,235,042	1,198,560	+54,074	-36,482
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Economic Committee	4,308	4,398	4,398	+90	---
Joint Committee on Taxation	8,773	9,416	9,416	+643	---
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	2,520	2,820	2,820	+300	---
Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office	8,524	10,876	4,448	-4,076	-6,428
Statements of Appropriations	30	30	30	---	---
Total, Joint items	24,155	27,540	21,112	-3,043	-6,428
CAPITOL POLICE					
Salaries	217,135	---	224,500	+7,365	+224,500
General expenses	38,500	---	61,500	+23,000	+61,500
Salaries and expenses	---	299,070	---	---	-299,070
Emergency appropriations	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Total, Capitol Police	265,635	299,070	286,000	+20,365	-13,070
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE					
Salaries and expenses	3,103	4,106	3,806	+703	-300
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	35,204	37,972	37,805	+2,601	-167
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
General administration	77,128	87,714	81,733	+4,605	-5,981
Capitol building	23,886	29,480	24,567	+681	-4,913
Capitol grounds	7,577	10,225	9,310	+1,733	-915
House office buildings	59,896	50,621	66,151	+6,255	+15,530
Capitol Power Plant	79,847	119,226	91,017	+11,170	-28,209
Offsetting collections	-6,534	-8,000	-8,000	-1,466	---
Emergency appropriations	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant	123,313	111,226	83,017	-40,296	-28,209
Library buildings and grounds	27,692	42,788	31,638	+3,946	-11,150
Capitol police buildings and grounds	11,768	18,816	16,109	+4,341	-2,707
Botanic garden	7,697	9,707	8,310	+613	-1,397

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2008 (H.R. 2771)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Capitol Visitor Center	43,758	---	---	-43,758	---
CVC Project (cost-to-complete)	---	20,000	20,000	+20,000	---
CVC Operations	---	13,884	7,545	+7,545	-6,339
Total, Capitol Visitor Center	43,758	33,884	27,545	-16,213	-6,339
Total, Architect of the Capitol	382,715	394,461	348,380	-34,335	-46,081
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses	387,597	467,452	401,000	+13,403	-66,452
Authority to spend receipts	-6,350	-6,350	-6,350	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	381,247	461,102	394,650	+13,403	-66,452
Rescissions	-49,549	---	---	+49,549	---
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses	58,420	51,562	49,827	-8,593	-1,735
Authority to spend receipts	-35,758	-35,373	-44,224	-8,466	-8,851
Subtotal, Copyright Office	22,662	16,189	5,603	-17,059	-10,586
Congressional Research Service, salaries and expenses	100,786	108,702	104,518	+3,732	-4,184
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, Salaries and expenses	53,614	75,623	67,741	+14,127	-7,882
Total, Library of Congress	508,760	661,616	572,512	+63,752	-89,104
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Congressional printing and binding	87,954	109,541	87,892	-62	-21,649
Office of Superintendent of Documents					
Salaries and expenses	33,096	45,613	35,434	+2,338	-10,179
Government Printing Office Revolving Fund	1,000	26,825	2,450	+1,450	-24,375
Total, Government Printing Office	122,050	181,979	125,776	+3,726	-56,203
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	488,627	530,314	510,838	+22,211	-19,476
Emergency appropriations	374	---	---	-374	---
Offsetting collections	-7,931	-7,510	-7,510	+421	---
Total, Government Accountability Office	481,070	522,804	503,328	+22,258	-19,476
OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER					
Payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund	13,860	14,400	6,000	-7,860	-8,400
STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE					
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
Grand total	2,981,468	3,379,420	3,103,709	+122,241	-275,711

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2008 (H.R. 2771)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
House of Representatives	1,144,486	1,235,042	1,198,560	+54,074	-36,482
Joint Items	24,155	27,540	21,112	-3,043	-6,428
Capitol Police	265,635	299,070	286,000	+20,365	-13,070
Office of Compliance	3,103	4,106	3,806	+703	-300
Congressional Budget Office	35,204	37,972	37,805	+2,601	-167
Architect of the Capitol	382,715	394,461	348,380	-34,335	-46,081
Library of Congress	508,760	661,616	572,512	+63,752	-89,104
Government Printing Office	122,050	181,979	125,776	+3,726	-56,203
Government Accountability Office	481,070	522,804	503,328	+22,258	-19,476
Open World Leadership Center	13,860	14,400	6,000	-7,860	-8,400
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
Grand total	2,981,468	3,379,420	3,103,709	+122,241	-275,711

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chair, I want to start by saying that it's an awesome feeling being in my 11th year as a member of the House Appropriations Committee to be standing here as the ranking member offering our first bill and to congratulate our chairwoman from Florida on her first product. It is a joyous occasion for each of us, and I am grateful for this opportunity.

Let me also say that while I do not support and we do not support the overall spending that the Appropriations Committee is recommending for the year, we certainly do support this bill. This bill is a fiscally responsible product. We did work in a bipartisan way. We kind of went through waves where we could do better at times, but towards the end we really came together, and especially on the critical issues, in a bipartisan way. I commend the gentlelady from Florida on that cooperative spirit. I think we both learned a lot along the way about how to work with each other and how to reach out to our members and we do have a good subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

I too want to thank this outstanding staff: Jeff Shockey and Liz Dawson on the minority side; Tom Forhan, Chuck Turner and David Marroni on the majority; particularly Melissa Chapman and Amanda Schoch on my personal staff for all the work that they've done. We're new, we're learning, but we are working together and we're grateful for that.

I want to point out a few things in this bill that I think are very noteworthy. As the chairwoman said, the Inspector General of the Architect of the Capitol is a very important move. Former chairman and now ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS, began this initiative in the '07 bill. For the chairwoman to go forward with it I think is incredibly important. We've learned a lot. Unfortunately, a lot of lessons learned from the CVC, but clearly they need the oversight of the Inspector General.

I also want to commend her on responding to the needs of the Capitol Police. If we are not state-of-the-art in communication on Capitol Hill, then in the whole country we've got a problem with security. They need the money for interoperable communications. It is now in this bill and we're grateful for that.

One caution, and we talked about it some during the rules debate, is this FDA building, the swing space, the whole issue of are we in the wake or behind the CVC going to go into another major capital improvement project and is that necessary or even wise at this time to go forward with that. We're going to talk more about that, but my view is we need sweeping procurement reforms in the way the AOC operates. I know that this is not necessarily an AOC directly driven project, but the whole supervision of how we procure capital improvements, renovations and do it is not efficient.

Frankly, we saw the Botanical Gardens a few years ago, we didn't learn enough lessons from that. We went into the CVC. It's gotten out of hand. We need reforms before we go forward. I look forward to discussing that more as the morning goes.

The Green the Capitol Initiative falls under the category of the prerogative of the majority but the responsibility of the minority to question, is this real substantive. I think there's widespread bipartisan support for environmental improvements on Capitol Hill and across the country. I'm the cochairman of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus. The gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, will speak in a few minutes with concerns about the Green the Capitol Initiative. He's one of the leaders, as am I, on renewable energy and energy-efficiency technologies, but does this end up being somewhat window dressing, not as much substance as we would like. It's not a large budget issue, but we have the obligation to ask these questions.

One of the questions would be, we have an E–85 pump coming but we don't yet have these fleet vehicles or leased vehicles running off of E–85. So we've got to connect the dots and make this work, but we're respectfully asking these questions with the same desire as the majority, to green the Capitol and frankly be as environmentally responsible across the board as we can.

Let me also say another disappointing aspect is that we're still in my view not doing enough for the blind and physically handicapped. The digital talking books program does still receive a reduction even though we made some improvements at the full committee. I want to advocate for doing all we can along the way.

And then let me just say a word about something that's in this bill that thankfully the Rules Committee allowed to stay in this bill and it's the naming of the hall which some say that this subcommittee or even the full committee should not take action on, but I disagree. Because time is of the essence. This new Capitol Visitors Center is the 600-pound gorilla that we've been trying to get our arms around and frankly we've both taken a lot of ownership in this. We inherited this problem, as did the Acting Architect, Mr. Ayers, inherit the cost overruns in this very large project, which is unprecedented. We haven't done it in the history of the Capitol, something this large, 580,000 square feet, $592 million, over twice the original cost; but frankly the planning overlapped September 11. $170 million in cost overruns are for enhanced security improvements in the wake of September 11. But there is a 20,000 square foot space in the middle of this new Capitol Visitors Center, and it's going to be the largest congregate space in the Capitol. Unfortunately, through, I think bad communication, this hall was called the Great Hall, which is exactly the same name as the main hall in the Library of Congress for over 100 years. The Great Hall is this beautiful, ornate room at the Library of Congress. Early on, there was bipartisan agreement at our subcommittee that both of these halls on each end of a tunnel should not be called the Great Hall.

So we took action and I think carefully thought through and felt through some of the options, and the most glaring omission in the history of the Capitol is the irony that the people that built the Capitol were, in large part, slaves who never were honored in any way, shape or form for the work that they did building this Capitol. There were even periods of time where the people working on the dome were Union soldiers and slaves, at the same time, building the dome during the Civil War. What an unbelievably awesome thought that the people who were fighting for their freedom were working side by side with these slaves.

Listen, this is our opportunity to truly honor them in a way that transcends our service, our existence, individuals. And so the naming of this 20,000 square foot hall Emancipation Hall is something that is ripe with life and tradition and time-honored work for all of us. I'm pleased that it was left in the bill, and I'm pleased that our Senate counterparts took action on this yesterday by introducing legislation.

The power to convene is greater than the power to legislate. Sometimes we forget that things like this may seem to be symbolic, but it means so much more. I've taken 1,700 groups through the Capitol over the last 13 years. I give these tours and it inspires young people to a life of service. What greater way to honor freedom than to walk people through this new 20,000 square foot hall and say, this is Emancipation Hall, a great lesson of history.

□ 1100

We gained our national character by the mistakes that we learned from, never to repeat again. That's where we get our character. That's why this is so important.

Some people say we shouldn't spend the money to change the name of the signs. We should never have printed the signs. Let's not make another mistake by not rectifying this first mistake.

I really appreciate the bipartisan spirit in which we have worked on this particular issue.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I wanted rise not to speak on the issue that gentleman just spoke so passionately about, but just to say a word about the two new leaders of this committee.

I have had opportunity of serving in this House for some period of time.

When I first came here, shortly thereafter, Vic Fazio, Congressman Fazio and Congressman LEWIS, who is now the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, handled this responsibility that DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ZACH WAMP are now handling. For almost at least a decade, Liz, I think they handled that responsibility. And they handled it in an absolutely bipartisan way to reflect the fact that 435 Members representing the 300 million people in this country care about this institution working well to their benefit, and to the benefit of our country.

I want to congratulate certainly DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who, in her third year, has become a cardinal, in large part because of her energy and her focus and her talent and her experience in the State Senate in Florida and the House in Florida, and what she brings to this institution. She is an institutionalist.

We are also fortunate with ZACH WAMP from Tennessee, with whom I disagree from time to time and maybe a lot of times when we vote on substantive legislation, but who is a good friend of mine. We are blessed that the two of them are working on this bill.

I mentioned Liz Dawson, who has been, really, mothering this bill, I was going to say husbanding this bill, but for a very significant period of time, since she was a very young girl, and who cares a great deal about this institution. I want to thank her as well for her leadership.

But I think we ought to all feel fortunate that we have two people like DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ZACH WAMP trying to make the accommodations for this institution to work well to represent our people. This is the people's House. To the extent that we have the resources to represent our people in a way that will reflect credit on this House and a positive result for our people, our country will be better. So I wanted to say that and congratulate Mr. WAMP and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished vice chair of the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, first let me also thank our chair for your leadership, for your very focused work, and for your commitment not only as chair and to this bill, but to this entire institution.

I also want to thank our Ranking Member WAMP for your leadership and your expertise and, really, your ability to work together in a bipartisan way to make the committee truly a bipartisan committee, which is what all of our committees are striving for.

So it's a pleasure to serve as vice chair on this committee. I am very proud of the product which we are presenting today.

I rise in strong support of this legislative branch appropriations bill, and really want to just take a moment to thank all of the staff who really, as a result of their vigilance and their expertise and their hard work, they were the ones who really helped us put this all together. I want to especially acknowledge Chris Lee on my staff, because this is one of his very first legislative initiatives, and he did a phenomenal job in keeping me pointed on looking at the goals of what we were trying to accomplish in this legislation.

This bill also seeks to improve the working conditions of dedicated staff who are a vital and integral part of this legislative process. This bill also commits the House of Representatives to set an example to the Nation on how to reduce the environmental impact of the workplace by beginning the greening of the Capitol complex. How exciting this is.

This bill also begins to address the pattern which, unfortunately it is, but it's a pattern of exclusion that has gone on for too long in contracting and procurement in the House of Representatives. For too long businesses owned by women, minorities and the disabled have not had a seat at the table. It was appalling, with what we learned at the hearings about the exclusion of such a large segment of our qualified business community. For too long we have operated without written formal policies and reliable reporting on compliance without the crucial data that the committee cannot know if real progress is being made or if additional action should be required.

Well, naming the great hall Emancipation Hall in recognition that the great Capitol had been built by the expertise, the blood, sweat and tears of slaves is appropriate and timely as we also now go beyond the name to include the descendants of slaves in the economic vitality and opportunity of this Capitol. So we have included in this bill language that requires specific contracting with minorities, with women and the disabled.

We required contractor and vending opportunities and access to equal opportunities for our disadvantaged businesses and for promoting their hiring and development as well.

We also include language that requires GAO to adopt a formal affirmative action plan. They may be doing the right thing, but we don't know that. We know that they do need an affirmative action plan, so we would require that in this bill.

We also make sure that there is accountability in this bill, but let me just say I am very proud of the fact that for the first time we will have requirements now, with our own Capitol contracting opportunities, as well as with the Visitors Center, to not exclude minorities and women and the disabled, but to include them in the economic opportunities that this bill provides.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you very much.

Madam Chairman, to ZACH WAMP, I want to express my feelings about your work on this bill in a couple of ways.

First, those of us on the committee who have watched this process go together, Chairwoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ZACH WAMP working together, frankly, seeing people develop a relationship in a job that involves the real business of the House. It is the bill that funds our appropriations process. While it's not the largest bill, it's very important to the fundamentals here.

But I have never been quite so impressed as I watched them working with our very fine professional staff, to see them also bring along Members of the Appropriations Committee addressing this bill in a very special way. I wish the entire House could have observed the Appropriations Committee as we discussed Emancipation Hall the other day.

JESSE JACKSON was magnificent. The interplay between he and the chairwoman and ZACH WAMP was worthy of the Appropriations Committee, but very much a reflection of the very best of this House. I couldn't have been prouder than I was observing that conversation within appropriators.

With that I want to congratulate you very much for this product. It's a tremendous reflection of our work.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Chairwoman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the chairwoman.

Madam Chairwoman, thank you for your leadership on this bill; In particular, for your support and leadership of the Green the Capitol Initiative, which accounts for the House's global impact on global warming.

Also, I want to thank the ranking member Mr. WAMP, Speaker PELOSI and Chairman BRADY as well.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to congratulate Mr. WELCH for his initiative in moving this issue forward.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. By making my office carbon-neutral earlier this year, my hope was to be able to take a small, but meaningful, step towards addressing the impact of my own congressional activity on global warming.

May I clarify my understanding that the committee report on the bill directs the Chief Administrative Officer to purchase carbon financial instruments to offset carbon produced by all House operations, and that these offsets will be fully transparent, verified, American, project-based offset credits?

I yield.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, that's correct. As written in the report, the committee believes it is important to offset the greenhouse gases generated by the House, which is why we have directed the CAO of the House to purchase carbon offsets at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and credits to successfully offset carbon produced by all House operations.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. It's my understanding through conversations with Dan Beard, the CAO, that he has agreed to develop a plan to deliver a report to your committee in a timely fashion for accounting the balance of congressional offices' carbon footprints. This plan would expand the Green the Capitol Initiative to be inclusive of all Member official travel in district office operations.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is the intent of the subcommittee to eventually encompass all House operations, including travel and district operations. I would welcome this report from Mr. Beard and encourage his recommendations on how we will offset the remaining carbon footprint of the House.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Thank you, Madam Chair; thank you, Ranking Member WAMP. We all really appreciate the way you have worked on this bill together. You make us all proud.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. WELCH.

I look forward to working together on this important issue.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, let me just underscore what Mr. LEWIS said about the work of JESSE JACKSON, Jr., on the work on Emancipation Hall, but also the support from JOHN LEWIS, JIM CLYBURN and Ms. NORTON, who is in the Chamber this morning, and all the people who have any jurisdiction or involvement in this particular issue.

Ms. KILPATRICK and the Congressional Black Caucus support his bill, in large part because of JESSE JACKSON, Jr.'s, leadership. He is extraordinarily bright. He was so articulate and passionate about this issue. Frankly, it wouldn't have been done to this point. We are not complete without him. I just want to underscore that recognition.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman of Pennsylvania, a member of the full committee, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their bonding of bipartisanship. We could use a lot more of that around here. I think it has been great.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for accepting my amendment in full committee that was a GAO study on the implications of changing our fuel source from coal to natural gas. That's a symbol for America to listen to our carbon imprint, so we will go to the clean, green fuel, natural gas.

I see universities doing it. I see State governments doing it already. As our symbol, if that happens in all agencies, State, local, education, we will have a huge impact on the need of affordable, clean natural gas in this country.

My concern is we have a body here who is very much opposed to the production of clean, green natural gas.

One point, on Green the Capitol, I have not been able to find a window that was Energy Star. I have not been able to find a window that was not a single-pane glass that is a great transfer of heat out and cold in. It seems like we ought to be using fuel-efficient first. Maybe that's our next objective.

We're going to be accepting an amendment in a few minutes, and I am not going to protest it, I will not debate it, on light bulbs. It's going to mandate energy-efficient Star-rated light bulbs.

I have them in my home. I have a large home. We have a lot of lights going, and I try to put them where I burn them all the time. But they are not very bright. They are not good for reading. My wife has replaced the one in her reading chair. They buzz sometimes, they just buzz like a transformer, so they are not exactly what we are used to.

Oh, by the way, next year at this time, every light bulb in the Capitol will be made in Communist China, will have mercury in it, and the incandescent light bulb industry that's left in this industry, and I have two plants, those good union jobs will be leaving quicker, not later.

I am not saying Americans shouldn't switch, but we need to know what we're doing.

□ 1115

I believe we need to have a much more thoughtful approach and look at where the jobs are in America in that we are transferring jobs to China. We're putting mercury into the workplace, and we're eliminating some of the best jobs that we have back in our districts. We need to think about that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise to engage the subcommittee chairwoman, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, in a colloquy to express my concerns regarding the Comptroller General's implementation of the Human Capital Reform Act of 2004 and the resulting unionization effort at the Government Accountability Office.

For the past 18 months, the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia, which I chair, has been investigating certain personnel actions taken by the Comptroller General.

Our investigation culminated in a joint House and Senate hearing on May 22, where CRS's legal division and the General Counsel for the GAO's Personnel Appeals Board testified that, based on current statute, GAO did not have the authority to deny over 300 employees who met and, in some cases, exceeded expectations, their 2006 and 2007 annual across-the-board increase.

GAO says that it took this action based upon a compensation-based study conducted by Watson Wyatt. However, when the subcommittee's staff, working with experts in market-based pay, reviewed the documentation, they were unable to validate that the employees who did not receive their across-the-board increase were overpaid, as asserted by GAO.

In addition to meeting their performance expectations, these employees were among the most experienced, with over 25 years of service to GAO.

The workforce at GAO has been severely disrupted by these personnel actions. In reaction to them, a majority of GAO's 1,500 analysts filed a petition with the GAO's Personnel Appeals Board to be represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers.

Unfortunately, GAO has responded by hiring the law firm Venable, LLC, to represent it before the PAB. It is uncommon for a Federal agency to use taxpayers' dollars to hire private sector counsel for such purposes. In addition, GAO is asserting that one-third of the petitioners are supervisors and, therefore, cannot unionize.

Furthermore, GAO has indicated that if its challenge is successful, and it can show that the alleged supervisors were involved in the solicitation of authorization cards for the remaining eligible employees, it will not commit to recognize and bargain with the employee group.

I yield to the chairwoman to ask what steps has the Appropriations Committee taken to address Member and employee concerns about the situation at the GAO.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you for yielding, Chairman DAVIS. Like you, I am very concerned about the Comptroller General's actions and have personally spoken to him to express my concerns.

I am committed to doing all we can to ensure that the Comptroller General does not put up obstacles to workers' rights to organize. In particular, I am dismayed the GAO, as a legislative branch agency, has retained outside counsel, rather than use its own attorneys to represent it before the Personnel Appeals Board. This action is unnecessarily costly and will likely delay the process of determining the outcome of the petition.

The committee has reiterated these points in report language in this bill. We will be closely monitoring the progress of the Comptroller's review of

eligibility, and we are requiring weekly reports on progress in these areas.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Chairman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. My committee will continue to closely monitor this situation as well. I look forward to working with your subcommittee on this matter in the future.

Representatives WYNN, VAN HOLLEN, and Majority Leader HOYER regret that they could not be here to speak on this issue. However, I have statements from them, and will submit them for the RECORD, along with a letter dated June 21, 2007, from the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers to Comptroller General David Walker alleging unfair labor practices.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS, AFL–CIO & CLC,
Silver Spring, MD, June 21, 2007.

Hon. DAVID M. WALKER,
Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. WALKER: Enclosed is an unfair labor practice charge against you. Accept this letter and enclosure as your 30 day advance copy of the charge pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1§15(b). We request that you review the allegations, and to prevent any future violations we urge you to cease any activity related to those described herein. Further, we trust that you will instruct all other Agency officials that such improper conduct will not be permitted.

We anticipate an informal resolution of this charge pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1§15(b). However, if this matter cannot be resolved informally within the next 30 days, the charge will be filed with the GAO Personnel Appeals Board Office of General Counsel and further action will result.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. JUNEMANN,
President.

Personnel Appeals Board/Office of General Counsel U.S. Government Accountability Office **UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE**	**FOR PAB/OGC USE ONLY** Case No. Date filed

See instructions on the back of this form and the PAB regulations governing unfair labor practices at 4 CFR §28.120 *et seq.* Attach additional sheets if needed, numbered according to the item to which they pertain.

1. **Charging Party (Individual or Labor Organization)**

Name/Contact	*Address*	*Phone and Fax*	*Email*
Julia Akins Clark International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers	8630 Fenton St, Suite 400 Silver Spring, MD 20910	Phone: (301) 565-9016 Fax: (301) 565-0018	*jclark@ifpte.org*

2. **Charged GAO Component or Agent**

Name/Contact	*Address*	*Phone and Fax*	*Email*
Hon. David M. Walker Comptroller General of the United States	Government Accountability Office 441 G Street, NW Washington, DC 20548-0001	Phone: (202) 512-5500 Fax: (202) 512-5507	

3. Identify any subsection(s) of GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a) that you believe that GAO and/or its agent(s) has violated.

GAO Order 2711.1 § 12(a)(1) and (8)

4. Describe precisely the actions taken by GAO and/or its agent(s) that you believe violated the provisions identified in #3. Identify the date, location and individuals (with titles) involved in the alleged unfair labor practice.

See Attachment 1

5. Have you or anyone else raised this matter in any other procedure? _X_ No ____ Yes If yes, explain in detail how, when and where this matter was raised.

6. I DECLARE THAT I HAVE READ THIS CHARGE AND THAT THE STATEMENTS IN IT ARE TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. I UNDERSTAND THAT WILLFULLY MAKING FALSE STATEMENTS CAN BE PUNISHED BY FINE AND IMPRISONMENT PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. §1001.

Julia Akins Clark		6/20/07
Type or print your name	Your signature	Date

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILING AN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Use this form if you are charging that the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) or its agents committed an unfair labor practice under GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a). File an original signed copy of the charge with the Personnel Appeals Board, Office of General Counsel (PAB/OGC) at 820 1st St. NE, Suite 580, Washington, D.C. 20002. If filing a charge by fax (202.512.7522), you must promptly submit the signed original to the PAB/OGC. You may, but are not required to, submit evidence or documents supporting the charge. If you choose to do so, these materials must be delivered, not faxed, to the PAB/OGC.

LINE BY LINE INSTRUCTIONS

1. Give the full name, mailing address, phone and fax numbers, as well as email address, of the Charging Party. If a union, give both national affiliation (if any) and local designation. If an employee, identify the component of GAO at which you are employed.

2. Identify the GAO official alleged to have committed the unfair labor practice(s) by full name, mailing address, phone and fax numbers as well as email address (if known). Provide the name of a contact person if the charged party is GAO or a component of GAO.

3. Identify which of the following provisions of GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a) that you allege was violated:

(a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for the GAO to

(1) interfere with, restrain, or coerce any employee in the exercise by the employee of any right under GAO Order 2711.1;

(2) encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization by discrimination in connection with hiring, tenure, promotion, or other conditions of employment;

(3) sponsor, control, or otherwise assist any labor organization, other than to furnish, upon request, customary and routine services and facilities if the services and facilities are also furnished on an impartial basis to other labor organizations having equivalent status;

(4) discipline or otherwise discriminate against an employee because the employee has filed a charge, complaint, affidavit, or petition, or has given any information or testimony under GAO Order 2711.1;

(5) refuse to negotiate in good faith with a labor organization as required by GAO Order 2711.1;

(6) fail or refuse to cooperate in impasse procedures and decisions as required by GAO Order 2711.1;

(7) enforce any rule or order, other than a rule or order implementing 31 U.S.C. 732(h)(2), which is in conflict with any applicable collective bargaining agreement if the agreement was in effect before the date the rule or order was prescribed; or

(8) otherwise fail or refuse to comply with any provision of GAO Order 2711.1.

4. Be concise, complete and factual. Tell what happened in chronological order.

5. State whether this same matter has already been raised as all or part of a claim brought elsewhere, e.g., the GAO Office of Opportunity and Inclusiveness or grievance procedure.

6. Type or print your name. Date and sign the statement attesting to the truth of the statements contained therein.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

ATTACHMENT 1

Item (4):

Comptroller General David M. Walker has made remarks regarding the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (''IFPTE'') and its efforts to assist employees of the Government Accountability Office (''GAO'') in their organizing activities, which violate the requirement that management, especially the Comptroller General as head of the Agency, maintain strict neutrality during a union organizing campaign. GAO Order 2711.1 (defining a management action which interferes with protected Union activities as an Unfair Labor Practice). See GAO Order 2711.1 12(a) (requiring management not to ''interfere with, restrain, or coerce any employee in the exercise by the employee of any right'').

It is well established pursuant to Federal Labor Relations Authority (''FLRA'') precedent that the prohibition on interference with protected Union activities means that an Agency must remain neutral during a Union organizing campaign. See also 5 U.S.C.§7116(e) (providing that management can only make expressions of personal view, argument, opinion or statements relating to cc representation elections that: (1) publicize the fact of a representational election and encourage employees to vote; (2) correct the record with respect to any false or misleading statement made by any person; or (3) inform employees of the Government's policy relating to labor-management relations and representation as long as these statements do not contain threat or reprisal or promise of benefit and are not made under coercive conditions).

The objectionable remarks are summarized below:

In a January 23, 2007 article on www.govexec.com. (See Rutzick, Karen, ''GAO Employees Move Toward Vote on Union Representation'') Comptroller General Walker: (1) Characterized the union movement as coming from a ''handful'' of employees; (2) Stated that, ''a few employees are trying to do something''; and (3) Stated that, ''there are pros and cons'' of the organizing effort that ''[he] would have to present to [his] employees''.

During the May 9, 2007 quarterly Health Care Team meeting at GAO, held the day after the representation petition was filed Comptroller General Walker: (1) Stated that having a union can seriously impact the decision-making process within an agency, and could ''dramatically'' slow things down; (2) Stated that he wanted employees to ''have all the information'' before deciding on whether or not to bring such a change to GAO; and (3) Stated that some employees are concerned that the workplace is ''not fair'' and ''those that think it is not fair do not understand the situation.''

Similarly during the June 6, 2007 IT Team staff meeting at GAO, Comptroller General Walker: (1) Stated that, ''[t]he people who want a union are the vocal minority in GAO''; and (2) Stated that ''[d]ue to union organizing efforts, labor law prevents [him] from helping employees unilaterally. Both of [my] hands are tied due to the union organizing efforts''.

Comptroller General Walker's above-referenced statements to the media and in his addresses to GAO staff meetings are a breach of his obligation to remain neutral regarding the employees' union organizing effort, and constitute a violation of GAO Order 2711.1 §12(a)(1) and (8).

On June 19, 2007 the agency circulated a memorandum to GAO employees. The document: (1) Is titled ''Union Update.'' The title of the document is confusing and implies that it is from the Union rather than the Agency; (2) Stated that IFPTE filed the representation petition when in fact the name of the petitioner is GAO Employees Organization, IFPTE; (3) Withholds the fact that in its May 16, 2007 letter to the PAB the employer agreed to the exclusion of PDP employees, and changed its stance during the meeting between the parties on June 13, 2007; (4) Withholds the fact that GAO's offer required the union to waive the right of Band IIB employees to be union represented, in consideration for GAO's agreement to hold the union election in July. Further, GAO withheld the fact that the union offered to hold the election during the summer, and resolve GAO's IIB supervisory challenge post-election, in order to expedite the election; and; (5) States that a hearing will be held this summer. The agency has no basis for that assertion, since no hearing date has been set.

These statements contained within the memorandum are inaccurate and misleading. As noted above, the June 19, 2007, ''Union Update'' contains numerous factual errors and omissions which, in and of themselves constitute violations of Section 2711.1 §12(a)(1) and (8). In addition, however, section 2711.1 §12(e) specifies the conditions in which the Agency may provide information about the organizing/election process. The information in the Agency's ''Union Update'' goes well beyond the matters specified. The Agency is not permitted to provide periodic self-serving, spinning of facts related to the ongoing procedures of the union organizing process, and then send these to a captive audience via intranet. Accordingly, the contents of the ''Union Update'' itself constitute a ULP in violation of 2711.1 (a)(1) and (8). Moreover, the inaccuracies in the document interfere with employees' free choice and are impermissible pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1 §12(e) and inconsistent with 5 U.S.C. §7116(e). Thus, the document constitutes a violation of GAO Order 2711.1 §12(a)(1) and (8).

PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD/OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL, U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE,

Washington, DC., June 21, 2007.

REQUEST TO PROCEED

The undersigned requests the Personnel Appeals Board to proceed with the above-captioned representation case notwithstanding the alleged violation(s) of GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a) filed directly with the charged party pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1, §15(b) on June 21, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIA AKINS CLARK.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chair, before recognizing the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, Mr. EHLERS of Michigan, I want to just point out that the Comptroller General of the GAO, David Walker, has stated that he ''supports the right of GAO employees to organize if they so choose.'' And I also recognize the presence on the floor today of the chairman of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. BRADY, a friend of mine.

But to speak eloquently on this bill is a man who knows as much about the House as anyone here, a person who I work with very well. I yield 9 minutes to Mr. EHLERS of Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Chair, I'd like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me to speak on this legislation.

First of all I'd like to respond to his comments earlier about greening and also the comments of the subcommittee Chair. I have been involved

in environmental issues even before the first Earth Day. And I also, with all the discussion about fluorescent lights, it's more than 15 years ago that we installed fluorescent lights in the most heavily used parts of our house. We have saved immense amounts of energy and, above all, have avoided having to change light bulbs very often. It's certainly a good thing to do, and we should do it here.

Also, in connection with the comments made about the carbon footprint of the House, let's recognize the most important thing to do is to start by conserving energy, and that is key. You can gain more energy and greater results by increasing efficiency of the use of energy than any other single thing you can do, not just in the Capitol but, frankly, anywhere. And every reduction in a kilowatt of energy is a reduction in carbon emissions. So you can do two things at once.

And I applaud the emphasis on the carbon issue, but that's part of it. Include energy too, that's a very important part. So I encourage the full view. Simply buying credits from someone, if we ever do, and I don't think we should, is not really the answer. We have to reduce the amount we use, and there are many, many ways we can reduce the use of energy in this complex. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) for the compliment on that issue.

The main reason I rise today is to express my concerns with many of the administrative provisions in this bill that infringe on the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration. These could hamper our ability to provide meaningful and effective oversight of the offices and operations within our purview.

I recognize full well I am no longer the chairman of the committee, but I am the ranking Republican. And Mr. BRADY, whom I think very highly of, is in total agreement on these issues.

Initially, when I saw these, I thought of taking the route of moving points of order against these issues, but I'd prefer to work this out with the Chair and ranking member of the subcommittee.

Let me share just a few of the matters that have raised concern among members of the Committee on House Administration. I have also shared these with Mr. BRADY and with Mr. WAMP, and I know that Mr. BRADY shares my concern.

In the section titled ''Legislative Branch-wide Matters,'' the report language states in regard to policies governing contracts with women and minority-owned businesses that ''all agencies shall provide a copy of policies to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate within 60 days of enactment of this act.''

It goes on to say that ''the committee further directs all agencies provide an annual report of their compliance with this policy.'' One of the key reforms in the last decade or so has been giving the Committee on House Administration authority governing use of accounts within the House. The oversight provided by the House Administration Committee was designed to prevent financial abuses and also extended to the creation of procurement guidelines, since procurements are made from House accounts.

Those reforms were put in place to guarantee open competition in the procurement process and to ensure that the House would get the best value for the taxpayers' dollars.

This bill essentially creates a reporting relationship to the Appropriations Committee that circumvents the Committee on House Administration and damages our committee's ability to perform the vital oversight function that is within our jurisdiction.

And I would appreciate it if I could have the attention of the Chair because I'm going to ask a question about this in a few minutes.

In the section titled ''Culinary School Students,'' the Appropriations Committee requests that the Chief Administrative Officer contact culinary schools and explore the possibility for culinary school students to enhance their skills and make appropriate arrangements for the students to participate on a rotational basis among the participants in an on-the-job training or similar program.

While I certainly appreciate the interest of the Appropriations Committee in training students and creating a more enjoyable dining experience for Members and staff, the House Administration Committee has already tried to do this in the past and found that no culinary schools were interested because of the unpredictable hours of operation. Again, by circumventing our committee's authority, the Appropriations Committee has added another layer of bureaucracy, created a duplication of work for the CIO, and created a conflict of oversight authority.

Similarly, in the section titled ''Disability Access,'' the language includes a directive to the Chief Administrative Officer of the House, with the assistance of the Architect of the Capital, Government Accountability Office, and the Office of Compliance, where necessary to do a comprehensive assessment of the Capitol complex regarding disability access.

In fact, as required by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, the Office of Compliance conducts biennial ADA inspections of the legislative branch. Most, if not all, of the corrective actions to be taken are under the purview of the Architect of the Capitol. The AOC works closely with the OOC to develop abatement plans and includes cost estimates for that abatement in their annual budget submissions. The CAO is not equipped to conduct this type of study and does not have authority to examine the entire Capitol complex.

Just to conclude, while each of these issues are troubling on their own, together with the other concerns I have addressed with Chairman BRADY, they carry even greater significance as a symbol of an emerging pattern whereby report language is being used to establish administrative policy that was never intended to be a matter before the Appropriations Committee. If continued, this creates a duplicative oversight function, threatens to severely hamper the oversight ability of the House Administration Committee.

We've often heard the term ''the power of the purse strings,'' but in this case the power's being used to grant oversight authority to the Appropriations Committee in a manner that will create additional bureaucracy and cause undue harm, particularly to the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration.

I would like to yield time to the Chair of the subcommittee to respond to this. I hope that we can resolve this amicably, and that's why I did not make an issue offering points of order to strike language, et cetera. I don't want to make a do-or-die issue of this, but I would appreciate assurances from the Chair of the subcommittee that we can amicably resolve these jurisdiction issues between ourselves and perhaps with the help of the Parliamentarian.

And I know that Mr. BRADY shares my concern. I believe he's had some conversations with you as well.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the hard work of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

□ 1130

I appreciated as a freshman his assistance during the orientation process and want to assure the gentleman, as I have in conversations with Chairman BRADY, that the language in our report, specifically as it relates to the culinary language, is simply a request for the GAO to take a look at that issue so that we can incorporate culinary students in an instructional way in the preparation and delivery of food in the Members dining room. In addition, the disability language, while it is a directive, it was intended to make sure that we could keep the safety and security focus of our legislation.

I do look forward to working very closely with the chairman and the ranking member of the House Administration Committee so that we can make sure that we cover those needs that we have in the House of Representatives and the legislative branch agencies.

And I appreciate the gentleman's kind words.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for the assurance.

I just want to state I have been on that committee virtually since I came to the Congress. I have worked very, very hard on this committee to establish a good working administrative system. We have clarified jurisdiction

over the years, and even though I am no longer chairman but the ranking member at this point, I just want to ensure that the committee continues to enjoy a good relationship with the subcommittee.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chair of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I just want to say a few quick things.

We had a problem in House Administration when Chairwoman MILLENDER-MCDONALD passed away. There was a void. But taking over as chairman, I have a great working relationship with my ranking minority member, Mr. EHLERS. I have a great working relationship with the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, ZACH WAMP. I also have tremendous respect for and a great working relationship with the chairwoman.

We have had some conversations that we did not need to discuss here. I have been assured and am extremely comfortable with the fact that we will be together working out our jurisdictional problems. I thank the gentlewoman for stepping in at a time when it was needed. Again, with my ranking minority member, we have a great relationship. We probably have the best committee in that we get along all the time. We are going to continue to do that. I thank, again, the ranking member.

I look forward to working with you, and I have your assurance that we will be doing that.

Madam Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for the work of the gentlelady from Florida to craft the FY08 appropriations bill for the Legislative Branch. As we are well aware in the Committee on House Administration, working on this bill may not be very glamorous, but it is essential to keeping the House running.

The Committee on Appropriations has done a good job of balancing the many needs of the House—paying our employees, keeping the physical plant running, and operating the various agencies that serve Capitol Hill.

I am particularly pleased to see in this bill an additional $5 million toward upgrading the radio systems of the Capitol Police. Establishing a secure communications system for our police force is essential to the security of the Hill.

I also appreciate the Committee's commitment of funds for the "Green the Capitol" initiative. According to the House Chief Administrative Officer's calculations, we can eventually recoup these costs from savings on our utility bills when we make the House more energy-efficient.

I look forward to continuing our strong working relationship in the future.

Finally, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I urge the Members to reject the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. FLAKE]. It is essential that the Congressional Printing and Binding Appropriation be funded at least at the level recommended by the Appropriations Committee. The Government Printing Office must have enough resources to provide Congress with the printing and digital services fundamental to our legislative process.

The congressional printing account has been flat-funded since 2005. As a result, in order to deliver what we require to do our jobs in Congress, GPO has had to reach into its own working capital. When GPO depletes it working capital, it consumes funds otherwise available to keep pace with technology, train employees, even to maintain plant and equipment.

GPO receives no salaries-and-expenses appropriation for its printing operations. GPO runs just like a business, and the Congressional Printing and Binding Appropriation is Congress' prepayment for its own orders. As a GPO customer, like many other Federal agencies, Congress has to pay its way and cannot expect GPO to underwrite printing needs, especially as we increase congressional activity in this 110th Congress. If Congress continues to underfund its own printing, GPO will eventually face a financial crisis that we caused, threatening its ability to operate for any of its agency customers. Let's reject the Flake amendment to keep that from happening.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I thank her for her excellent work on her maiden voyage as chair.

I have come to say a few words that I think need saying about the performance of GAO with respect to the grand experiment that our committee allowed on pay for performance. We allowed it. We have not tried to interfere with it. But the actions taken by the Comptroller General where you would at least have expected it has produced nothing short of a revolution within, of all places, the GAO workforce.

They were chosen for this grand experiment because they were a fairly upscale part of the Federal workforce. And what have we got? How would you feel if you had worked at or above performance, and yet you were among 300 employees of, what is it, 2 million Federal employees who did not receive the across-the-board pay increase that everybody else receives? Well, some of you might have sued or filed a claim with the Personnel Appeals Board within the GAO. And those employees, all 12 of them, have received their COLA, have been promoted, and have had their retirement fixed.

But there are 300 employees from 2006, 130 from 2007 who have been punished as to their pensions and pay because the Comptroller did not keep his promise with the Congress, which was that nobody's across-the-board pay would be affected. In fact, what he did was to insert a market-based study without informing the subcommittee, an unvalidated study, and now he has a whole racial claim on top of it because the African Americans have been disproportionately affected by his action.

If the Comptroller wanted some help, he could have gone to the OPM. Instead, he used a market-based study from a consultant. If he wanted to know how to deal with unionization which is now upon him, he could have gone to the OPM. He could have gone to the Federal Labor Relations Authority. Instead, he is spending taxpayer funds in order to try to beat a union within the Federal sector, the first time ever. If we allow taxpayer funds to be used that way, then it seems to me we ought to be called to account.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 2771, the legislative branch appropriations bill. I want to thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ranking Member WAMP, and the appropriations staff for their hard work in crafting this fiscally responsible bill.

The bill on the floor today is "lean and mean," providing just the resources that we need to serve the people in an honest, transparent manner.

I strongly believe that as our Nation's elected leaders, we have a responsibility here in the people's House to lead the Nation in creating an environmentally friendly workplace. This is why I crafted two amendments for today's bill that would have directed the Architect of the Capitol to take small but significant steps toward "greening" the Capitol complex.

I am pleased that Subcommittee Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ shares my support for the Speaker's Greening of the Capitol Initiative. Since she has enthusiastically agreed to consider them during conference, I won't be offering them today.

But I would like to draw the House's attention to these two initiatives because they demonstrate how small investments can reap large rewards.

Both initiatives were drawn from the Greening of the Capital report recently

completed by the Architect of the Capitol, and both are endorsed by the American Society of Landscape Architects.

The first initiative would study the feasibility of constructing a ''green roof'' on the Ford House Office Building. A green roof is a rooftop that is carefully planted with vegetation. It can be anything from a simple plot of grass to a park-like setting.

Green roofs have proved to be tremendous economic and environmental benefits. They are great insulators, reducing heating and cooling costs often by as much as 25 percent. And they save on maintenance costs as well since they are more protective than traditional roofs. Green roofs cool the surrounding neighborhood by reducing the amount of heat that is reflected back into the surrounding atmosphere, the so-called urban heat island effect. Vegetation on green roofs celebrates our natural heritage and also absorbs rainwater, reducing contaminated runoff.

Even with all these benefits, green roofs have not caught on. They are not very popular yet in the United States. And as Members of Congress, we now have the opportunity to lead by example. A successful demonstration of the economic benefits of green roofs right here in the Capitol Complex can help promote green roofs across the Nation.

My second proposal concerns the planting of more trees around parking lots in the Capitol Complex. My colleagues who closely follow environmental issues already know that trees have a remarkable ability to reduce the air temperature in our urban areas. Trees remove carbon from our atmosphere, shade our buildings and cars, and even reduce asthma by filtering out air pollutants. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, this proposal would even save the taxpayers money.

Without action this year, many of the Speaker's Greening of the Capitol Initiatives, including the two I have just discussed, won't get funding until 2009 or 2010. These proposals would get us started modestly but promptly and don't require additional funds.

I look forward to working with Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ to incorporate these projects into the legislative branch's plans for 2008.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on environmental issues and look forward to working with her on continuing the Speaker's leadership on the Green the Capitol Initiative, both in terms of planting of the trees and the greening of roofs, and I look forward and appreciate her input.

At this time, Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, this place, this House is always at its best when Members of the United States Congress work together. And I want to congratulate the chairwoman of this committee and the ranking member of this committee for working together.

Most people don't understand that the legislative branch creates an atmosphere of hospitality in this place. As I look and see the number of visitors that we have, your responsibility is to secure them and to welcome them. Let me thank you personally for the task that you have undertaken.

I want to thank you for the increase in the House Child Care Center, and I hope that our community does not criticize the fact that we are family friendly so that employees have the opportunity to have child care.

I want to thank you for supporting the Speaker's Green Initiative because we, too, must do what we ask Americans to do.

And, of course, the brave men and women that serve us, I welcome the increase in the Capitol Police, and I also look forward to their continuing to address the questions of discrimination and equality as they increase the numbers of police.

Let me join in the words of Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and hope that we will challenge, if you will, the GAO to be responsible in its dealings with its employees and unionization.

But I came today to be able to offer to the American public the sense of pride and the sense of humbleness that I am now experiencing because of your grand leadership and that of the Appropriations Committee. And my good friend Congressman JESSE JACKSON and, of course, members of the Congressional Black Caucus signed a letter, which I was proud to sign, because this picture reflects something that is near and dear to Texas.

My good friend comes from Tennessee. He knows that we have a lot of continuity or connection between Tennessee and Texas and the good State of Florida.

But we celebrated this week the Emancipation Proclamation. We celebrated, in particular, Juneteenth. Those of us in the South remember Major General Gordon Granger coming 2 years late to indicate that we might be free. Isn't it wonderful that now we will name the Visitors Center, and we hope for our good friends in the other body to be as reasonable, the Emancipation Hall.

I went through the hall just outside this door before I came to the floor, and I saw the name of William Jennings Bryan. I saw the name Wheeler of Alabama, Huey Pierce Long, Lew Wallace, Sequoyah, Sam Houston.

□ 1145

I met a woman who told me about her grandfather, Levi Coffin, who had helped slaves in the Underground Railroad. Her name was Ms. Holt. She was just standing there talking to me.

That's what naming the Emancipation Hall means to America. It reflects the wholeness of America, the wonderment of our history, the dignity of our history. Yes, slaves built this place, but all Americans will be able to go into Emancipation Hall, and it will symbolize the freedom of this Nation. I am so grateful that we have come to this place at this time.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, Emancipation Hall.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2771, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2008 and to commend Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her leadership in shepherding this bill though the legislative process. This legislation funds the House, Senate and various entities in the legislative branch, including the Library of Congress, the Capitol Police, the Government Accountability Office, and the Government Printing Office.

But it does more than that, Madam Chairman. The bill provides funding for ''Greening the Capitol'' to reduce carbon emissions from the operations of House buildings and the Capitol. It makes the necessary investments for critical health and safety needs by funding security upgrades and addressing health hazards and safety requirements in law. In short, this legislation demonstrates a commitment by the new Democratic majority to increased oversight, accountability and fiscal responsibility.

H.R. 2771 appropriates $3.1 billion for legislative branch entities, including $1.2 billion for House operations and $1.9 billion for legislative branch agencies and other offices. The total provided is $275.7 million (8 percent) less than requested by legislative offices and agencies and only $122.2 million (4 percent) more than comparable FY 2007 funding. Nearly 25 percent of this increased funding is directly attributable to costs associated with the 2008 presidential election and subsequent inauguration.

Following the long-established practice that each house of Congress determines its own housekeeping requirements without interference from the other body, the bill contains no funding for Senate operations. The bill appropriates $1.2 billion for operations of the House of Representatives, which is $36.5 million (3 percent) less than requested, but $54.1 million (5 percent) more than current funding.

The total for the House includes $581 million for members' offices, also known as MRA's, 5 percent more than current funding, but 5 percent less than requested and $162.8 million for House committees, 8 percent more than current funding and 4 percent more than requested. The bill also provides $169.4 million for the various House officers and employees, including the Clerk of the House, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), 8 percent more than current funding, but 3 percent less than requested.

H.R. 2771 provides $21.1 million for joint House-Senate items, 13 percent less than current funding and 23 percent less than requested, when the recent June 8 supplemental request for the Capitol guides is taken into account. The appropriated amount includes $9.4 million for the Joint Committee on Taxation, 7 percent more than current funding.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 2771 provides a total of $1.9 billion for other offices and legislative branch agencies that directly or indirectly support congressional operations. This funding is $71.2 million (4 percent) more than current levels but $232.8 million (11 percent) less than requested. Among the agencies this bill funds are the Architect of the Capitol; the Capitol Police; the Library of Congress; the Government Printing Office, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Government Accountability Office.

For the Architect of the Capitol, the bill provides $348.4 million, 9 percent less than current funding and 12 percent less than requested. Included in the bill is $27.5 million for the Capital Visitors Center. I cite with particular approval that the bill renames the center's Great Hall as "Emancipation Hall" in remembrance of the slave labor that created this mighty edifice.

Earlier this week, the House passed H. Con. Res. 155, which recognized the historical significance of June 19, 1865, or "Juneteenth," the oldest known celebration of the ending of slavery. On June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, landed at Galveston, TX, with news that the war had ended and that all slaves were now free. But this was 2½ years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation—which had become official January 1, 1863.

Madam Chairman, I suppose it may just be another irony of life that the U.S. Capitol was rebuilt during the Civil War and completed around the time of Juneteenth. This magnificent symbol of democracy, freedom, and equality could not have been brought in to being without the blood and sweat and unrequited toil of slave labor. For much of our history the contributions to our country by slaves and their descendants has not been fully acknowledged. But in renaming the Great Hall to the Capitol Visitor Center as "Emancipation Hall," we begin to rectify this error. It is a wonderful thing we are doing.

The bill also provides $3.9 million to implement the "Green the Capitol" initiative, including $2.7 for shifting from coal to natural gas for heating in the Capitol power plant, and the report requires the House CAO to purchase carbon credits. The bill also requires the hiring of an inspector general.

The bill provides the Capitol Police $286 million, which is $13.1 million (4 percent) less than requested, but $20.3 million (8 percent) more than current funding. The Library of Congress is slated to receive $572.5 million, $63.8 million (13 percent) more than the current level, but $89.1 million (13 percent) less than requested. There is $125.8 million for the Government Printing Office; $37.8 million for the Congressional Budget Office (CBO); and $503.3 million in net funding for the Government Accountability Office (GAO). The bill does not contain any earmarks as defined under House rules.

To conclude, Madam Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2771 because it makes the necessary investments for critical health and safety needs by funding security upgrades and addressing health and safety hazards. I support this legislation because it reflects the commitment by the new Democratic majority to increased oversight, accountability and fiscal responsibility.

I thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her fine work in bringing this exceptional legislation to the House floor where it should receive an overwhelmingly favorable vote.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, with the understanding that the distinguished Chair from Florida will close, I would like to yield myself 1 minute before yielding the balance of our time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

I congratulate our chairwoman for just working really hard, having a lot of hearings, digging in, learning a lot, and then finding a way to work together through the process, and I'm grateful.

Also, I want to say, with regard to the GAO issue and outside counsel, using outside counsel is actually commonplace; even the House itself has used it, the legislative branch agencies have used that. And then also to say about the greening of the Capitol issue, what we've heard today should remind us to use great caution because we are all for greening and environmental efficiency, but we need to be careful that the Congress itself is not a guinea pig to try a whole lot of things just to see how they work.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia, the former chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. KINGSTON.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Mr. WAMP. And I thank the Chair and congratulate both of you on your work for this bill.

I want to say, however, I do not support it. I am very disappointed that after the bill left the Appropriations Committee and went to the Rules Committee, a funny thing happened. All this transparency and all this promise of open government and open rules seemed to fade away in a dark corner room up on the third floor of this building, because there were 23 amendments offered, and yet only three of them were accepted.

We talk about bipartisanship and we talk about sunshine in the process, and yet this is the very bill that basically funds and perhaps even governs our own body, our own congressional branch, and yet it has the closed rule. And 20 amendments won't get the sunshine, will not get the debate because of the Rules Committee under Democrat leadership. I would say you need to go back to your campaign brochures and look at all the promises that you made before you pass another rule like this.

One of the casualties of this closed process was an amendment that I offered that deals with contractors who deal with the Federal Government, who work for the Federal Government. I'll give you some examples. December 2005, 22 Mexican nationals were found illegally working in Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque, New Mexico. January 27, 2001, illegal aliens were found working at Fort Benning, Georgia. March 2007, the Golden State Fence Company was actually fined because, in building a border security fence, they had hired 10 illegal aliens.

It doesn't stop there. In Louisiana, December 2005, a local company was busted working on a Veterans Administration hospital because they had illegal aliens. This is absurd. Now, I've heard from many people the theme of "leading by example." Perhaps one thing we could do and absolutely should do is require that if you are contracting for the Federal Government, that you have a Social Security verification process going in your business, more than the sham, more than the, Yeah, but we have an I–9 kind of approach that we're seeing. And this would actually say you need to be in the ICE, which is the Customs and Immigration Enforcement Service, you need to be in the ICE Basic Pilot Program, which is a way to know that your employees have correct and legal Social Security numbers. That's all the amendment would have done.

I would predict that this amendment would get lots of bipartisan support because we see that the biggest issue facing America, besides Iraq and perhaps energy, is the issue of illegal immigration. And here was an opportunity for us to make a definitive statement, to have a significant amendment added to the bill, and the Democrats said no.

I hope they'll reconsider on future legislation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I think it's unfortunate that the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished former chairman of this committee, has chosen this opportunity as a message opportunity, as opposed to working together in a bipartisan way, like the ranking member and I have done, to make sure that we can provide for the safety and security of the facilities of this institution.

He knows full well that the Capitol Visitors Center and the employees of the subcontractors that have been engaged to build that facility, while moving entirely too slowly, and we certainly have decried the cost overruns, are required to hire people who legally may work in this country and are required to ensure that a background check and a security check has been done on them. So his remarks are unfortunate, but everybody makes their own choices.

In conclusion, Madam Chair, I am really proud of the work that the subcommittee and I have engaged in. We offer this legislation to the House and ask for their support. We have endeavored to make sure that this bill is fiscally responsible, provides for the life, safety and security of the needs of the people who work here as well as the people who visit us here, and make sure that we can engage in Congress's oversight role and provide for accountability for the American people.

I look forward to continuing to work with Mr. WAMP from Tennessee on making sure that we can consistently

provide those initiatives for the American people.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express concerns about GAO's response to GAO employees' petition for a union election, which was filed on May 8 of this year. As a legislative branch agency it is imperative that GAO conduct its labor relations in a manner that is a model for all Federal agencies.

I am particularly concerned by GAO's decision to challenge the eligibility of one-third of the employees covered by the union petition. GAO is asserting that these employees are not eligible for representation because they perform a supervisory role.

The facts of their employment status at GAO strongly suggests otherwise. If these employees are in fact determined to be supervisors, then they are supervisors in name only because they are prohibited from performing supervisory functions. Moreover, GAO would have a 1:3 ratio of supervisors to nonsupervisors. That would be one of the smallest ratios in any public or private organization.

I am deeply concerned that GAO's challenge is an attempt to delay balloting until the end of the year, one that will entail a considerable expenditure of resources that will only distract the agency from carrying out critical investigatory and oversight work for the U.S. Congress.

I strongly urge GAO to reconsider its challenge, which will be costly, undermine agency morale, and distract it from its mission.

Mr. WYNN. Madam Chairman, today I rise to express my concerns with Government Accountability Office, GAO, management's response to the GAO employees' petition seeking a union election.

It should be noted that applicable law strictly prohibits the GAO management from expressing any personal view, argument, opinion, or statements relating to a union election except to: publicize election and encourage employees to vote; correct the record with respect to any false or misleading statement; or inform employees of the Government's policy relating to labor-management relations and representation as long as these statements do contain a threat or reprisal or promise of benefit and are not made under coercive conditions.

Despite these restrictions, Comptroller General Walker was quoted in a January 23, 2007 publication as stating that he ''will present to the employees [his] views on the advantages and disadvantages of unionization.''

Shortly after this statement was published, attorneys for the union sent a letter advising Comptroller General Walker of his obligation to remain ''neutral'' during the employees' deliberations regarding unionization.

The GAO's General Counsel responded acknowledging GAO management's legal obligation to maintain strict neutrality during a union organizing campaign.

Further, the Comptroller General met with me shortly before I sent a letter to him regarding his response to the union organizing activities.

In that meeting, the Comptroller General tried to discourage me from sending the letter, and promised not to interfere with the unionization effort. I informed Mr. Walker that I appreciated his assurances but that would be sending the letter all the same.

I have the letter dated February 23rd of this year, and signed by a bipartisan group of 19 House Members and 3 Senators with me and wish to submit it for the RECORD.

I am sorry to say that despite these assurances, and since the union filed the election petition on May 8, 2007, the Comptroller General has made additional statements that are at odds with his obligation to remain neutral.

I am very concerned that I have received reports from GAO employees that Mr. Walker has used his staff meetings to make statements that are seen by employees as a breach of GAO management's neutrality obligation.

For example, they report that Mr. Walker has urged employees to ''get all the facts'', that a union could ''make things different . . . seriously impact agency decision-making'', and ''slow things down.''

He refers to the GAO employees who seek to form a union as a ''vocal minority in GAO'' and that ''[d]ue to union organizing efforts, labor law prevents [him] from helping employees unilaterally. Both of [my] hands are tied due to the union organizing efforts. . .''

By implication, Mr. Walker asserts that if employees reject union-representation, Mr. Walker will ''help'' them.

Mr. Walker's statements are not neutral. I find it hard to believe that GAO analysts need to be reminded to ''get all the facts'' and the very purpose of a union is to ''impact'' the employer's decision-making.

Further, it cannot be clearer that the reference to potentially ''slowing things down'' is intended as a negative reference about unionization.

I rise today not only to call on Mr. Walker to stop interfering with GAO employees' right to organize and petition for a union election, but to call on my colleagues to stand together with these GAO employees who serve Congress and the public.

Let us do all we can to help these dedicated public servants get a vote on their union election petition this summer.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to add my voice of support to our valued public servants at the Government Accountability Office, GAO. Just as Congress relies on the GAO for the gold standard of fair and even-handed analysis, so too must we ensure that our GAO workforce receives that same standard of fairness and even-handedness when it comes to matters of their own employment.

The issues that gave rise to the language in today's underlying Legislative Branch Appropriations bill are not new to the Government Oversight Committee on which I sit, or to the Federal employee community I am privileged to serve. Like many of my colleagues on the committee, I have received reports expressing concern about the process surrounding the recent Band II Restructuring Project, as well as the methodology used in the 2004 Watson Wyatt Worldwide, WWW, compensation study. In that regard, I am particularly troubled that the WWW study is being cited as the reason over 300 hard-working GAO employees who met or exceeded their performance expectations have been denied annual cost of living adjustments, notwithstanding public commitments to the contrary.

As a majority of GAO analysts have now exercised their employment rights to organize a union, it is critical that the requisite election process go forward expeditiously and without interference. I thank my colleagues for this opportunity to voice my support for the GAO workforce and the rest of our valued Federal employee community.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, I want to begin by taking the time to congratulate Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her excellent work on this bill as well as in the subcommittee the past couple of months. It has been a pleasure to work with you and I look forward to working with all other Members as we continue to address the concerns of all people working in and visiting the Nation's Capitol.

I would also like to commend Ranking Member WAMP for his work. Together the chairwoman and ranking member have fostered a collegial bipartisan atmosphere.

The bill before us is a good bill, a bill that brings us necessary security upgrades, that shows a commitment to increased oversight, and does it in a fiscally responsible manner.

Among the bill's many important provisions is funding for the Greening the Capitol Initiative. This initiative will enable us to start switching from coal to cleaner burning natural gas for the running of the Capitol powerplant. Pages live in the shadow of the Capitol powerplant. It will allow us to purchase energy efficient light bulbs, and will allow us to begin other energy savings operations throughout the Capitol Complex.

The bill includes necessary funding for the Office of Compliance, which will allow that office to conduct oversight of the utility tunnel improvement efforts and health and safety issues. During hearings in the subcommittee, I have raised concerns, along with several of my colleagues, about the utility tunnels and workers and I am pleased to see that the Office of Compliance will receive the resources it needs to oversee the ongoing situation.

This bill also includes funding for the Library of Congress and several of its extremely important programs, such as the Books for the Blind Program, which provides services to blind and physically handicapped patrons including the production and distribution of books and magazines in Braille and electronic media.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ranking Member WAMP for the efforts they have put in to the subcommittee this year to ensure that the Capitol Complex and various agencies around us are run well and efficiently.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2771

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, namely:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, $1,198,560,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, $23,648,000, including: Office of the

Speaker, $4,761,000, including $25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, $2,188,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, $4,090,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, $1,894,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, $1,420,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, $499,000; Republican Steering Committee, $943,000; Republican Conference, $1,631,000; Republican Policy Committee, $325,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, $1,295,000; Democratic Caucus, $1,604,000; nine minority employees, $1,498,000; training and program development—majority, $290,000; training and program development—minority, $290,000; Cloakroom Personnel—majority, $460,000; and Cloakroom Personnel—minority, $460,000.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, $581,000,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, $133,000,000: *Provided,* That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2008.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, $29,800,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided,* That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2008.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, $169,393,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not more than $13,000, of which not more than $10,000 is for the Family Room, for official representation and reception expenses, $22,881,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $7,024,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, $116,891,000, of which $6,269,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, $4,457,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Operations, $3,111,000, to remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, $1,202,000; for the Office of the Chaplain, $166,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian, $2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, and not more than $1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $1,828,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, $3,046,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, $7,406,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, $752,000; for other authorized employees, $170,000; and for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Historian, $459,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, $261,719,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, $3,688,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, $410,000; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, $237,410,000; supplies, materials, and other costs relating to the House portion of expenses for the Capitol Visitor Center, $2,308,000, to remain available until expended; Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery, $17,200,000, of which $5,408,000 shall remain available until expended; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, $703,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (2 U.S.C. 2112), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) REQUIRING AMOUNTS REMAINING IN MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES TO BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for ''HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES—MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES'' shall be available only for fiscal year 2008. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for fiscal year 2008 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''Member of the House of Representatives'' means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

SEC. 102. CONTRACT FOR EXERCISE FACILITY.—(a) Section 103(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 3175), is amended by striking ''private entity'' and inserting ''public or private entity''.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2005.

SEC. 103. DEPOSITS.—(a) The second sentence of section 101 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (2 U.S.C. 117j) is amended by striking ''deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts'' and inserting ''deposited in the Treasury for credit to the account of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer''.

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 104. HOUSE SERVICES REVOLVING FUND.—(a) Section 105(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2005 (2 U.S.C. 117m(b)) is amended by striking ''the Chief Administrative Officer'' and inserting the following: ''the Chief Administrative Officer, including purposes relating to energy and water conservation and environmental activities carried out in buildings, facilities, and grounds under the Chief Administrative Officer's jurisdiction,''.

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 105. ADJUSTMENT.—The first sentence of section 5 of House Resolution 1238, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to December 22, 1970 (as enacted into permanent law by chapter VIII of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1971) (2 U.S.C. 31b–5), is amended by striking ''step 1 of level 6'' and inserting ''step 7 of level 11''.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, $4,398,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, $9,416,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including: (1) an allowance of $2,175 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of $725 per month each to four medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician; (3) an allowance of $725 per month to two assistants and $580 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and (4) $2,023,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, $2,820,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office, $4,448,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the statements for the first session of the 110th Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriations bills as required by law, $30,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For salaries of employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, and Government contributions for health, retirement, social security, professional liability insurance, and other applicable employee benefits, $224,500,000, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, the awards program, postage, communication services, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and not more than $5,000 to be expended on the certification of the Chief of the Capitol Police in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $61,500,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for a radio modernization program, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2008 shall be paid by the Secretary of Homeland Security from funds available to the Department of Homeland Security.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1001. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2008 for the Capitol Police may be transferred between the headings ''SALARIES'' and ''GENERAL EXPENSES'' upon the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 1002. EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 908 of the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2002 (2 U.S.C. 1926, Public Law 107–117; 115 Stat. 2319), as amended, is further amended in subsection (c) by striking ''$40,000'' and inserting ''$60,000''.

SEC. 1003. ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Capitol Police is authorized to make advanced payments for obligations when it has been determined that making such payments is in the best interest of the government.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), $3,806,000, of which $780,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance may, within the limits of available appropriations, dispose of surplus or obsolete personal property by interagency transfer, donation, or discarding: *Provided further*, That not more than $500 may be expended on the certification of the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance in connection with official representation and reception expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1101. LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS.—(a) The Executive Director of the Office of Compliance shall have the authority to make lump-sum payments to reward exceptional performance by an employee or a group of employees.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2007.

SEC. 1102. TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR PERSONNEL. (a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 4122. Training for employees of the Office of Compliance

''(a) The Executive Director of the Office of Compliance may, by regulation, make applicable such provisions of this chapter as the Executive Director determines necessary to provide for training of employees of the Office of Compliance. The regulations shall provide for training which, in the determination of the Executive Director, is consistent with the training provided by agencies under the preceding sections of this chapter.

''(b) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall provide the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance with such advice and assistance as the Executive Director may request in order to enable the Executive Director to carry out the purposes of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 4122 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

''4122. Training for employees of the Office of Compliance.''.

SEC. 1103. REIMBURSEMENT.—(a) Section 415 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1415) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—

''(1) NOTIFICATION OF PAYMENTS MADE FROM ACCOUNT.—As soon as practicable after the Executive Director is made aware that a payment of an award or settlement under this chapter has been made from the account described in subsection (a), the Executive Director shall notify the head of the office to which the payment is attributable that the payment has been made, and shall include in the notification a statement of the amount of the payment.

''(2) REIMBURSEMENT BY OFFICE.—Not later than 180 days after receiving a notification from the Executive Director under paragraph (1), the head of the office involved shall transfer to the account described in subsection (a), out of any funds available for operating expenses of the office, a payment equal to the amount specified in the notification.''.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to payments made under section 415 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary for operation of the Congressional Budget Office, including not more than $4,000 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $37,805,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for surveys and studies in connection with activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol; for all necessary expenses for the general and administrative support of the operations under the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden; electrical substations of the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol; including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than $5,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle, $81,733,000, of which $400,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

CAPITOL BUILDING

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol, $24,567,000, of which $8,790,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, $9,310,000, of which $500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, $66,151,000, of which $25,400,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, $83,017,000, of which $4,945,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012: *Provided*, That not more than $8,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2008.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, $31,638,000, of which $10,140,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

CAPITOL POLICE BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, AND SECURITY

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of buildings, grounds and security enhancements of the United States Capitol Police, wherever located, the Alternate Computer Facility, and AOC security operations, $16,109,000, of which $2,500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

BOTANIC GARDEN

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $8,310,000: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, the Architect may obligate and expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance, care and operation of the National Garden established under section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146), upon vouchers approved by the Architect or a duly authorized designee.

CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

For an additional amount for the Capitol Visitor Center project, $20,000,000 to remain available until expended, and in addition, $7,545,000 for Capitol Visitor Center operation costs: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol may not obligate any of the funds which are made available for the Capitol Visitor Center project without an obligation plan approved by the Committees on

Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1201. ROSA PARKS STATUE.—(a) Section 1(a) of Public Law 109–116 (2 U.S.C. 2131a note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Joint Committee may authorize the Architect of the Capitol to enter into the agreement required under this subsection on its behalf, under such terms and conditions as the Joint Committee may require.''.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of Public Law 109–116.

SEC. 1202. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—There is established in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol the Office of the Inspector General, headed by the Inspector General of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Inspector General'').

(b) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Inspector General shall be appointed by the Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of integrity and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigations.

(2) TERM OF SERVICE.—The Inspector General shall serve for a term of 5 years, and an individual serving as Inspector General may be reappointed for not more than 2 additional terms.

(3) REMOVAL.—The Inspector General may be removed from office prior to the expiration of his term only by the Architect of the Capitol. Upon such removal, the Architect shall promptly communicate the reasons for the removal in writing to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(4) SALARY.—The Inspector General shall be paid at an annual rate equal to $1,500 less than the annual rate of pay in effect for the Architect of the Capitol.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) APPLICABILITY OF DUTIES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH ESTABLISHMENT.—The Inspector General shall carry out the same duties and responsibilities with respect to the Architect of the Capitol as an Inspector General of an establishment carries out with respect to an establishment under section 4 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 4), under the same terms and conditions which apply under such section.

(2) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—The Inspector General shall prepare and submit semiannual reports summarizing the activities of the Office of the Inspector General in the same manner, and in accordance with the same deadlines, terms, and conditions, as an Inspector General of an establishment under section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 5). For purposes of applying section 5 of such Act to the Inspector General, the Architect of the Capitol shall be considered the head of the establishment.

(3) INVESTIGATIONS OF COMPLAINTS OF EMPLOYEES.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—The Inspector General may receive and investigate complaints or information from an employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol concerning the possible existence of an activity constituting a violation of law, rules, or regulations, or mismanagement, gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to the public health and safety.

(B) NONDISCLOSURE.—The Inspector General shall not, after receipt of a complaint or information from an employee, disclose the identity of the employee without the consent of the employee, unless the Inspector General determines such disclosure is unavoidable during the course of the investigation.

(C) PROHIBITING RETALIATION.—An employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, take or threaten to take any action against any employee as a reprisal for making a complaint or disclosing information to the Inspector General, unless the complaint was made or the information disclosed with the knowledge that it was false or with willful disregard for its truth or falsity.

(4) INDEPENDENCE IN CARRYING OUT DUTIES.—Neither the Architect of the Capitol nor any other employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol may prevent or prohibit the Inspector General from carrying out any of the duties or responsibilities assigned to the Inspector General under this section.

(d) POWERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General may exercise the same authorities with respect to the Architect of the Capitol as an Inspector General of an establishment may exercise with respect to an establishment under section 6(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 6(a)), other than paragraphs (7) and (8) of such section.

(2) STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General may appoint and fix the pay of such personnel as the Inspector General considers appropriate. Such personnel may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, regarding appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no personnel of the Office (other than the Inspector General) may be paid at an annual rate greater than $500 less than the annual rate of pay of the Inspector General under subsection (b)(4).

(B) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Inspector General may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title.

(C) INDEPENDENCE IN APPOINTING STAFF.—No individual may carry out any of the duties or responsibilities of the Office unless the individual is appointed by the Inspector General, or provides services procured by the Inspector General, pursuant to this paragraph. Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to prohibit the Inspector General from entering into a contract or other arrangement for the provision of services under this section.

(D) APPLICABILITY OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL PERSONNEL RULES.—None of the regulations governing the appointment and pay of employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol shall apply with respect to the appointment and compensation of the personnel of the Office, except to the extent agreed to by the Inspector General. Nothing in the previous sentence may be construed to affect subparagraphs (A) through (C).

(3) EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES.—The Architect of the Capitol shall provide the Office with appropriate and adequate office space, together with such equipment, supplies, and communications facilities and services as may be necessary for the operation of the Office, and shall provide necessary maintenance services for such office space and the equipment and facilities located therein.

(e) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.—

(1) TRANSFER.—To the extent that any office or entity in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol prior to the appointment of the first Inspector General under this section carried out any of the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Inspector General under this section, the functions of such office or entity shall be transferred to the Office upon the appointment of the first Inspector General under this section.

(2) NO REDUCTION IN PAY OR BENEFITS.—The transfer of the functions of an office or entity to the Office under paragraph (1) may not result in a reduction in the pay or benefits of any employee of the office or entity, except to the extent required under subsection (d)(2)(A).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1203. FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULES.—For purposes of subchapter II of chapter 61 of title 5, United States Code, during fiscal year 2008 the Office of the Architect of the Capitol shall be treated as an agency under section 6121(1) of such title.

SEC. 1204. TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION.—(a) Section 5721 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (G) and (H) as subparagraphs (H) and (I); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following new subparagraph:

''(G) the Architect of the Capitol;''.

(b) Section 521(1)(B) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8241(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''(B) through (H)'' and inserting ''(B) through (I)''.

SEC. 1205. EASEMENTS.—(a) Subject to subsection (e), the Architect of the Capitol may grant easements upon such terms and conditions as he considers advisable (including the payment of monetary consideration) for rights-of-way over, in, and upon the grounds of the United States Capitol or the grounds of any other facility under the jurisdiction and control of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol to any person for—

(1) railroad tracks;

(2) gas, water, sewer, and oil pipe lines;

(3) substations for electric power transmission lines and pumping stations for gas, water, sewer, and oil pipe lines;

(4) canals;

(5) ditches;

(6) flumes;

(7) tunnels;

(8) roads and streets;

(9) poles and lines for the transmission or distribution of electric power;

(10) poles and lines for the transmission or distribution of communications signals (including telephone and telegraph signals) and structures and facilities for the transmission, reception, and relay of such signals; and

(11) any other purpose that the Architect considers advisable.

(b)(1) No easement granted under this section may include more land than is necessary for the easement.

(2) In lieu of, or in addition to, any monetary consideration provided in exchange for granting of an easement under this section, the Architect may accept in-kind consideration with respect to the easement for—

(A) maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvement, or restoration (including environmental restoration) of property or facilities which are subject to or affected by the easement;

(B) construction or acquisition of new facilities;

(C) provision of other property or facilities;

(D) support for facilities operation; and

(E) provision of such other services as the Architect considers appropriate.

(c)(1) There is established in the Treasury a special account for the Architect of the Capitol into which the Architect shall deposit all of the funds which are paid as consideration for the granting of easements under this section, and all other proceeds received pursuant to the granting of easements under this section.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3), amounts in the special account established under this subsection shall be available to the Architect, in such amounts provided in appropriations acts, for the following purposes:

(A) The maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvement, or restoration (including environmental restoration) of property or facilities.

(B) The construction or acquisition of new facilities.

(C) Support for facilities operation.

(3) Any amount paid as consideration for the granting of an easement, or received pursuant to the granting of an easement, which is deposited in the special account established under this subsection may not be used by the Architect for any purpose which is not related to the same property or facility over which the easement was granted unless such use is approved—

(A) in the case of an amount paid as consideration for the granting of an easement with respect to property under the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives, by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(B) in the case of an amount paid as consideration for the granting of an easement with respect to property under the jurisdiction of the Senate, by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(C) in the case of an amount paid as consideration for the granting of an easement with respect to any other property, by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Architect of the Capitol may terminate all or part of any easement granted under this section for—

(1) failure to comply with the terms and conditions under which the easement was granted;

(2) nonuse of the easement for a two-year period; or

(3) abandonment of the easement.

(e) The Architect of the Capitol may grant an easement under this section upon submission of written notice of the intent to grant the easement (including notice of the amount or type of consideration to be received in exchange for granting the easement) to, and approval of the notice by—

(1) in the case of an easement proposed to be granted with respect to property under the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives, the House Office Building Commission;

(2) in the case of an easement proposed to be granted with respect to property under the jurisdiction of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate;

(3) in the case of an easement proposed to be granted with respect to any other property, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the House Office Building Commission; and

(4) in the case of an easement proposed to be granted with respect to any other property, the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(f) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 1206. DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACTS.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Architect of the Capitol may use the two-phase selection procedures authorized in section 303M of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253m) for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work in the same manner and under the same terms and conditions as the head of an executive agency under such section.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 1207. ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—During fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol may make payments in advance for obligations of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol for subscription services if the Architect determines it to be more prompt, efficient, or economical to do so.

SEC. 1208. CASUALTY AND OTHER INSURANCE FOR EXHIBITS AND WORKS OF ART.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Architect of the Capitol may use funds made available to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol during a fiscal year to acquire insurance against the loss of or damage to any exhibit or work of art which is loaned or leased to the Architect for the United States Capitol, the Capitol Visitor Center, or the Botanic Garden.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 1209. CVC MAINTENANCE.—Any expenses for the maintenance of the Capitol Visitor Center shall be treated as expenses for the maintenance of the Capitol under the heading ''Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Building'', and shall be subject to the same financial management and reporting requirements applicable to amounts under such heading.

SEC. 1210. LEASING AUTHORITY.—(a) Section 1102(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004 (2 U.S.C. 1822(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Committee on Rules and Administration'' and inserting ''Committees on Appropriations and Rules and Administration'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the House Office Building Commission'' and inserting ''the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the House Office Building Commission''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', for space to be leased for any other entity under subsection (a).''.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004.

SEC. 1211. (a) The great hall of the Capitol Visitor Center shall be known and designated as ''Emancipation Hall'', and any reference to the hall in any law, rule, or regulation shall be deemed to be a reference to Emancipation Hall.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Library's catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, $401,000,000, of which not more than $6,000,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2008, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than $350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2008 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $6,350,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $16,451,000 shall remain available until expended for the partial acquisition of books, periodicals, newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including $40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than $12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $4,010,000 shall remain available until expended for the digital collections and educational curricula program: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $600,000 shall remain available until expended, and shall be transferred to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission for carrying out the purposes of Public Law 106–173, of which $10,000 may be used for official representation and reception expenses of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $6,500,000 shall remain available until expended for the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, $49,827,000, of which not more than $29,826,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2008 under section 708(d) of title 17, United States Code: *Provided*, That $10,000,000 shall be derived from prior year unobligated balances: *Provided further*, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under such section, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That not more than $4,398,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2008 under sections 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 803(e), 1005, and 1316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections and unobligated balances are less than $44,224,000: *Provided further*, That not more than $100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an ''International Copyright Institute'' in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for

the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than $4,250 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of chapter 8 of title 17, United States Code, any amounts made available under this heading which are attributable to royalty fees and payments received by the Copyright Office pursuant to sections 111, 119, and chapter 10 of such title may be used for the costs incurred in the administration of the Copyright Royalty Judges program, with the exception of the costs of salaries and benefits for the Copyright Royalty Judges and staff under section 802(e).

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, $104,518,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), $67,741,000, of which $20,704,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, $650,000 shall remain available until expended for telecommunications services for the blind.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1301. INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM.—Of the amounts appropriated to the Library of Congress in this Act, not more than $5,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the incentive awards program.

SEC. 1302. REIMBURSABLE AND REVOLVING FUND ACTIVITIES. (a) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2008, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed $122,529,000.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

(c) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—During fiscal year 2008, the Librarian of Congress may temporarily transfer funds appropriated in this Act, under the heading ''LIBRARY OF CONGRESS'' under the subheading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' to the revolving fund for the FEDLINK Program and the Federal Research Program established under section 103 of the Library of Congress Fiscal Operations Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–481; 2 U.S.C. 182c): *Provided*, That the total amount of such transfers may not exceed $1,900,000: *Provided further*, That the appropriate revolving fund account shall reimburse the Library for any amounts transferred to it before the period of availability of the Library appropriation expires.

SEC. 1303. AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Section 207(e) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1998 (2 U.S.C. 182(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) AUDIT.—The revolving fund shall be subject to audit by the Comptroller General at the Comptroller General's discretion.''.

SEC. 1304. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2008 for the Library of Congress may be transferred between any of the headings for which the amounts are appropriated upon the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (section 902 of title 44, United States Code); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, $87,892,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under section 906 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, $35,434,000: *Provided*, That amounts of not more than $2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 to depository and other designated libraries: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

For payment to the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund, $2,450,000 for workforce retraining and restructuring, information technology development, infrastructure, and facilities repair: *Provided*, That the Government Printing Office may make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided further*, That not more than $5,000 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings ''OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS'' and ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' may not be used for contracted security services at the GPO passport facility.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Government Accountability Office, including not more than $12,500 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with section 3324 of title 31, United States Code; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), (6), and (8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), (6), and (8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, $503,328,000: *Provided*, That not more than $5,413,000 of payments received under section 782 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for use in fiscal year 2008: *Provided further*, That not more than $2,097,000 of reimbursements received under section 9105 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for use in fiscal year 2008: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided $2,500,000 shall remain available until expended for technology assessment studies: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall

be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants: *Provided further,* That payments hereunder to the Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 1401. ANNUITY OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—(a) Section 772 of title 31, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) Title 31, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In section 735(a), by striking ''772, 775(a) and (d)'' and inserting ''or 775(b)''.

(2) In the second sentence of section 773(a), by striking ''or, if an election is made'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

(3) In section 774(b)(2), by striking ''or while receiving an annuity under section 772 of this title''.

(4) In section 775—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (a) through (d);

(B) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''sections 772 and 773'' and inserting ''section 773'', and

(ii) by striking ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)'';

(C) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subsection (c) or (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (b)''; and

(D) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''sections 772 and 773'' and inserting ''section 773'', and

(ii) by striking ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''.

(5) In section 776(d)(1), by striking ''section 775(d)'' and inserting ''section 775(b)''.

(6) In section 777(b), by striking the first sentence.

(c) The table of sections for subchapter V of chapter 7 of subtitle I of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 772.

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any individual who is appointed as Comptroller General after the date of the enactment of this Act.

OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND

For a payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund for financing activities of the Open World Leadership Center under section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), $6,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 1501. (a) TRANSFER OF OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE.—On October 1, 2008, there shall be transferred (1) to the Department of State, the Open World Leadership Center established by section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151) and all functions, personnel, assets, and obligations of the Center; and (2) to the Secretary of State, all authority of the Board of Trustees and the Library of Congress under such section 313.

(b) MAINTENANCE AS DISTINCT ENTITY.—Following the transfer under subsection (a), the Open World Leadership Center shall be maintained as a distinct entity within the Department of State and, except as otherwise provided in this section, the provisions of section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151) shall continue to apply to the Center.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of State shall consult with the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center to plan and implement the transfer required by subsection (a).

JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund established under section 116 of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1105), $430,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. MAINTENANCE AND CARE OF PRIVATE VEHICLES.—No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 202. FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION.—No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2008 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

SEC. 203. RATES OF COMPENSATION AND DESIGNATION.—Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 (46 Stat. 32 et seq.) is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided,* That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 204. CONSULTING SERVICES.—The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued under existing law.

SEC. 205. AWARDS AND SETTLEMENTS.—Such sums as may be necessary are appropriated to the account described in subsection (a) of section 415 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1415(a)) to pay awards and settlements as authorized under such subsection.

SEC. 206. COSTS OF LBFMC.—Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed $2,000.

SEC. 207. LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE.—The Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the District of Columbia, is authorized to maintain and improve the landscape features, excluding streets and sidewalks, in the irregular shaped grassy areas bounded by Washington Avenue, SW on the northeast, Second Street SW on the west, Square 582 on the south, and the beginning of the I–395 tunnel on the southeast.

SEC. 208. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

This Act may be cited as the ''Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008''.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 110–201. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. INGLIS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–201.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina:

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 light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the ''ENERGY STAR'' or ''Federal Energy Management Program'' designation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 502, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I thank the gentlelady.

I rise with the support of several Members of this amendment. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the gentlelady from California (Ms. HARMAN), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and I are offering an amendment that would require that light bulbs purchased in the Leg Branch appropriations would comply with the ENERGY STAR and Federal Energy Management Program identifications. The idea here is to save some money easily and to save a lot of energy, and of course energy is money.

Most Americans are still using, and most of the light bulbs in my house are incandescent bulbs that Thomas Edison invented more than 100 years ago. But only 10 percent of the energy of those light bulbs turns out to be light; 90 percent is wasted as heat. So we've got something better. And like many, I'm switching to CFLs. Those lights provide much more efficient lighting. And it's amazing to think that if every American just switched one incandescent bulb to an energy-efficient alternative, we would collectively save more than $8 billion in energy costs, prevent the burning of 300 billion pounds of coal, and remove 2 million cars' worth of greenhouse gas emissions from our atmosphere.

This small step in this amendment is part of something else that Mr. LIPINSKI and I are working on, which is a Bulb Replacement in Government and High Efficiency Technology, BRIGHT we call it, Energy Savings Act, along with Representative HARMAN, that would require GSA to replace burned out light bulbs with more efficient options like compact fluorescent lighting.

The BRIGHT Act has 82 cosponsors, and we look forward to its adoption. This amendment is a good step toward that goal.

Madam Chair, I am happy to yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and commend him for the role that he is playing on a bipartisan basis to assure that existing standards, the ENERGY STAR standards and the Federal Energy Management Program standards are adhered to. This effort that we're making on every appropriations bill will ensure that our practice complies with our law.

I agree with him that CFLs offer much more efficiency. There are also LEDs. And hopefully the incandescent bulb makers in America will adjust their own manufacturing so that they produce efficient light bulbs as well.

Another bill that we're all cosponsoring that's pending in the Energy Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce will provide incentives to U.S. manufacturers to produce more efficient lighting and set proper goals.

Finally, I want to say that bipartisanship has been hailed all morning. It takes 270 Members of Congress and 60 Members of the Senate and hopefully one willing President to change the light bulb policy, and I think we're proceeding that way this morning.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. I would just like to compliment the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. HARMAN. We are seeing efforts move. And we've learned already that if everyone did this across the country, we would save 65 billion kilowatts of energy, which is the equivalent of 80 coal-fired plants. Obviously this is something we want the Federal Government to do.

I compliment Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member LEWIS on the floor for allowing us to proceed without a lot of debate, knowing that we have strong support for this. I look forward to having this adopted.

Mr. WAMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. I just want to commend the authors, commend the ENERGY STAR Program. This is the kind of greening initiative that actually resonates. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Chair, we appreciate very much the committee's willingness to accept this amendment. It is a good step forward.

Mr. MICA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chair, I'm pleased to see we're doing something about this, but the Members should be aware of the procedure in the House of trying to change a light bulb. I tried to change one. It took filling out forms. This is to get an energy efficient one. Then two people appeared several days later, one with a form, one with a light bulb; an incredible waste of time, energy and taxpayer money to put in one fluorescent light bulb. I hope the procedure improves in the House.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman. I certainly hope that we can improve that procedure.

In the meantime, we're improving the bulbs, making us more energy efficient here in the Capitol, and hopefully throughout these appropriations bills in this season.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition even though I am supportive of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, very briefly, I fully support this amendment and appreciate the bipartisan cooperation that was endeavored in moving it forward.

I do want to express some concern about how the light bulbs will be adapted to the historical lighting that we have in this facility, in the Capitol complex.

I look forward to working with the sponsors of the amendment as we move this legislation through conference to ensure that that occurs.

Ms. HARMAN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. We do have language in our bill that I just described, the one pending in the Energy and Commerce Committee to exempt historical lighting from the new goals. Hopefully we can invent light bulbs for historical lighting that are more efficient too, but we're trying to be reasonable here.

In response to earlier comments by Mr. PETERSON, the goal is to help the domestic industry be able to produce efficient lighting. And the goal is also to set tough enough standards so that we save the enormous amount of energy that Mr. UPTON was just mentioning.

Mr. UPTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. We just want to be on the record for this. Working with the Parliamentarians to make sure that the amendment is germane, we were not able to use the words ''or equivalent'' when we said ''ENERGY STAR or equivalent.'' We would like to see that happen in the conference, but we know that that is legislating on an appropriation bill.

We would also like to have a provision for historical lighting. Again, that needs to happen in conference, it cannot happen on the House floor, and that's why we proceeded in that way. We look forward to working with all parties to make sure those concerns are addressed.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Reclaiming my time, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I think that, as Ms. HARMAN just pointed out and as the Chair of the committee has pointed out, there are some issues involving the aesthetics. You've got to choose the right light bulb, that's for sure. We've heard some discussion this morning about how they glow moon glow, or whatever. Well, if you pick the wrong kind, they do glow moon glow. I've got some in my garage, and it's a really freaky kind of look in there. But I've got some in the house that look yellow and nice.

So you've got to pick the right bulbs. And of course in the historical context we have to pick the right bulbs. And we do have to deal with the recycling of these. Just like we don't have a sufficient program for recycling lead batteries around, we toss those in the trash, we have a problem with the mercury in these. But we can get there. We start by saving an awful lot of money and a lot of energy.

□ 1200

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Chairman, I did not mention earlier and would like to say that the Speaker's initiative, her Green Initiative, does also address this issue of trying to move away from inefficient incandescent bulbs. One more time, our goal would be to make incandescent bulbs, as well as other bulbs, more efficient.

We are not choosing winners in this effort. But surely, everyone must understand that it takes 18 seconds to change a light bulb. This is something all of us can do quite quickly, except you have to comply with the House procedures that we just heard about.

I am very excited about the notion that we are setting an example in this House and in this Congress about more efficient lighting.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues and Mr. WAMP as we move through the conference process and commend them, as well as Speaker

PELOSI, for including the shifting from the light bulbs we use now to energy-efficient and environmentally friendly light bulbs as part of the initiative of the greening of the Capitol.

I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–201.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

In the item relating to ''Government Printing Office—Congressional Printing and Binding'', insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $3,200,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 502, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

I brought with me today a stack of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. All of us are familiar with these. We used to use them quite a bit, but today not so much. Today most of us just simply go on the computer and have a searchable version that is much faster, searchable back to 1989. With the click of a button, you can find what you are looking for. So we don't use these as much. Unfortunately, we haven't caught up with the times.

These are just a few of the thousands and thousands that are delivered that are never read. This was just from one office, the Legislative Research Center in the Cannon Building near my office. These are those that are just going to be thrown away today. One office that collects a few of these will throw these away just today.

This year alone these records will cost the American taxpayer over $25 million. Recently my office did an informal survey of about 100 offices. We went in and said, ''What do you do with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that comes?'' Virtually all of them, nearly every one of those 100 offices, said, ''We throw them away. We wish they would stop delivering them.'' We had some offices say that they had requested that they stop being delivered. They are still delivered.

So they stack up. They are thrown away. They fill up landfills. I believe the figure is something like 57 tons of paper each year are thrown away just here.

Before the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was put on line, as I mentioned, they were useful, but they are not now. We obviously do have to have some paper copies. We simply don't need so many.

Our amendment would simply do this, and I should add, this amendment was offered by myself and Mr. BLUMENAUER 2 years ago and was accepted by the then majority. It was simply taken out in the conference. I think we would do well to accept it again today.

This amendment would simply save $3.2 million annually by instructing the Government Printing Office to print only half as many copies. Today only 5,600 are printed. Half would do us just fine. That amendment would not reduce the funding for preparation, data collection or other aspects of the RECORD. It would simply reduce the ink-and-paper copies for half of what we print. So those who might oppose this amendment might say that it is going to cut deep and cut personal and others. It won't as long as fewer records are printed. The costs will go down.

This is simply a good way to save taxpayer money. It will show the country that we are interested ourselves in cleaning up our own house, making sure that we move ahead in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. WAMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman.

You know, when we were in the majority, we supported and accepted this approach. I believe this is part, or should be part, of the Speaker's Green the Capitol Initiative. This is a lot of trees. It is a space efficiency issue. They are storing all this paper. It is a government efficiency issue.

Why don't we, Madam Chair, just accept this amendment, as we have in previous years, address this issue in conference, move right along and get Members on their way this afternoon?

I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. I certainly support it.

Mr. FLAKE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment for a number of reasons.

While I support the gentleman, who is from the same generation that I am, in his endeavor to make sure that we can communicate and receive information in an electronic format, the approach that the gentleman is taking is absolutely inappropriate and won't accomplish his goal.

We have crafted a tight and fiscally responsible bill. As I outlined in general debate, we have held the bill to a 4.1 percent increase. We actually held it to $276 million below the total request.

In their traditional views, the minority agreed. They said that, on balance, the funding provided in this bill to operate the legislative branch agencies is fiscally responsible. This amendment would add to existing shortfalls. It would add to what is already a growing funding shortfall in this account.

To be fiscally responsible, we have had to make some tough choices, including funding levels for GPO. The bill already, our colleagues should know, holds congressional printing and binding $62,000 below what was provided in fiscal year 2007. GPO is expecting an $8 million shortfall in this account in fiscal year 2007 in addition to a $3 million shortfall in fiscal year 2006. These shortfalls are due to the flat funding provided to this account since fiscal year 2007, in spite of increasing costs and workloads. These shortfalls will continue in fiscal year 2008. Eventually they are going to have to be paid.

This amendment would make that situation even worse. Most of the appropriation for congressional printing and binding goes towards Congress' printing requirements. I want to point out that the gentleman is incorrect when he states that there is a statute. While there is a statutory number in the Code that the GPO is told to print, they only print the number that is requisitioned. In other words, they only print, on a daily basis, the number that they are asked for. We have a deficit in the account that allows them to print the number that is asked for. GPO has no control over those requirements. It's required by law to produce the information.

If the gentleman is concerned about the number of printed materials being produced, he should take it up with the authorizing committee, the Joint Committee on Printing, and seek reductions in the amount of material that GPO is required to print in the Code.

Simply gratuitously cutting out and leaving people with the impression that we are doing something, when we are not, and all we are doing here is cutting $3.2 million when GPO will still be required to print the Code, is the wrong approach. The suggestion that this amendment was accepted previously but then cut out in conference also leads people to believe that we have done something when we have not.

I refuse to be disingenuous when it comes to being forthright with the American people. We do need to make sure that in the future the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is produced electronically. This is not the right way to do it. It is irresponsible. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. May I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman controls 1½ minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Before yielding 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon, let me point out, here is the Code. The Code states that we are supposed to print 30,000 a day, yet we only print 5,600. So, it is not the case that the GPO has to follow what the statute says. They are

required to do by demand. And they already do under; they can simply do less and save a lot of money.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the opportunity to join with my colleague again in this effort to try and reduce this output. I respect my friend, the chairwoman of the subcommittee, but I do think it is time for us to take a more aggressive action to reduce what is a gratuitous waste of resources and is a signal, I think, for us all to find ways to be able to deal with the electronic era.

This is a holdover. We have attempted in the past to be able to scale it down. I have also checked with legislative counsel to find out what we need to repeal. But I have been told that simply by enacting our amendment today, we will, in fact, achieve that objective in terms of reducing the number of unnecessary printed copies.

□ 1215

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I just want to point out that the amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE does not say anything about reducing the number of copies printed of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It simply cuts $3.2 million out of the Congressional Printing and Binding account. It provides no direction. It simply cuts that funding. There is no assumption that any of what the gentleman is suggesting would occur. It would simply further add to the deficit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Will the gentlelady yield, since I am out of time?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I believe the gentleman has his own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. How much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman controls 1½ minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you. I appreciate the courtesy.

Let me point out, just as with any program that is not an entitlement, everything is subject to appropriation. The Government Printing Office is not bound, no pun intended, to print as many copies as they think they need. They can print as many as they have money for. We were very careful in taking $3.2 million, to take only the printing costs for half of the number that are printed already. I think that is reasonable.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I really believe that we should approach this in the appropriate way. If we want to change the statute and go to electronic production of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that is what we should do. We should not simply hamstring the GPO by requiring them to print a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and not ensuring they have adequate funds to do that, when they are already in a deficit situation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple: by instructing the Government Printing Office (GPO) to print half the number of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS daily, we will save $3.2 million in taxpayer dollars and 57 tons of paper annually.

An unofficial survey of House offices revealed that many swiftly discard their daily copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And why shouldn't they? The full, easily searchable text of the RECORD is available online back to the year 1989. As electronic viewing of this resource becomes more widespread, we must continue to adjust the number of printed copies accordingly. In fact, since 1995 we have reduced the number of daily printed CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS from 18,000 to 5,600 per day.

We have an opportunity to save millions of dollars by taking advantage of paperless technology and pushing House operations into the 21st Century. I commend Speaker PELOSI in her recent effort to "Green the Capitol" and this is a common-sense amendment that is consistent with that initiative.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110–201.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION.—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 4 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 502, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the Chair.

I want to thank the Chair of the committee and the ranking member for their good work and the committee's work. I know for the Chair in particular, I want to congratulate her on the first bill coming through her subcommittee, a very important subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. So I appreciate the fine work done there and the oversight of the visitors center. The passion with which the ranking member spoke about Emancipation Hall I thought was right on target. So I appreciate the work done.

This amendment, just like the amendment I offered last night to the Foreign Operations bill, simply says this: instead of increasing spending by 4 percent, let's hold the line. I articulated reasons last night in the long debate that this body had over why that is appropriate, why that makes sense. Because there is in fact a crisis looming for this country if we don't get control of the spending here in the United States Congress, in the United States Senate and the United States Government.

It is important that we recognize that. I articulated last night too, don't take my word for it. Yesterday's Washington Post talked about this growing problem that is coming in the very near future, and it is important we understand that.

I won't go through all the arguments again here, because I know we have had a long debate and people want to get on their way and get back to their district.

I will just say this: ever-increasing spending inevitably leads to ever-increasing taxes. The American families, the American people are overtaxed because our government spends too much. It has been a problem for both parties. We need to get it under control.

Millions of families, millions of families across this country are going to live on last year's budget. It is not too much to ask the United States Government, in particular the United States Congress, to do the same.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, this is a fiscally responsible bill. Again, we have held the bill to a 4.1 percent increase, only $122 million over actual spending in fiscal year 2007, and if you take into consideration the $50 million rescission in the CR, we are at a 2.3 percent increase. That is $276 million below the total budget request.

Again, I want to point to the minority views, where the minority agreed this bill is fiscally responsible. They say, "On balance, the funding provided in this bill to operate the legislative branch agencies is fiscally responsible."

This bill funds the must-have's, not the nice-to-have's, by targeting increases towards keeping the agencies running, providing Congress with the tools it needs to perform its oversight responsibility, and funding critical security and life safety projects.

The amendment, if adopted, would eliminate $50 million worth of critical health and safety and security projects that we would be unable to fund if a 4 percent across-the-board reduction were adopted.

This amendment would eliminate funding for things like the $5 million we have in this bill to ensure that the Capitol Police have interoperable radios. According to the new police chief, a new radio system is their number one priority. The existing radio system is 20 years old. It is antiquated and outdated. It is not encrypted nor secure, and it is not interoperable. Hurricane Katrina showed the importance of interoperable communications during a crisis.

It also would eliminate funding potentially monitoring the utility tunnel abatement. We had tunnel workers who were subjected to horrendous conditions and have been exposed to asbestos, and we are endeavoring to make sure that we can make up for that and provide the funding for the abatement. That would be impossible if this amendment were adopted.

We provide $1.2 million for escape hoods for our Library visitors, $1 million for emergency exit signs and lighting in the capital, and emergency lighting upgrades in Rayburn.

The amendment would also impair our agency's work. It would put the legislative branch agencies back to a fiscal year 2006 funding level since there was no increase in 2007.

In practical terms, the impact of this would be less capability on the part of GAO to assist Congress in its oversight responsibilities; fewer and less timely products from CRS to assist Members in their legislative duties, a further reduction in CBO's ability to score Member bills, which was pointed out in the Rules Committee as already being a problem; elimination of the digital talking book conversion program for the blind; a reduced ability for the Office of Compliance to pursue health safety issues around the Capitol complex, even as we get ready to add new space with the approaching opening of the CVC; the Architect's operations would be strained to keep up with increases in utility costs; and, finally, since 77 percent of this bill is labor costs, as is most of the increase, this amendment would surely result in a reduction in our workforce.

It is irresponsible. Mr. WAMP and I have endeavored to put forward a bill that is fiscally responsible, fiscally tight, and ensures the life, safety and security needs of the people who work and visit here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. WAMP. I wasn't going to say anything, but I just want to say that because we have not accepted commonsense amendments like the previous amendment, and because the Rules Committee only granted three amendments in order, we are losing a lot of support for this bill on this side of the aisle unnecessarily because I do think we worked hard to make it fiscally responsible. But they are making a strong case, and we have closed the process down instead of opening it up.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank him for his outstanding leadership on the issue of fiscal responsibility, coming to the floor and offering this series of amendments.

I do want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member. Certainly relative to many other appropriations bills that we have seen and will see on this floor, relatively speaking, this is a more fiscally responsible bill.

But we can never forget that this is not our money; this is the people's money. And every time we are increasing some aspect of the Federal budget, we are taking it away from some family budget. We are taking it away from some family that had a dream of having a down payment on their first home. We are taking it away from some family who was putting that money away for college tuition for one of their children.

So contrary to the debate we hear and the rhetoric about cuts, what this amendment does is say, you know, let's lead by example. In the big scheme of the Federal budget, I know this isn't a huge amount of money. But when you think about having to save us from the single largest tax increase in history that the Democrat majority put in their last budget, shouldn't we lead by example? Is this apocalyptic vision that we hear, is this going to happen if we give the legislative branch the same money they had last year? Somehow there are families all across America who are having to make do on the same income they had last year.

Now, again, relative to other bills, this is more fiscally responsible. But it comes down to a simple choice: Do you want to put us on the path for the largest single tax increase in American history that would impose $3,000 of additional tax burden on American families, or do you want to put us on the path of fiscal responsibility? We should support the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman controls 2 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio controls 1 minute.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would ask that he speak for 1 minute and then we will close in opposition.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I will be brief and just point out this: we heard some of the terrible things that are going to happen if we keep the spending at the same level we had last year.

The American people need to understand this, Madam Chair: $3.1 billion is what this bill spends. My amendment would say $3 billion, $3 billion to run the United States Congress. You ask American families that, they would probably say, you know, that is probably enough. They can probably get by on $3 billion versus $3.1 billion. That is all this does. As the gentleman from Texas pointed out, in the course of the appropriation bills we have been dealing with, this is fairly fiscally responsible. But $3 billion is enough to run the United States Congress.

That is all this amendment would do, keep us where we are right now. Things are working fine now. Why can't we do that in the future?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the former ranking member of this subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank the Chair, and I particularly want to congratulate Chairman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, because she took on a very difficult responsibility and she has performed in a conscientious, extraordinarily fiscally responsible manner.

This is a bill that all of the Members have an interest in, and all of the Members have issues within this bill that they would particularly like to see increased, and some decreased. But it is a difficult one.

She has told me how much she appreciates the ranking member, Mr. WAMP, and I hope Mr. WAMP is listening, how much she appreciates Mr. WAMP's cooperation in coming up with a bill that was acceptable to the overwhelming number of the full Appropriations Committee members when they reported it out to the floor.

Now, this bill is $276 million below the President's request. That is extraordinary, and it is the first time that the Legislative Branch appropriations bill has reflected that deep a cut versus the President's request. So if you are looking for fiscal responsibility, you will find it in this bill, more than any other appropriations bill. We congratulate Mr. WAMP, as well as the chairwoman, for coming up with a bill that accomplishes that kind of fiscal responsibility.

But if anybody else wants to cut another $100 million, which this amendment would do, below that, then it is concomitant upon the proponent of that amendment to say exactly where you would make those cuts. Because this is the result of a lot of give and take, a lot of compromise, a lot of very conscientious investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 191, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

AYES—218

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Stearns
Taylor
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hare
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—28

Baker
Bonner
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fortuño
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Wicker

□ 1251

Messrs. BAIRD, CHANDLER, MEEHAN, MEEK of Florida, CARNAHAN and RUSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. EHLERS, CRENSHAW, MAHONEY of Florida, LATOURETTE, ELLSWORTH, Ms. HARMAN and Mr. PORTER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 545. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to the Flake of Arizona amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 231, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

AYES—177

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Mitchell
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOES—231

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

NOT VOTING—29

Baker
Bonner
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fortuño
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Pryce (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Wicker

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Two minutes left in this vote.

□ 1259

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 546. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to the Jordan of Ohio Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Ms. BALDWIN, 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. 2771) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 502, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1300

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KINGSTON. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kingston moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2771, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 16, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $16,000,000)''.

On page 16, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $16,000,000)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I offer this amendment to bring something to the Members' attention that I think is very important.

We are about to create a fourth building for the House of Representatives. We have Cannon, we have Rayburn, we have Longworth. We are about to put on another 200,000-square-foot building. I think you should know about it, and I think we deserve a vote on it.

Number one, this is an earmark. Now, we have been talking weeks and weeks and months and months about transparency and ending earmarks. Yet if you will look in the report on page 20, there is a $16 million earmark for a new House office building. There is no explanation of the project, no total cost, there have been no hearings and no oversight, and it is not in the Democrat budget. It was not requested by the Architect of the Capitol, and, yet, it's in the bill.

Now, looks like a duck, walks like a duck, could be an earmark. That's where we are on this.

Number two, I think Members have the right to vote on a fourth office building. As former chair of this committee, one of the big frustrations I have about the Capitol Visitors Center is none of us owned the project. There wasn't one person that you could say it's his or her fault. It was all diluted and by committee. We never had a vote on it.

Indeed, when I was a chairman of this committee, a staffer put in $18 million to renovate the House floor, which none of us knew about. I took the money out of it, as did Chairman LEWIS last year.

But things get stuck in the bills that we don't know about that we deserve a vote on. This gives you an opportunity, unlike the CVC, which started out as a $260 million project, with partial private funding, and now is up to $600 million.

This motion to recommit gives you the opportunity to vote on something and say no to something that has already cost this House $140 million. This is a 200,000-square-foot building. That's the size of 15 House floors. It's the size of four White Houses. It's five football fields big. This isn't incidental swing space.

What is this needed for? In case we renovate the Cannon House Office Building. Now, don't you want to vote on that? I haven't had a debate on renovating the Cannon Office Building, but I want to know about it. This is a big building of substance, and you deserve a vote.

Incidentally, this isn't going to be the only new building. We are adding 580,000 square feet in the form of the Capitol Visitors Center.

This building is huge. To move forward, it's going to cost us not the $16 million that's in the bill, but actually $56 million, and then another $12 million to lease it, plus $18 million for furniture for it.

Think about it. How many times have we heard from some Members in a rather preachy fashion, we need to control our carbon footprints? Ladies and gentlemen, all of those of you who want to reduce our carbon footprint, here is your opportunity. Say ''no'' to a 200,000-square-foot boondoggle which we are about to put in.

This has not had the proper oversight, it has not had the proper hearings. The contracts have all been verbal. That's why we are all in the situation.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I want to point out and remind my colleagues that Mr. WAMP and I are proud to report to you that we have brought the legislative branch appropriations bill in at $276 million below the request. The easiest thing in the world to do is jump on the table and to cry waste.

I want to also point out that this is a security upgrade, funding for security upgrades requested by former Speaker HASTERT and continued by Speaker PELOSI so that we can ensure that we provide swing space for our very cramped space so that we can properly renovate the Cannon and Longworth House Office Buildings.

I ask my colleagues to come over and look at these pictures of the deterioration of our facilities. These are pictures of the 100-year-old Cannon House Office Building. If you take a look at the deterioration and life, safety and security upgrades that this facility needs, we can no longer wait to make these upgrades, and to make sure that we can protect the people who work here and the people who visit us. They are deteriorating and badly in need of renovation.

What the gentleman from Georgia's motion to recommit would do is delay for years, if not make it impossible, for us to begin renovation and repairs on our aging House facilities.

My colleagues, this committee does not deal with the sexiest of subjects that confront us every day, and I have only been here for 2 years and the chair of this subcommittee for the last 5 months. You don't earn a reputation as an institutionalist in that short period of time, but it is my hope to be able to do that over time.

We are stewards of this great institution, but we are also stewards just as much of these facilities. My colleague on the Appropriations Committee, JOSÉ SERRANO of New York, recently made a wonderful suggestion to remind us of the history embedded even in what may seem mundane, the space we occupy each day. He suggested that we each have plaques in our offices with the names of our predecessors in Congress who occupied that space before us. My own office, I was thrilled to learn, was once occupied by former Congressman Lyndon Johnson.

My point is they may seem like buildings and office space to the outside world, but we know better. How many of us countless times have found ourselves approaching this beautiful building we are now in and marveling privately to ourselves, wow, I work here, what an incredible privilege.

But with privilege comes responsibility. We must think about the institution, but we must also think about our hard-working staff. The number of hours they toil in these facilities is mind-boggling. You might be surprised to learn that the average work space for each of our staff is about 36 square feet. And I want to show you what 36 square feet is. This is 36 square feet. That is how much space that we allot, on average, to our employees.

GSA recommends an average of 100 square feet of space per employee. We need to renovate so that we can make sure we are not cramming our staff into unreasonable boxes for hours on end. Our staff make incredible sacrifices to serve the public, our constituents, and they help us do our job. We must make sure that we keep these facilities, the place they work every day and night, safe for them. We must make sure we keep these facilities safe and in good condition for our constituents and our successors.

Mr. KINGSTON's amendment is well-meaning, but it is not responsible, and it is not an eye toward the future with respect for our past. I strongly urge you to vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. It was my understanding you indicated this is the initiative of Speaker HASTERT; am I accurate?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes, it is. It is an initiative from former Speaker HASTERT.

I strongly urge you to vote against the motion to recommit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 217, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

AYES—181

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

NOES—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Campbell (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords

Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—34

Akin
Baker
Berman
Bonner
Boyd (FL)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Everett
Fossella
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
McGovern
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Pryce (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Wicker

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on this vote.

Members are advised that this vote will close precisely when time has expired.

□ 1326

Mr. McDERMOTT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FOSSELLA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 547, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 547. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on the motion to recommit on H.R. 2771, Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 176, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—216

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

NAYS—176

Aderholt
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Holden
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—40

Akin
Baker
Berman
Bonner
Boyd (FL)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carter
Castor
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Doggett
Doyle
Emerson
Everett
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hulshof
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
LaHood
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
McGovern
Meehan
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Pryce (OH)
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Tancredo
Waxman
Wicker

□ 1332

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2007, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 548. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on passage H.R. 2771, Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY 2008.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, on June 22, 2007, I was unable to be present for all rollcall votes due to an unexpected delay. If present, I would have voted accordingly on the following rollcall votes: roll No. 543—"nay"; roll No. 544—"nay"; roll No. 545—"aye"; roll No. 546—"aye"; roll No. 547—"aye"; roll No. 548—"nay".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall votes 547 and 548.

Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have cast the following votes on H.R. 2771: to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for the Legislative Branch. Madam Speaker, had I been present for the motion to recommit with instructions, roll No. 547, I would have voted "no." On passage roll No. 548, I would have voted "yes".

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2764, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008; AND H.R. 2771, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2764 and H.R. 2771, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section number and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 2829, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–207) on the bill (H.R. 2829) making appropriations for financial services and general government 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.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend the majority leader for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

On Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour business and at 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes rolled until 6 p.m.

I want to reiterate that, as we did the other day. It will be 6 p.m. I would hope that the offices that are covering the floor, that they remind their Members 6 p.m. on Monday will be the votes. The congressional baseball game is at 7:30, and we want to give Members time to get to the game. It is a fun event and a collegial event, and we are going to accommodate that by accelerating by half an hour the votes on Monday at 6 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of those bills will be announced later today.

On Tuesday the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour business and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m., and on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m. We will consider the following fiscal year 2008 appropriations bills: Interior and Environment; Financial Services.

I will say to my friends that those two bills will be considered, and we will obviously, consistent, hopefully, with our agreement, try to enter into unanimous consent agreements in terms of the amendments and the timing of those amendments. And we will see how the balance of the schedule goes Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for that information.

And from the fact that you said we will see how the week goes Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, I think that anticipates that at least there is a chance that with the State-Justice-Commerce bill's not being next week, we may be able to be done on Thursday, and the Members can start their work period on Friday. Would that be one of the options that would be a possibility at least?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

The answer to that is yes. Again, we are going to complete those two bills at least. There may be some other legislative business. We don't know whether there will be conference reports. As you know, there is a conference on the 9/11 bill and some other conference reports on other items that may come forward. But the answer to your question, I think, is essentially yes. If we can complete the work that we have before us prior to Friday, there may not be a need to meet on Friday.

Mr. BLUNT. Reclaiming my time, a couple of other thoughts. I thank you for that information.

On the conference reports that are upcoming, the 9/11 conference report is there.

Mr. HOYER. Lobbying disclosure is the other.

Mr. BLUNT. I was going to ask about lobbying reform, if you thought there was a chance for that. Water Resources or the competitive science bills, do you have a report on where those might be?

Mr. HOYER. I really don't. But because I don't have a report, my speculation is that there is not anticipation that those conferences will be completed in time to consider conference reports next week. We don't have any report on that.

I am looking at the person who knows so much on my staff, Mr. Cogorno, to make sure that I am making a correct representation, but that is accurate.

Mr. BLUNT. I would also ask, I believe we announced last week, Madam Speaker, we thought that we were going to have the Science-State-Justice-Commerce bill up next week, and now we are not. Is there any particular reason for that that you can share with me on that?

I yield for a response.

Mr. HOYER. Yes, there is. We had a lot of discussion about this. As Mr. OBEY has represented, because of the reforms that have been adopted and the transparency that we want to effect, but also the certification that is necessary for the legitimacy of projects, the time frame necessary to do the State-Justice-Commerce was more than could be accomplished within the time frame that the staff had available. As you know, they had to deal with the Interior and the Financial Services as well. Science-State-Justice-Commerce was such that they simply could not get it done in time. Regrettably, therefore, it, too, as the other four bills, one of which was already scheduled for July, the defense appropriations bill, had to be moved to July.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for that. And I do believe that the protracted discussion we had and the agreement we made on transparency on these bills is a good thing.

Next week's being a week where we will be leaving for a district work period, we won't have a chance for this colloquy, and I am wondering if you have any sense yet of where we will be the week we come back after the Independence Day break. Should we anticipate any appropriations bills that week or do you have other work that we might get to that week?

And I would yield.

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

It is our expectation that the first week back, which will be the week of July 9, I believe, Tuesday, the 10th, at 6:30 p.m., we will not have appropriation bills that week. There will be legislation that week, and we will give notice of that next week so that one can anticipate it for the week that we come back from the July break. But we do not expect appropriation bills to start until the following week, the week of July 16.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that. And I appreciate also that generally that is the way that it usually works out on a week where we are coming back from being in our districts the week before.

Last week you said that we should anticipate an announcement on an omnibus energy bill by the Fourth of July recess. I am wondering if you have any more information on that.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Yes. What I said was it is my expectation that at the end of next

week, there will be an announcement. The Speaker has made it very clear that this is a priority, energy independence, and addressing the issue of global warming is a priority item for our caucus and, therefore, for the Congress, and that we will be addressing what we intend to do in July prior to leaving here for the July break.

Mr. BLUNT. And would that also include a sense of when that bill would actually be on the floor when we make that announcement prior to the Fourth of July break?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't know that it will be specific, but certainly it is our hope and belief that it will be the month of July.

Mr. BLUNT. And what I believe would be my last question is on the related Ways and Means energy tax bill that I believe in that committee has about $16 billion of tax increases in it as part of the energy package. Would that come up earlier than the rest of the energy package, or do you expect that to be on the floor at essentially the same time?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. That decision has not been made, but my thought would be it would come up in close proximity, whether before, just after, but it would be considered in very close time frame to the consideration of the other pieces of the energy legislation.

Mr. BLUNT. And I believe the gentleman said that you really don't have a sense whether these bills would be on the floor in July or not, and if they are not on the floor in July, then we would look at sometime later in the year; is that correct?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. No. As I said, it is my expectation that we will have these bills on the floor in July.

And if I can, it has been somewhat complicated, as you can understand, by the fact that we now have four appropriation bills that we anticipated in June now scheduled for July. So to that degree, I want to be somewhat careful about what I represent, because we are still in the process of determining the scheduling of all of those bills.

Mr. BLUNT. That was not a question designed to go back and try to in any way create a problem. I think I did not hear what you said properly the first time.

Mr. HOYER. July is the expectation.

Mr. BLUNT. That is helpful to me, and I appreciate the information.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE HON. WESLEY E. BROWN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and give recognition to the life and continued service of the honorable Wesley E. Brown, United States District Court judge for the District of Kansas.

Since Judge Brown's appointment to the Federal bench by President John F. Kennedy in 1962, Judge Brown has served his beloved State of Kansas and this Nation with great distinction. And after 45 years of service on the bench, Judge Brown continues to serve as a senior judge, coming in each morning and carrying a full caseload. In fact, the Federal courthouse in Wichita could not manage its caseload without Judge Brown's service and his commitment.

Prior to his judicial appointment by President Kennedy, Judge Brown managed to work his way through law school by taking classes at night in Kansas City while working during the day assembling model A cars for the Ford Motor Company. After losing his job at Ford during the Great Depression, he served as Reno County Attorney in Kansas and later enlisted in the United States Navy to serve in World War II as a lieutenant, stationed at Commander Philippines Sea Frontier.

Today I have the honor of introducing a House resolution which not only recognizes Judge Brown's distinguished service to our Nation as the longest-serving Federal judge in Kansas, but also celebrates his 100th birthday today.

Judge Brown, your State of Kansas and this Nation wishes you a very happy birthday today and thanks you for your continuing service.

□ 1345

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLESTON'S FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects, and I know the respects of all others in this House, to the nine Charleston, South Carolina, firefighters who lost their lives this week while fearlessly and courageously discharging their duties, and offer my condolences to the families and friends who lost loved ones in this great tragedy: Captain Billy Hutchinson, Captain Mike Benke, Captain Louis Mulkey, engineer Mark Kelsey, assistant engineer Brad Beaity, assistant engineer Michael French, firefighter James Drayton, firefighter Brandon Thomas and firefighter Melven Champaign. They made a commitment to one of our Nation's highest callings, a calling to service in the face of great danger, and a call to honor a tradition of heroes.

These fallen firefighters, Mr. Speaker, represented more than 100 years of service to the people they swore an oath to protect. And the dedication with which they lived their lives is something our Nation will not soon forget.

John Kennedy once said: ''The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment, but it is no less a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must, in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures, and that is the basis of all morality,'' Kennedy concluded.

In their final moment, Mr. Speaker, these nine men taught us what true morality is really all about, a love and heartfelt concern for one's neighbors that provides the strength to rush into the breach while others are rushing from it, and a sense of responsibility that will not allow a man to stand idly at times when his help is most needed.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the thoughts and prayers of a grateful Nation are with the families and friends of these nine courageous men, firefighters, heroes. May their legacy of valor, gallantry, and service be something that lives on in our country forever.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE WESTERN BALKANS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERMAN) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice

to the *Federal Register* for publication stating that the Western Balkans emergency is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2007. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on June 23, 2006, 71 FR 36183.

The crisis constituted by the actions of persons engaged in, or assisting, sponsoring, or supporting (i) extremist violence in the Republic of Macedonia and elsewhere in the Western Balkans region, or (ii) acts obstructing implementation of the Dayton Accords in Bosnia or United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999, in Kosovo, that led to the declaration of a national emergency on June 26, 2001, in Executive Order 13219 and to amendment of that order in Executive Order 13304 of May 28, 2003, has not been resolved. The acts of extremist violence and obstructionist activity outlined in Executive Order 13219, as amended, are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the Western Balkans and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE *June 22, 2007*.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4303, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University:

Ms. WOOLSEY, California
Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland
Mr. KLINE, Minnesota
Mr. WICKER, Mississippi

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DEDICATION OF VILLAGE HOMES OF WAYZATA, MINNESOTA

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a special day in our community of Minnesota. Tomorrow is the day we welcome four very special new families to our community. Tomorrow is the day we dedicate and cut the ribbon at Wayzata Village Homes, an affordable housing complex built by Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity.

As we dedicate these beautiful new homes and welcome our new neighbors, I'm feeling deeply grateful to live in a community of compassionate, caring and committed people, people who care deeply about people suffering the ravages of poverty, homelessness and hunger, people who reach out to meet the housing needs of people in need, people like John and Nancy Berg.

John and Nancy Berg started a family foundation several years ago to meet the affordable housing needs in our community and have contributed so generously time after time after time. People like Steve and Geri Bloomer, who donated the land for Wayzata Village Homes. People like Wayzata Mayor Andrew Humphrey, the members of the Wayzata City Council and the Wayzata Housing Authority, all of whom have a progressive, enlightened and generous approach to expanding access to affordable housing.

I am also deeply grateful to all the sponsors, donors and other partners, as well as LaDonna Hoy, Jill Kohler and Kim Vohs, and all the staff and volunteers at Interfaith Outreach and Community Partners. Interfaith Outreach and Community Partners is truly the conscience of our community. I am also deeply grateful to Sue Haig, Tony Beckstrom, and all of those with Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity. Habitat is truly the conscience of our entire Nation in meeting the huge need for affordable housing in our country.

In 1961, on the steps right here at the Capitol, in his celebrated inaugural address, President John F. Kennedy said: ''Here on Earth, God's work must truly be our own.'' In Wayzata, each of these wonderful people answered President Kennedy's call. They helped make Wayzata Village Homes a reality. They answered our community's call. And tomorrow we will celebrate this great affordable-housing success story.

Tomorrow, we will celebrate four new families in our community and extend a special welcome to the proud new residents of Village Homes.

Nobody will give a more special welcome than Rachel Poss. Rachel is a fifth grader at Birchview School in Plymouth. Rachel certainly touched my heart this week with her community service project, which was written up in the Minneapolis Star Tribune, of providing baskets of household items to the new families of Village Homes.

Thank you, Rachel, and to all who made this Habitat project a reality. You showed us what public service is all about.

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

(Mr. HOYER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRATULATING THE MILLERS ON 50 YEARS OF MARRIAGE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mr. Tom and Mrs. Lois Miller on the occasion of their 50th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, the institution of marriage is one of the most sacred and effective traditions in civilized society which organizes, holds together and perpetuates continuation of civilized humanity. And to many it is both a civil and religious act. And whereas Tom and Lois Miller have shared 50 years of holy matrimony, I am pleased to pause and wish them well.

Tom and Lois met in McCool, Mississippi, while teenagers and were married after coming to Chicago by Reverend Daniel A. Williams on January 14, 1957. Tom worked at CELO Steel, and later went to the R.C. Cola company, where he retired after a long, satisfying and productive career.

Lois pursued a career in cosmetology, became one of the best in her field, and subsequently owned her own business, the L & L Beauty Salon, which has been in existence for 47 years.

Mr. Speaker, Tom and Lois Miller became and still are pillars of their community. They've raised four daughters, have four grandchildren and two great grandchildren. Ever since their marriage they have been rocks of the Greater Zion Missionary Baptist Church, where they have both displayed tremendous leadership, with Tom Miller becoming chairman of the deacon board.

They were founding members of the 4,500 West Congress Block Club in Chicago and have been active in many other civic and social endeavors, and for the past 10 years have lived in Westchester, Illinois, where they have immersed themselves in community life.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years is a long time. And when you can spend those 50 years in a state of peace, happiness and productive engagement, you have been

truly blessed. And just as you have been blessed, you have also blessed others. I've been told that ''to those to whom much is given, much is expected in return.''

The Millers have been fortunate to have a great family, great children, great grandchildren, friends and relatives. Their children, grandchildren, other relatives and friends have been fortunate to have the Millers in their lives. And I wish all of them a great day as they gather for a tremendous celebration on Sunday.

And so I close my comments, Mr. Speaker, with congratulations to Tom and Lois Miller, wish them well and trust that they will have many more years of happy and blissful marriage and that this relationship will continue until the end of time.

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1400

EDUCATION

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to bring information before this body about the current status of education in our Nation.

I had the distinct pleasure of speaking before the Committee on Education recently during Members Day regarding No Child Left Behind, NCLB, and its reauthorization. But I felt compelled to come to the floor as well to join with my other colleagues and reiterate my concern with the current state of education in this country and what I hope to see come out of this year's reauthorization.

Now, I share with all my colleagues here in Congress the ultimate goal of providing a high-quality education for every child in America.

Surely, we can do better than what has been done so far. What, then, should we do? I have looked at past reauthorizations of ESEA, and I noticed a troubling trend. With every reauthorization, now problems are identified with American schools. With every reauthorization, the solution proposed by Congress is for the Federal Government to become more involved with education.

So, with this reauthorization before us, I have to ask, what has this interference wrought? Back in 1983, a famous report entitled ''A Nation At Risk'' said that America had fallen dangerously behind the rest of the world in education. Today new studies say many of the exact same things.

According to the National Center For Education statistics, for example, in 2003, U.S. fourth graders were outperformed by their peers in 11 countries, including four Asian countries and seven European countries. U.S. eighth graders were outperformed by their peers in nine countries. Yet, as a percentage of GDP, we spend more money now on education than at any time in our Nation's history. In fact, we spend more in the United States on K through 12 education than the Philippines, Saudi Arabia or Sweden spend on everything in their countries.

Our problem is this: We have increased Federal paperwork which requires increased taxpayer dollars to pay for increased administrative staff. But we have decreased teacher flexibility. We have decreased accountability to parents and decreased student performance.

So for this year's reauthorization, I am proposing something different. Very soon, I will be dropping in legislation that will allow a State to in essence opt out of the majority of the requirements of NCLB, but at the same time, allow those taxpayers in the States to keep their education funding through what we call a refundable tax credit.

I understand this is very different than what some other Members were proposing. But I feel that only by allowing the States and local governments to bear the burden of education accountability, accountability on that level, will we ever, as a Nation, make the progress that we need to make in the classroom so that we can stay competitive in the twenty-first century.

I recently held a town hall meeting back in my district about No Child Left Behind. Every person in that room had something negative to say about the administrative requirements in the program in general. At one point in the meeting, I asked how many people there had contacted and met with a local teacher or principal or school board member regarding their problems? Nearly everyone in the room raised their hand.

I then asked the question, how many of the people in the room here met with somebody in the State capital or in the New Jersey Department of Education about their concerns? About half the people raised their hands. I then asked, well, how many of you have had contact with someone from the U.S. Department of Education in Washington? Only one person raised their hand.

My point is this: By transferring the requirements for NCLB in Washington, we are moving the accountability for education further away from the parents, the teachers, the school boards, to where it belongs. It belongs close to the parents, the students and the educators in the local school boards.

In addition, the reporting requirements under NCLB have created basically a confusing system, a system that ends up punishing our best schools. One of the high schools in my district is consistently cited in publications in the State as one of the top-performing schools in my State. This very same school was placed on an early warning list 2 years after NCLB was instituted.

This was not an underperforming school. Every year, nearly 100 percent of the kids graduate and they attend college. The average combined SAT score for the students in that school was around 1,100. Fourteen AP courses and tests were offered and so on. So it is a great school. And, yes, it is on the warning list.

So I worry that while trying to meet the requirements of NCLB, students attending this high school will actually be held back by burdensome regulations rather than pushed to excel at already high standards that the school had previously set for them.

I am certain there are many other schools in my counties in my district in my State and across the country, which is why we need a change to NCLB.

CALLING FOR A TIMETABLE TO REDEPLOY FROM IRAQ

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

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, a little over 5 years ago I was on the ground in Afghanistan and then returned with an Aircraft Carrier Battle Group. I then took that Aircraft Carrier Battle Group into the Persian Gulf for the precursor operations just before we began that war.

After that war had commenced, I returned to the ground in Afghanistan 18 months later for a short period of time and saw what had not been done. We had accomplished so little compared to what might have been because we diverted our attention and our resources from our Civil Affairs Forces to our Special Operations Forces to the tragic misadventure in Iraq.

I speak of Afghanistan because as it becomes prey to terrorists and as the Taliban has moved back into the southern provinces, it is a poster child for why I believe we must bring about a timetable for the end of the war in Iraq.

That war has hurt U.S. security throughout this globe as well as here at home, yet not one Army unit, Active, Reserve or Guard is in a state of readiness that it could deploy anywhere in the world if another contingency were to occur. Never mind that we are failing to engage properly from the Western Pacific to Southeast Asia to the Middle East.

There is a change in our strategy that can bring about an end to this tragedy without a failed state in Iraq. That is to set a date that is certain by which we would redeploy out of Iraq, because a date certain changes the structure of incentives within that region to change the behavior of other

nations, in particular, Iran and Syria, that are involved destructively in this conflict because we are, to their delight, bleeding, bleeding profusely.

I asked when I was there with Senator HAGEL, our highest political officer there, does Iran want a failed state if we are to redeploy? His response was no. Therefore, we must have the confidence to set a date that is certain to redeploy out of Iraq, put our troops in Afghanistan, remain in the region on our bases in Oman, Bahrain, Qatar, or Aircraft Carrier Battle Group or Amphibious Ready Group, and bring others home, so we don't degrade the readiness of our forces, but have the competence to deal with Iran and Syria, bring them together with the Iraqis as they deal with the extreme elements and we deal with the middle.

There is a saying in the Middle East, ''Insha'Allah,'' basically, ''God willing tomorrow.'' Tomorrow for U.S. security has been enough. A date certain, approximately a year, 9 months, to give those countries time to work with us to bring about the political decisions that must cease the civil war, to have the Iraqis step to the plate and assume responsibility in the 32 ministries that thus far have been personal fiefdoms for personal ambitions as we provide the political and military cover for them to go about their personal pursuits. This is a change that can only about be brought about not by doubling down on a bad military bet by more troops, but by enforcing a date certain within a timetable. And lastly, we should do so on an authorization bill.

We should never again put our troops between us and the President. Being in the military is a dangerous business, but it doesn't have to be unsafe. Our business in the military has the dignity of danger, but you must provide them the bullets and the equipment they need to protect themselves, while having an authorization bill provide the date certain by which no forces in Iraq would remain, or funding for them to remain would not be there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time with the understanding that there is a strategic approach to end this conflict without a failed state in order to enhance U.S. security.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1415

A MATTER OF TRUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the ''New Yorker'' magazine, veteran reporter Seymour Hersh lays out the shame that was Abu Ghraib and the efforts at the highest levels to sweep it under the carpet.

Former Army General Antonio Taguba takes this very brave step to share details of his meetings with former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and other administration officials in the wake of the prisoner abuse scandal at Abu Ghraib. In May, 2004, photos of abuse at the American-run prison were made public by CBS and other media outlets. We can all recall the inhumane treatment and degradation depicted. What was included in the photos and videos were not interrogations. They were humiliating and often horrible acts of violence.

Months earlier, before the photos emerged, General Taguba had filed a report outlining the ''numerous incidents of sadistic, blatant and wanton criminal abuses that were inflicted on several detainees and systemic and illegal abuse.''

In fact, the first report sent to senior Pentagon officials came in January of that year. The response? A senior general in Iraq brushed off the report saying that the victims were ''only Iraqis.'' According to the article, General Taguba found that Lieutenant General Sanchez, the Army commander in Iraq who had visited the prison several times, knew exactly what was going on.

Despite many reports contradicting him, Secretary Rumsfeld himself clung to the claim that he saw the photos and video of the abuse only days before testifying before Congress. He said he first learned of the problem in late January or early February. His memory seems to be a little fuzzy in this regard. And in response, who did he send to oversee prison in Iraq? Major General Jeffrey Miller, the commander at Guantanamo.

If this were a movie plot, Mr. Speaker, it would seem ludicrous. Unfortunately, this is part of our real history in the occupation of Iraq.

And our commander-in-chief? It is unclear when he first learned of the situation at Abu Ghraib, but by most accounts it was months before the notorious pictures hit the airwaves. This is absolutely disgraceful.

It appears that the administration has no shame when it comes to the continuing abuse of human rights abroad and at home right here in America. Is this the legacy we want to leave in the Middle East? A preemptive strike against a nation which did not have weapons of mass destruction? A civil war that is tearing a nation apart? Our standing in the world at an all-time low? The loss of over 3,500 brave service members?

This did not have to happen. The administration willingly misled this Nation into an occupation that cannot be won.

The acts at Abu Ghraib could have besmirched the honor and reputation of all of the troops who serve each day with distinction and courage, but thankfully it did not, because the American people know and understand that the acts of the few and of the top leadership who endorse those acts should not be visited on those who so bravely and selflessly serve. Our troops have shown great valor in the face of unbelievable challenges. This Congress honors them and the sacrifices they have made.

That said, it is well past time that this Congress stands up and says, enough is enough from this administration. The American people are frustrated with the lack of progress on ending the occupation and bringing our troops home, and rightfully so.

This fight may be difficult, but it is our obligation. I ask my colleagues to demand that not another day goes by without a real effort to bring our troops home and to return the sovereignty of Iraq to its people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMENTS ON THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is this time as we end a week of discussion and debate and we all leave to reconnect with our constituents and find out from the real people of America what we have actually done here that we have a time to sit back and contemplate the significant questions that will be brought to us next week, probably the greatest of which is simply will the Republicans continue to win the congressional baseball game.

But at this time in this weekend, I am joined tonight by Congressman GARRETT of New Jersey, who is the Chairman of the Constitutional Caucus, who wisely thought that this would be a good time for us to take a

moment and discuss once again the significance and importance of the Constitution as we come to this end of this section of our legislative year.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia once said he understood there were those people who believe that there should not be a strict adherence to the words or intent of the words of the Constitution. But, he wrote, you would have to be an idiot to believe that.

The Constitution is not a living organism. It is a legal document. It says some things and doesn't say other things. The Constitution is a piece of paper that has words, but each of those words have a meaning.

I was once watching an episode of Fawlty Towers, obviously a very old one, and it is one in which John Cleese is trying in vain to talk to his waiter Manuel from Barcelona, who doesn't speak English very well, and in contempt he finally walks away and says, ''Say Goodnight, Gracie.''

Now, my students in school never understood what that line, ''Say Goodnight, Gracie,'' meant. As I was talking to them or other audiences, you would have to be around my age to remember the old George Burns and Gracie Allen routines in which every tagline of one of their routines was simply, ''Say Goodnight, Gracie,'' which had the effect of implying that Gracie Allen was probably the most ditziest, dumbest blonde ever produced.

Now, oddly enough, my students understood the phrase ''dumb blond.'' They don't understand the phrase, ''Say Goodnight, Gracie.''

We all have certain cue words which create larger meanings in the mind of the hearer. Those words have meaning based on the usage of time. The Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution also had cue words that they used to expand the meaning of what they meant.

One of the things I am happy about is the academic community seems of late to take a great deal more interest in the words of the Constitution and defining and understanding what they actually meant at the time.

I had a college professor who used to say the Founding Fathers had baggage that they took with them, which meant there were common concepts they brought together and they understood.

One of them, for example, is they all had read and understood Aristotle. Aristotle loved to divide everything up into categories. He divided up governments into a category of the government of one, a government of the few, a government of the many, and he said that each of those breakdowns could have a government that is good or bad, simply depending on the attitude of the ruling group. And he gave them all names. A government of one, for example, that he said was good, he defined as a monarchy. So in the 1780s, if you claimed someone was a monarch, that was a compliment.

The government of one that was bad that had bad intentions, he gave the term of a tyrant or a tyranny. It is not a coincidence that a decade earlier when Thomas Jefferson is writing the Declaration of Independence, that of all the terms he can use to describe King George, he used the word ''tyrant.'' It had a cue meaning to it which ticked up a whole bunch of other ideas in the mind of the reader or the hearer.

It is the same way when the Federalists decided to criticize Jefferson, they called him a Jacobite. You cannot understand the significance of that insult unless you have a deeper understanding of the meaning of what happened in the French Revolution. The words have specific meanings and specific attitudes.

Akhil Amar wrote a wonderful book exploring the historical context of the words used in the Constitution. Much of what I am going to say is based on many of his works and his research. I would like to take just the preamble of the Constitution to try and illustrate what that is talk about.

You see, I thought Gouverneur Morris and the committee who wrote the Preamble to the Constitution at the very end of the Constitutional Convention were merely putting something in there to add some kind of literary flair to the document itself. And even though these words don't have the same status as statute, these majestic words give us a window to see into the minds of those who actually framed our republican form of government.

It starts off with the phrase ''We the people of the United States.'' Now, whether intentional or not, it began with the concept of empowering people. And earlier drafts started off with ''We the people of,'' and then it listed each and every individual State. Politically, that would have been unwise if indeed one of those states had eventually not ratified the document, which they thought could easily happen, because, after all, Rhode Island wasn't even there.

But by changing it to ''We the people of the United States,'' it is more than just a political maneuver, it is a fundamental mindset of the Convention delegates. This Constitution goes full circle. It starts off by talking about the people and ends with Article 7, which is a new way of ratifying the constitutional document, which is a relatively contemporary concept of having a ratifying convention elected by the people. A new concept of republican democracy.

So this document starts and ends with the commitment to the faith in the people. The Constitution doesn't pander to governments, but rather is aimed at empowering the people of this United States who indeed empower this government at the same time.

The Founding Fathers never intended to amend the Articles of Confederation. They realized to do so would take unanimous consent, and since Rhode Island wasn't there in fact it would never happen. In fact, 2 years earlier New York had vetoed a new financial management amendment. That act in and of itself had done much to spur the call for a new Convention to try and solve the problem. Because the Articles of Convention truly was a treaty between sovereign states and the national government.

This was something that was going to be different. It was going to be different to solve the problem by forming a more perfect union.

Now, once again, I always thought that the phrase ''in order to form a more perfect union'' was simply in opposition to the less perfect union under the Articles of Confederation. But it meant something so much more than that. It implied that they were leaving the treaty to join the new supreme law of the land. And ratification specifically denoted leaving the commitment of a flawed treaty to a commitment of a new supreme law of the land.

The anti-Federalists got that point. They debated it. They lost the argument. They lost the vote. Confederates did not get that in the Civil War time.

Abraham Lincoln actually was wrong about it as well. When he gave the Gettysburg Address, he talked about an indivisible Nation that started four score and seven years ago. That was a reference back to 1776 and the Declaration of Independence. To be accurate, he should have said three score and 15 years ago was when we became an individual nation, because that was the ratification of the Constitution of the United States.

There is more to that phrase that Gouverneur Morris meant than simply glossing over once again. This phrase, ''a more perfect union,'' is a specific reference to the 1707 Act of Unification between England and Scotland. The words say ''the union of two kingdoms more active and complete.'' In fact Queen Anne referred to it all the time as her ''more perfect union.''

You see, the attitude of the mindset at the time was they believed the progeny of landed borders was always armies. So they looked at the time when England, Scotland and even Wales were individual countries with land borders and each had an army to offset the other, which meant eventually they would use that army one against the other, and if they were not using it to disturb the peace of the island, than a tyrannical king was probably using it to destroy the liberties of his individual people.

Once they formed the more perfect union of England, Scotland and Wales together, the relative quiet of the United Kingdom was in contrast as they looked across the English Channel to Europe, which still had individual borders and was still engaged in border wars and subjection of the individual liberties of their individual citizens.

So what we consider to be incomprehensible, the idea that Massachusetts might raise an army for some of their indigenous people, and that New York

would respond by raising an Army just in case Massachusetts doesn't stay with their own indigenous people, and Virginia might raise an army then because all three of them claim the same lands in the West. What we thought of as incomprehensible was an actual fear at the time.

And they had an option, they will had an option of either eliminating that, or becoming like Europe. They could either be like Europe, with multiple boundaries and all the problems associated with it, or become like the United Kingdom in a more perfect union, eliminating that threat for evermore. And, more significantly, not just bringing peace to the continent, but also providing the protection and preservation of the individual liberties.

It is significant the Founding Fathers had a fear of armies. They limited the army to two years. It had to be dissolved. They didn't do the same thing to navies, because a navy boat could not chase you down the street and beat you up—Armies could. The idea of a citizen army is something that comes about in the French Revolution. That hasn't happened for a decade yet.

So armies at this time were mercenaries who were not necessarily sympathetic to the people they were supposed to be defending. In fact, the British army that came over here to defeat us and defend the British was actually hired Germans.

So the idea in here was an Army was not necessarily nice to people. The militia were the citizens, and those were the ones who were going to be important. Armies were foreigners. Militias were your neighbors. Giving primarily defense of the country to a militia made sense. Allowing a militia, in reality the people, to be armed made sense. An armed citizenry as a check to a potential political abuse made sense. Thinking of the modern National Guard as the same as a 1788 militia when we talk about the Second Amendment makes no sense because we don't understand the meaning of the words.

Lincoln also understood this concept of more perfect union when he talked about the Civil War. If the South was successful, even though this was a horrible war, at a high cost and greatly criticized by the intelligentsia at the time, he predicted that if the Civil War was successful for the South, it would not be the Civil War that created the South, but the beginning in a series of wars between the North and the South over regional boundaries and regional issues.

This Constitution also establishes justice. The Founding Fathers considered justice lacking on both the national and the State level, and they invented the checks and balances system of Federalism to counteract that.

If we truly understand what it means to establish justice, we have to understand the Framers hope to curb the excesses of the State governments, just the way patriots today have to curb the excesses of our national government. So Federalism means we forget the concept of establishing justice.

''To ensure domestic tranquility'' was not only a reference to Shay's Rebellion, but was also the concept that Revolutionary War veterans marched on Philadelphia to get their money from the Articles of Confederation Congress and both Philadelphia and Pennsylvania refused to provide protection, one is of the reasons they insisted on having this place, a Federal District, so they could ensure the domestic tranquility.

And the next phrase is ''to promote the general welfare.'' Mr. Speaker, at this time we sometimes have a combination, I think, or conception, conception today, that promoting the general welfare is a door to open up to national involvement in all sorts of areas.

I think if you look at the actual words, it was quite the opposite. ''General welfare'' was a term of limiting qualifications, not expanding them.

With that in mind at this stage of the preamble, I would like to yield to the Chairman of the Constitutional Caucus, the good gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. GARRETT, to talk about the concept of promoting general welfare.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah.

Of course, it is humbling to follow after such a gentleman who is learned in these things and also previous to coming to Congress a teacher of such topics of our history and of our Constitution. So I will try, while I will never live up to his standards, but try to emulate him as best I can. When I conclude, I guess I should end by say saying ''Goodnight, Rob.''

When we looked at those expressions, we remember the words of talk radio host Rush Limbaugh, who often does say the expression ''words mean something.'' He is usually expressing it about one of his callers who has just called in and talked about a particular topic or what have you, and he will take a little slight angle on it and say, well, those words mean something that are being said there.

So too it is with our Constitution, the fundamental document, the Founding Father document of this Nation. It is unique in a sense and it was recognized at that time. Back in 1803, Thomas Jefferson stated, ''Our peculiar security in this Nation is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction.''

How prescient Jefferson was to see how future generations of this country possibly would and have and courts have as well taken that document; taken its plain meaning, and manipulated it to whatever the understanding of those words currently mean, as opposed to getting an understanding of what the founding document writers intended at the time.

James Wilson, writing in the Study of Law in 1790, said, ''The first and governing maxim in the interpretation of a statute,'' or in this case the Constitution, ''is discover those meanings of those words by those who made it.''

So when we come to the floor today, or any day, to take a look at our Constitution, we must have an understanding of those terms as those meanings of the words had when the Founders first wrote them.

The gentleman from Utah just went to the point as far as the fact the Preamble goes to the issue of a limiting basis. I would just suggest, and I believe he made one reference to this, that despite the fact that today certain people look to the actual words of the preamble as giving us certain rights or powers now, Gouverneur Morris, the delegate from Pennsylvania at the time, added the preamble, I won't use the word as an afterthought, but certainly after the rest of the Constitution was written down. And specifically preambles at that time in any legal document that were written, were understood to say that they did not have a substantive legal basis or meaning to them.

□ 1430

That is to say a Preamble did not grant nor did it limit powers.

So today, when people come and look at the Constitution and say there is the general welfare clause in the Preamble, they should have an understanding that that was not an intention of the drafters of the document, to expand the powers of the Federal Government.

This can be understood if you look to how those who wrote it and lived at that time understood the document. Anybody who has an understanding of the life and times of Alexander Hamilton understood that there was a brilliant mind, a confidant of George Washington. At the beginning of the revolution, he became an aide in battle, and later when George Washington became our first President, Hamilton was there as the Treasury Secretary and one of the most powerful men in government at the time second to the President himself, more powerful than the Vice President and the Cabinet members at the time, someone who had an array of employees under his control inasmuch as the Treasury was dealing with the collection of excise taxes and the like. He had people under his control throughout the entire country.

He understood in order for this country to be great, and he wanted this country to be great, just as the mighty powers of Europe had been at that time, he had envisions that this country could expand and grow through different aspects of building bridges and roads and building canals. But even Hamilton understood that if he was to try to go down this road, that the powers that were granted to the Federal Government at the time were limiting on him. Even Hamilton suggested that a constitutional amendment would have been necessary for them to do

some of the things that Hamilton thought necessary at the time.

So in 1790, Alexander Hamilton said an amendment to the Constitution is necessary in order to make the improvements to the country that are needed for a flourishing democracy. Of course, that amendment never occurred, and therefore the country and following Presidents never had the authority to do many of the things.

Mr. BISHOP will probably cite some of examples of some of the constructions that they were intending to do, and Presidents such as Madison and others vetoed those initiatives.

How all of this is relevant to us today, as someone who may be listening to our debate or discussion right now, this past week the House of Representatives began the debate and now passage of several appropriations bills. We will be coming back in the weeks to come on the consideration and eventual passage of other appropriation bills. Likewise this past week, or the week before last, I should say, this House had a considerable debate on the issue of earmarks.

Just an aside on the whole issue of earmarks. The debate on that topic goes to whether or not the Congress has the authority, and no one really questions this, but the authority to make, the issues of spending money on particular projects, and I don't think anybody debates that too much. The debate we have had on that topic is the transparency issue and whether or not Members of Congress and the American public are able to see exactly what individual Members are requesting that the American tax dollars go to. That is an appropriate debate and one which I supported, and I supported openness and transparency and to shine the light of day on what we do here.

But that really begs the question as to where American tax dollars go at the end of the day. Earmarks are just a very small fraction of the overall government spending. Sometimes we hear of egregious examples, the proverbial ''bridge to nowhere'' and the Cowgirl Hall of Fame and the like. These things are targeted in an appropriation bill, either on the House floor or in the Senate or in conference. People are outraged both here in the House and at home as well when these things are added to the budget.

But we must understand that such spending does not occur simply through earmarks, it occurs in the underlying bills as well. And it occurs also by the executive office and the administration as well.

So the fundamental question that we must be asking is whether it is a particular earmark, whether it is for a bridge to nowhere or a Cowgirl Hall of Fame or a museum someplace that we tag onto a bill here in the House or the Senate; or whether it can be exactly the same type of project that the administration puts into the spending pattern through their agencies and departments, or whether it is the same type of spending in the underlying bill. The larger question is, and this is a question that every Member of Congress should always consider every time they reach into their wallet or their pocket, wherever they keep it, and they pull out their voting card and they put it into the little device to vote ''yes'' or ''no,'' does Congress, does the Federal Government have the authority to spend those dollars on those purposes?

The argument is, and this is where the gentleman from Utah was leading to in the Preamble, which is also referenced in article I, section 8 of the Constitution, is the general spending clause.

So all the adherents of those who support the earmarks and support the spending on these particular topics will either look to the Preamble or article I, section 8, the general spending clause of the Constitution, which says for the general welfare of this country.

Well, as the learned gentleman from Utah would say, we have to have an understanding what the ''general welfare'' of this country was intended by the Framers when they penned that document.

Today we would take that to mean anything that the House of Representatives can think of that would be an improvement for this Nation. That broad and general, expansive meaning, interpretation of the language is not what the Framers intended. What they intended was the opposite. They intended it as a limitating factor on spending.

The Founders intended the general welfare clause and the spending clause in the Constitution was limiting to the extent that Washington could not spend the American taxpayers' dollars on just a parochial interest for this one particular Member's district or for this one particular Member's town or for this county or what have you. Instead, it had to be generally good for the entire Nation.

There is a story that came out of a book that was written in 1884 which I would like to share about a former Member of Congress, the name of which most Americans know, used to be on Disney TV, but he was a real Member of Congress back in 1827–1831, and that was a Member of Congress by the name of David Crockett, more familiarly known as Davy Crockett. He was, I guess you would call him back then, a conservative Member of Congress.

He actually addressed in his writings after he served in Congress this issue of whether or not under the general welfare clause he, as a Member of Congress, had the authority to actually spend money on these parochial interests. Let me share that with you.

He stated: ''If Congress is not given such extensive powers, then who is?'' The answer lies in the 10th amendment. Of course, I am not the first person to suggest this; others have as well.

He writes about how one day in the House of Representatives, that would have been in 1827–1831, a bill was taken up appropriating money for the benefit of a widow of a distinguished naval officer. Several beautiful speeches were made in its support. The Speaker was just about to put the question to the floor of the House when Congressman Crockett rose.

''Mr. Speaker,'' he said, ''I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased, and as much sympathy for the suffering of the living, if suffering there be, as any man in this House, but we must not permit our respect for the dead or sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living. I will not go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate money as an act of charity. Every Member on this floor knows it. We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity. But as a Member of Congress, we have no such right to appropriate a dollar of the public money. Some eloquent appeals have been made to us upon the ground that it is a debt due to the deceased. But, Mr. Speaker, the deceased lived long after the close of the war. He was in office to the day of his death, and I have never heard that government was in arrears to him.

''Every man in this House knows it is not a debt. We cannot, without the grossest of corruption, appropriate this money as payment of a debt. We have not the semblance of authority to appropriate it as a charity either. So, Mr. Speaker, I have said we have the right to give as much money of our own as we please. But I am the poorest man on this floor, and yet I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give 1 week's pay to the object. And if every Member of the Congress will do the same, it will amount to more money than this bill.''

At that point he took his seat, and no one replied. The bill was put upon for passage, and instead of passing unanimously, as no doubt it would but for his speech, it received only a few votes, and of course it failed.

Later, when asked by a friend why he had opposed the appropriation, he explained. Here is the crux of the story.

He told how several years earlier one evening he was standing on the steps of the Capitol with some other Members of Congress when their attention was attracted by a great light over the city of Georgetown. It was evidently a large fire. They jumped into a hack and drove over. The houses were burned, and many families were made homeless, and some of them lost all the clothes they had. The weather was cold, and he said that I felt that something ought to be done. And so the next morning a bill was introduced appropriating $20,000 for the relief. All business was put aside, and the bill was rushed through as soon as it could be done.

Davy Crockett stated, The next summer, when it came time to think about the election, I concluded I would take a scout around the district. When riding in a part of my district, I saw a man in

a field plowing and corning towards the road. I spoke to him. He replied politely, but I thought rather coldly.

I began, Well, friend, I am one of those unfortunate beings called candidates. The stranger said, Yes, I know, you are Colonel Crockett, but you should not waste your time. I have seen you before, and I voted for you once, but I shall not vote for you again.

Davy Crockett was shocked by this, but the man stated, You gave a vote last winter which shows that either you have not capacity to understand the Constitution, or you are wanting in the honesty and firmness to be guided by it. In either case, you are not the man to represent me. Your understanding of the Constitution is different than mine, and I cannot overlook, because the Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred and rigidly observed in all its provisions.

To which the Congressman replied, I admit the truth of what you say, but I do not remember that I gave any vote last winter upon any unconstitutional ground. But the man responded that he knew about it, having read about it in the papers, and how last winter you voted to appropriate $20,000 to some sufferers in Georgetown. Crockett admitted that was true.

The gentleman pointed out it was not the amount of money that Congress appropriates that he complains of, it is the principle. In the first place, Congress should not have excess funding. And secondly, it is the principle whether or not the Congress is abiding by the Constitution when it appropriates its money.

He said, so you see, while you are contributing to relieve one person, in that case the people in Georgetown, you are drawing it from thousands who are even worse off than he. If you have the right to give anything, the amount is a matter of discretion. You gave $20,000; you could have given $20 million. If you have the right to give to one, you have the right to give to all. And since the Constitution neither defines charities nor stipulates the amount, you are at liberty to give to anything and everything you believe in as charity, and for any amount you believe. You will easily perceive what a wide door this will open for fraud and corruption and favoritism on the one hand, and for robbing from the people on the other.

The man continued, Colonel, Congress has no right to give to charity. Individual Members may give as much of their own money as they please, but they have no right to touch a dollar of the public money for that purpose. You see, you have violated the Constitution in what I consider a vital point.

In the end what the poor farmer was saying was this: That he had a better understanding of what the Constitution meant and what the Founders had intended when they crafted it less than 100 years earlier at that time; that the Constitution set out limiting powers on the spending of money, both on the Preamble which sets out no powers whatsoever, as previously stated, and under the general spending clause of article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

And this is not just my interpretation or the farmer's reading. The Supreme Court has commented on this in several instances of note.

□ 1445

In 1905, the Supreme Court made that comment that the general welfare of laws under the preamble is not a grant of power but a limiting of power.

This tendency of the understanding of the Constitution was the case from the time of the Founders basically up until around 1930s. Starting in the 1930s in the New Deal, this Nation changed substantially.

It was at that time that this Nation began to have an interpretation of the Constitution that the Congress would be the arbiter of what the general welfare clause meant, and that the general welfare clause basically means that Congress can decide to spend money on any process or program that they desire. Then furthermore, subsequent U.S. Supreme Court decisions have held that the U.S. Supreme Court would not interfere with the determinations of Congress that these are basically political decisions.

To conclude, what this all means, that when the House of Representatives comes back together next week in the weeks that follow on the appropriation bills, when we hear discussions on earmarks and the likes, and when we hear from the other side of the aisle that we will be spending ever more money on the appropriation process than we ever had in U.S. history, the question we should always be asking, is it within the limits of the general welfare clause.

A strict interpretation of that clause would say no, but the Founders have said in order for it to be a general clause it must be for individuals all across this country and nor for a particular town, city or area of a State. It must benefit everyone.

But you will see in each and every one of those appropriations bills, in just about every one of those earmarks that those dollars are going in contravention of the Constitution and in contravention of what the Founding Fathers intended.

For that reason, we come here on a regular basis to try to raise up these issues to have a better understanding of what our Founders intended for the Constitution.

With that, I will say good night, or at least, good evening, Gracie.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate being able to put the phrase, ''promoting the general welfare,'' into a constitutional perspective, as well as a historical perspective. It is true that Madison and Monroe, both as Presidents, vetoed road construction projects because they only benefited the vicinity of the road, not the general welfare.

It's true that the City of Savannah suffered a horrendous fire; and even though people wanted to give money for it, the rebuilding of Savannah, Congress refused because it wasn't the general welfare.

Obviously, as Mr. GARRETT has said, starting with the New Deal era, we changed our view of what these words mean, so that most times, most politicians today just assume Federal involvement is exactly what was intended.

It also says that when these guys wrote the elastic clause of article I, section 8, they must have had a vastly different and a much more limited view on what was the power entailed than modern policymakers or scholars do.

The last phrase of the preamble is that we do ordain and establish. It's an appropriate benediction to the preamble. It's a phrase that brought to the 1780 mind the creation found in the Book of Genesis, for religious vocabulary at the time spoke of God ordaining and creating the Earth, as comparison to the Founding Fathers who ordained and established this new government. These men in a very real and reverent sense created a new country.

We pass laws almost every week that we either make incorrect assumptions about the meaning of the Founders' words, or we simply ignore them as no longer relevant to our time.

Justice Scalia also once again said about the Constitution: ''What it meant when it was adopted it means today, and its meaning doesn't change just because we think that meaning is no longer adequate to our times.''

My students not understanding ''Say goodnight, Gracie'' was simply an annoyance, excusable because they're young, and their view is a tennis player trying to decide whether to date a 20-year-old or a 40-year-old is great television. But for Congress not to understand the meaning of the words of the Constitution is irresponsible, it's inexcusable, and it's dangerous.

Let me yield to one last comment to the chairman of the Constitution Caucus.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I will conclude with the quotes of Thomas Jefferson, who addressed this overall issue, in 1791, when opining on the constitutionality of a national bank, so, in essence, what he was doing is what we were doing, we do every week. The thought was at that time in 1791, of course, Alexander Hamilton at the time was pushing for such, and whether there was a constitutionality to do so.

He said: ''I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground that 'all powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people,' '' obviously our 10th amendment. ''To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specifically drawn around the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power, not longer susceptible of any definition.''

Jefferson was very clear that once we overstep the authority that is granted to us by the Constitution, there is no limiting factor on us any more in Congress and the Senate can spend whatever they want on any purpose that they want. The Supreme Court has already opined that they are not going to be the element to rein us in.

So we, therefore, must, fortunately or unfortunately, if not going to rein in ourselves, look to the American public to be the political process to rein the Congress back in the manner that the Constitution and the Founders intended.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to thank the gentleman from Utah, Mr. BISHOP, for reserving time today so that we can discuss the Constitution, the cornerstone of our Republic and freedoms we cherish.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of this body, all of us are sworn to uphold and protect the principles outlined in the Constitution. Yet, all too often, we routinely find ourselves coming to this floor to vote for measures that directly assault the freedoms outlined in it. We too often consider legislation that contradicts the Constitution's core principles of individual freedom together with limited government.

However, make no mistake: Congress isn't the only culprit. It is much more widespread than that. The Constitution is a document of limited, delegated powers for all branches of government. However, we have an executive branch, whether a Republican or Democratic administration, that often looks for ways to grow beyond its constitutionally defined boundaries. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, my constituents are regularly impacted by Federal agencies with legions of bureaucrats who implement regulation upon regulation, each dealing a blow to their pocketbook and very often their liberty.

Again and again, we see the Federal Government taking more power away from the States, effectively leading them to become gigantic, castrated counties solely accountable to Washington, DC. This is wrong and we must take steps to begin rolling back the tide.

Finally, we have the judiciary which, under the principle of checks and balances, is supposed to be the final safeguard of our constitutional liberties. But just last summer, across the street, five people in black robes overturned established constitutional principles by reinterpreting the fifth amendment and the essence of private property rights. No, Mr. Speaker, these examples show that this isn't simply a congressional problem, this is a national problem.

With that, I urge my colleagues to take a moment to remind themselves just why it is they are here. We must remember that we are a body of limited, enumerated powers. We are the first line of defense for our Constitution. As James Madison said, we are the "guardians of . . . (the) rights and liberties" of our citizens. In doing so, we must be willing to question the merits of every bill.

We must be willing to conduct effective and rigorous oversight of the administration's activities. We must be sure to question any initiative that would seek to limit and constrain the rights of the individual and the States. The Constitution is the guide for doing just that. By checking our actions against what is outlined in the Constitution, we'll know when our deeds overstep their limits.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I came to Washington on a platform of freedom—the freedom that is promised to every citizen of the United States in our Constitution. The freedom that makes our Nation a beacon of liberty for the rest of the world.

Through the work of the Constitution Caucus and others in this Chamber, I believe that we can get there—to the Founders' intent: a federal government of limited powers which respects and protects the individuals' various freedoms. We should all heed the words of our Nation's first President, who said, "(t)he Constitution is the guide which I will never abandon."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Illinois) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAMSTAD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 28 and 29.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a scholarship event in the district.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1352. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 127 East Locust Street in Fairbury, Illinois, as the "Dr. Francis Townsend Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 25, 2007, at 12:30 p.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:

2284. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Self-Insurance Plans Under the Indian Housing Block Grant Program [Docket No. FR-4897-F-02] (RIN: 2577-AC58) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2285. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedural Rules for DOE Nuclear Activities and Occupational Radiation Protection [Docket No. EH-RM-02-835] (RIN: 1901-AA95) received June 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2286. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's request regarding the use of appropriated funds for the implementation of Section 1221(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2287. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Great Lakes Naval Training Center Harbor, North Chicago, IL [CGD09-07-012] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2288. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Kenosha Harbor, Kenosha, WI. [CGD09-07-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2289. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Patuxent River, Calvert County, MD [CGD05-07-037] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2290. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Baileys Harbor Fireworks, Baileys Harbor, Baileys Harbor, WI. [CGD09-07-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2291. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Kenosha Harbor, Kenosha, WI. [CGD09-07-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2292. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report regarding its efforts in the area of transportation security for the calendar year 2006, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44938; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

2293. A letter from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting a joint report setting forth recommendations regarding cooperative activities in areas of mutual interest related to research, development, and test and evaluation, pursuant to Public Law 109-163, section 259; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Science and Technology.

2294. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report of the Department's Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 345; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security and 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:

Mr. DICKS: Committee on Appropriations. Supplemental report on 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, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SERRANO: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2829. A bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2286. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure with respect to bail bond forfeitures (Rept. 110–208). 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. SKELTON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. NADLER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2826. A bill to amend titles 28 and 10, United States Code, to restore habeas corpus for individuals detained by the United States at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 2827. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide a floor of 1.0 for the practice expense and for the work expense geographic practice cost indices (GPCI) under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

H.R. 2828. A bill to provide compensation to relatives of United States citizens who were killed as a result of the bombings of United States Embassies in East Africa on August 7, 1998; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 2830. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FARR, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 2831. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 2832. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct or support a comprehensive study comparing total health outcomes, including risk of autism, in vaccinated populations in the United States with such outcomes in unvaccinated populations in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 2833. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional limitations on preexisting condition exclusions in group health plans and health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2834. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat income received by partners for performing investment management services as ordinary income received for the performance of services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 2835. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to extend the requirements under such Act regarding the ability of absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters to use absentee registration procedures and vote by absentee ballot in Federal elections to elections for certain offices in American Samoa; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 2836. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Sea Grant College Program Act for fiscal years 2009 through 2013; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 2837. A bill to provide for administrative procedures to extend Federal recognition to certain Indian groups, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 2838. A bill to enhance the Department of Energy Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program established under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 by explicitly permitting its application on United States Government installations worldwide, in the Insular Areas of the United States, and in those nations in free association with the United States, as well as explicitly authorize loans for ocean thermal energy conversion projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2839. A bill to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 to require protection and advocacy systems to give notice to, and obtain the authorization of, an individual (or the individual's legal representative) before pursuing remedies on behalf of the individual; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. CARSON):

H.R. 2840. A bill to amend the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 to allow the direct support by a financial institution of a qualified community-based financial literacy program provided to consumers and borrowers to be taken into account in assessing the institution's record of meeting the credit needs of its entire community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend the wetlands reserve program of the Department of Agriculture to exclude from enrollment under the program land subject to a State or local set-back requirement unless the Secretary determines that enrollment of the land is essential to restore or preserve wetlands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit preexisting condition exclusions for children in group health plans and

health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 2843. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of existing libraries and resource centers at United States diplomatic and consular missions to provide information about American culture, society, and history, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that hunting seasons for migratory ducks and geese should be modified so that individuals have a fair and equitable opportunity to harvest such birds; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. REYES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LEE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 510. A resolution honoring the life accomplishments and extraordinary leadership of Sylvia K. Brooks, a 16-year President and CEO of the Houston Area Urban League (HAUL) and first female president of the Houston Urban League, who transformed the Houston Area Urban League into a nationally-recognized and respected social service agency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Res. 511. A resolution congratulating the men's volleyball team of the University of California, Irvine, for winning the 2007 NCAA Division I Men's Volleyball National Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H. Res. 512. A resolution honoring and commending the Honorable Wesley E. Brown, United States District Court Judge for the District of Kansas, for his commitment and dedication to public service, the judicial system, and equal access to justice as he celebrates his 100th birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

86. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Memorial No. 1004 encouraging the Congress of the United States to continue the funding and completion of Sbinet; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 23: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. WALSH of New York, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 111: Mr. HODES.

H.R. 196: Mr. LATHAM and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 197: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 346: Mr. HILL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 446: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 507: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 510: Mr. ISSA and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 552: Mr. OLVER and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 583: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 621: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 642: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 643: Mr. BOREN and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 728: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 743: Mr. SPACE, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 746: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 760: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 901: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 927: Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 969: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 980: Mrs. BONO, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1000: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1014: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1043: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1077: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1102: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1113: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. FARR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1134: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1154: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1177: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1193: Mr. WATT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1194: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1216: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1236: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1282: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1283: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. HARE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 1338: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WATT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 1343: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 1355: Mr. POE.

H.R. 1366: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1399: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 1409: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1419: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1430: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1440: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1459: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1464: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1474: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 1514: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1528: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1532: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1537: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1542: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HARE, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1552: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. FOXX, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 1584: Mr. MELANCON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas and Ms. FALLIN.

H.R. 1589: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 1610: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. BOYD of Florida.

H.R. 1627: Mr. POE.

H.R. 1629: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1647: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

H.R. 1651: Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 1657: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1663: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1671: Mr. HARE, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1693: Ms. WATERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WYNN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WATT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 1713: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1728: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1732: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1740: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1792: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1840: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1841: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 1845: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1880: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1881: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1897: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 1926: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1940: Mr. POE.
H.R. 1947: Ms. CASTOR, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 1965: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1967: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1983: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1990: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 2015: Mr. REYES, Ms. CASTOR, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 2016: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 2035: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 2054: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2066: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2122: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2189: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, MS. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2210: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2219: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 2244: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2265: Ms. NORTON, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 2266: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 2280: Mr. WELLER, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2286: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2293: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2295: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2303: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2307: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2315: Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 2327: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TAYLOR, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2353: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 2362: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 2363: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2365: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BOREN, Ms. MATSUI and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2370: Mr. FEENEY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2390: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 2405: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 2424: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 2464: Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2478: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2486: Mr. LANTOS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 2495: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2512: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2566: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2588: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2591: Mr. OLVER and Mr. HARE.
H.R. 2599: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2605: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 2723: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2729: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2734: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 2746: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2747: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 2750: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOYLE, MR. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. DE LAURO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2761: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 2762: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2772: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2778: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2787: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BURGESS, and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2792: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.J. Res. 44: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. WYNN.
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. PENCE.
H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.
H. Con. Res. 169: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 32: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. TAUSCER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H. Res. 34: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CARSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H. Res. 111: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 303: Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 375: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H. Res. 380: Mr. COHEN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 426: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H. Res. 427: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Res. 433: Mr. PICKERING.
H. Res. 467: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 470: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Res. 477: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H. Res. 489: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H. Res. 493: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 501: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 506: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 509: Ms. LEE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

89. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, relative to a Resolution recognizing the need for state certified school library media specialists; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.