United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 17, 2007 No. 114

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 17, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HILDA L. SOLIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Dr. Billy F. Hudgins, Cross Creek Community Church, Hokes Bluff, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Lord, our gratitude to You for being in this place, and hallowed by the presence, and we're honored by the blessings that You bestow upon us and upon those that will be represented by the ones in the room.

Lord, our cry this morning is for Your wisdom. Our cry is for Your mercy, Your anointing so that the ones in this room may accomplish their task that's been assigned to them today with insight far greater than their own ingenuity and other provisions.

Lord, give to this House a spirit of unity that supersedes personal prejudice or party pressures so that Your divine purpose may be accomplished this day.

Lord, for those precious men and women serving in Iraq and other difficult global assignments, or for those protecting us here at home, guide them with a sense that their task is Yours.

And Lord, may the words of our mouth, the meditations of our heart be acceptable in Your sight, oh, Lord, our strength, our redeemer.

Lord, we pray these things in that sweet name of Jesus, Your son.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GINGREY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Purple Heart Recognition Day''.

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution commending the 1st Brigade Combat Team/34th Infantry Division of the Minnesota National Guard upon its completion of the longest continuous deployment of any United States military unit during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The message also announced that pursuant to Executive Order 12131, as amended, the Chair reappoints the following Member to the President's Export Council:

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI).

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

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

Printed on recycled paper.

INTRODUCTION OF DR. BILLY FRANKLIN HUDGINS

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our guest chaplain, Dr. Billy Franklin Hudgins. Dr. Hudgins has served selflessly as a pastor in Louisiana, South Carolina, and now in the district I represent in Alabama where he's the senior pastor of Cross Creek Community Church of Hokes Bluff, Alabama.

In addition to pastoral work, Dr. Hudgins has also been very involved with both State and national church leadership organizations. Among the honors he's received, he's served as president of the Alabama Baptist Convention Pastors Conference. He also served as trustee of the International Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Dr. Hudgins has been a teacher and a coach over the course of his career. He has spent 5 years as a bi-vocational pastor and 35 years in churches belonging to the Southern Baptist Convention. If that wasn't enough, at a time when others look toward retirement, at the age of 60, Dr. Bill Hudgins helped start the church he currently serves in Hokes Bluff.

Dr. Hudgins is joined in Washington today by his wife, Connie, with whom he'll be celebrating 46 years of marriage in a matter of weeks. I'm honored to welcome Dr. Billy Hudgins as our guest here in the United States House of Representatives this morning as someone who is a servant and has spent his career as a follower of Jesus, and one who has helped others do the same along life's way.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches.

TROOP WITHDRAWAL STRATEGY

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

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, ending this tragic misadventure in Iraq is necessary but insufficient. How and the means by which we end it is of even greater importance, both to the safety of our troops and to our overall strategic security.

First, our troops. It took us 6 months to extract 6,000 troops out of Somalia after Blackhawk Down, and we inserted 17,000 personnel to guard the retreat. We have not only 160,000 troops in Iraq, but over 100,000 civilians. We must ensure their safety, and that will take approximately 1 year.

Second, that time line of a year is actually the change in strategy that will ensure that we have an aftermath, if we pursue diplomacy with Iran and Syria, to bring about an unfailed state. Recently the intelligence community said Iran does not want a failed government. Therefore, we must approach the end of this war with a strategic approach working with the Republicans. This is our country's war, because the aftermath of its consequences are so great and it requires a strategic end.

MINNESOTA NATIONAL GUARD RETURNS AFTER 16-MONTH DEPLOYMENT TO IRAQ

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 2,600 men and women of the Minnesota National Guard who, after serving our country with great honor and courage, are returning home from their 16-month deployment to Iraq.

Last Friday my friend and colleague, Congressman TIM WALZ, and I had the privilege of visiting Volk Field near Fort McCoy in Wisconsin and welcoming home soldiers from the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 34th Infantry Division, the famed ''Red Bulls.'' It was truly a memorable experience greeting these proud soldiers as they returned from the longest combat deployment of any Army brigade combat team in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Minnesota's ''Red Bulls'' escorted supply convoys and traveled 2.4 million miles in Iraq. Other members of the BCT provided essential security to U.S. bases throughout the country.

Speaking with the fine men and women of the ''Red Bulls'' as they stepped off the plane and smelled that clean, fresh air and stepped on American soil, it became clear that these soldiers are justifiably proud of their accomplishments. The great State of Minnesota and all Americans can be proud as well.

HONORING ROBERT CAUSOR, JR.

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

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert Causor, Jr., a paratrooper rifleman with the 82nd Airborne Division who was killed July 7 by a homemade bomb in Samarra, Iraq.

Robert was born and grew up in San Jose, California. Since childhood, he dreamed of being a soldier, and after graduating from Overfelt High School he enlisted to serve in Iraq. Despite worries from his family, Robert was determined to fulfill his lifelong dream.

To Robert, service in the military was a way to repay his country for the successes of his family. He came from a close family, one of 26 cousins who lived in San Jose for over three decades.

On behalf of California's 16th Congressional District, I offer Robert's family our deepest condolences as they deal with this painful loss. He will be decorated with many honors, including a Bronze Star and a Purple Heart, but today our thoughts and our prayers are with his parents, the rest of his family and his friends.

CONTINUING TO FIGHT TERRORISM ACROSS THE WORLD

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that we are engaged in what truly is a global war on terrorism. The war in which we are fighting does not have borders. It is not contained to Iraq and Afghanistan. Again last week the United Kingdom reported that up to eight police officers and several public officials were uncovered with ties to extremist groups, including al Qaeda, who may have also attended terror training camps in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Everyone should be concerned about the recent series of suicide bombings in northwest Pakistan. Al Qaeda has established safe havens in the border areas of Pakistan, a nuclear armed nation. The tribal area of North Waziristan announced on Sunday that they are ending a 10-month ceasefire with the government. These terrorist attacks follow last week's mass murder of police officers in Algeria, and the beheading of 10 Army personnel in the Philippines. Americans must face the threat that modern civilization is under attack worldwide.

I am proud of our brave men and women in uniform who fight daily to ensure that American families are protected.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we'll never forget September the 11th.

COST OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq has cost, as of last week, every man, woman and child in my district, New York's 19th district, $3,077. Now, for that $3,077, the men, women and children of my district have paid for a war that was a strategic mistake and has been horribly mismanaged.

In the latest example, USA Today revealed that the Pentagon has been even slower than we thought in providing safer vehicles for our troops. According to e-mails within the Pentagon, a Marine general in Iraq requested MRAPs, mine resistant ambush protected vehicles, as far back as December 2003. These vehicles offer the best protection from IEDs for our troops. The number one killer of troops in Iraq are IEDs.

However, while Pentagon leadership delayed in providing these vehicles to U.S. troops, they decided to equip the Iraqi Army with these vehicles, while leaving our soldiers with Humvees. This resulted in the unnecessary deaths of at least 600 Americans.

For $3,000, the taxpayers of my district paid for the best equipment we could buy for the Iraqi Army, but left our soldiers and marines with substandard Humvees. It is time we reorient our priorities, protect our own soldiers, and end this war.

END CURRENCY MANIPULATION AND LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, currency manipulation by our foreign competitors is creating difficult challenges for our country's manufacturing base, particularly our domestic auto industry.

The Wall Street Journal reported in June that ''a cheap yen is making it advantageous for Toyota to increase manufacturing capability and to export cars from Japan, and that it is much more profitable to produce cars in Japan and ship them all to the United States right now.''

And what is the response of the Congress to this threat against the American automotive industry which is directly responsible for the employment of millions of American jobs?

Well, the Democrats control the Congress, and the Democratic leadership has decided that Detroit doesn't have enough on its plate right now. Instead of trying to level the playing field, Democrats want to pile on unworkable new CAFE standards on the domestic auto industry.

Higher CAFE standards will not reduce our dependence on foreign oil, but they will steal investment dollars from technologies that could transform the entire automobile industry and level the global automotive market.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided policy and stand up for American manufacturing companies, stand up for American jobs.

□ 1015

IRAQ IS DISTRACTING US FROM PROTECTING THE HOMELAND AND FIGHTING GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, an interim report last week by the White House confirmed what most observers believe, that the situation in Iraq is not improving. The Iraqi Government has failed to meet the political benchmarks endorsed by the President last January. The Iraqi security forces continue to perform below expected levels. But the President continues to ask us stubbornly to stay the course.

At the same time, U.S. troops are overextended, many having served multiple tours in Iraq. This is unfair to our soldiers, their families, and dangerous for our national security. As Major General John Batiste recently noted, ''Iraq is distracting America from what should be the focus . . . It is in America's best interest to rethink our national strategy, deliberately disengage from Iraq, refit and rearm the military, get serious about homeland security, and prepare to win the next phase of the struggle.

Last week this House voted to do exactly that. This Democratic House joins with the American people and our retired generals in demanding a new direction in Iraq. This week the Senate can join us by supporting the Levin-Reed amendment.

OPERATION SMILE

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

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 25th anniversary of Operation Smile, a worldwide children's medical charity headquartered in Norfolk, Virginia, that repairs cleft lips and cleft palates for children and young adults in developing countries.

Founded in 1982 by Dr. William Magee, Jr., a plastic surgeon, and his wife, Kathleen, a nurse and clinical social worker, Operation Smile has grown from humble beginnings into a worldwide children's medical charity whose network of medical volunteers are dedicated to helping improve the health and lives of children worldwide.

Operation Smile has helped more than 100,000 children and young adults in 30 developing countries overcome their physical irregularities. The organization now operates one of the world's largest volunteer networks, utilizing more than 5,000 medical and nonmedical professionals around the world.

I commend the Magees for their passion to improve the health and lives of children and young adults worldwide. Through Operation Smile, their efforts over the past 25 years have offered new life and new hope to those suffering from facial deformities.

REPUBLICANS CONTINUE TO MOVE AWAY FROM BUSH ON IRAQ; ACTION SPEAKS LOUDER THAN WORDS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Democratic efforts to change direction in Iraq forced the President to issue a preliminary report showing that the Iraqis have not met the benchmarks that they were supposed to. The failure of the Iraqi Government to keep its promises, coupled with continued violence on the ground, the death of our soldiers and Iraqi civilians has led Senate Republicans, at least some of them, to join us in calling for a new direction in Iraq.

Some Senate Republicans see the writing on the wall, writing on the wall in both of our House cloakrooms, but is yet to be seen on the Republican side but for four of our colleagues, for the optometrist hasn't made his way over there. The situation is getting worse for our troops. We will see this week whether Senate Republicans mean what they say and they vote for the Levin-Reed amendment when it comes to the Senate floor tomorrow and bring our troops home. The amendment is close to identical with what the House passed with Democratic votes and four Republicans last week.

The Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki has said they can supply their own defense and they don't need us any longer. When a host says go home, it is only correct to go home. He says they don't need us. We aren't needed. We need to bring our troops home and not have them needlessly die.

MT. SINAI BAPTIST CHURCH

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to pay tribute to Mt. Sinai Baptist Church of Marietta, Georgia, celebrating 143 years of spiritual service to our community.

The history of Mt. Sinai reaches back nearly as far as the history of Marietta itself. In 1864, 1 year before the Civil War ended, a group of black slaves gathered in the backwoods of Georgia and they began their own worship service, and by 1873 the now freed slaves built Mt. Sinai Baptist Church on a plot of land south of Marietta.

They were not content to merely be a house of worship. Mt. Sinai created a school to educate the children of former slaves and became a central gathering place for the whole community.

Mr. Speaker, today Mt. Sinai Baptist Church carries on that tradition as a spiritual and communal leader in Marietta. Currently under the guidance of Pastor Albert Johnson, the church is upholding its legacy of education and outreach, the same commitment that it has displayed for nearly 1½ centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the Mt. Sinai Baptist Church on 143 years of service and request that they have at least 143 more.

THE TRUE COSTS OF THE WAR IN IRAQ TO OUR MILITARY AND TO THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, over the last week, we have seen more proof of the devastating effects that war in Iraq is having on our Nation's budget and military.

Last week CRS reported that the average monthly cost of the Iraq War is now $10 billion a month. That means this year alone, the Bush administration has already spent $60 billion in Iraq. Just imagine how we could have used $60 billion here at home? We could have improved a lot of Americans' lives and addressed our deficit.

The war is also negatively impacting our military. Last week the Army announced it missed its recruiting goals for the 2nd month in a row, falling 1,000 recruits shy of its June goals.

Mr. Speaker, the status quo cannot continue in Iraq. That's why Democrats have repeatedly tried to change the direction of the war, with little help from our friends across the aisle. How much worse do things have to get before congressional Republicans stop blindly following President Bush?

The warning signs of change have been in the air for months. But Republicans refuse to see them.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT WILLIAM ''BILL'' ZAPFE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to honor the life of Sergeant First Class William ''Bill'' Zapfe. Sergeant Zapfe was serving with the Army's 3rd Infantry Division as a combat engineer when he was tragically killed by an improvised explosive device last month. Sergeant Zapfe was a dedicated soldier on his third tour in Iraq.

Bill grew up in Park Hills and Dry Ridge, Kentucky, and joined the military shortly after graduating from high school. He came from a family of dedicated public servants. His late father, Joseph, was a State trooper, and his two brothers, Joseph and Edward, have also both dutifully served our Nation. He is remembered by his family as a loving and devoted husband and father. Bill Zapfe is a true patriot who died fighting for a cause he believed in. Bill leaves behind his mother, Jeanne; his loving wife, Evelyn; and his three children, Anastasia, Cameron, and Spencer.

Today, as we honor the life of Sergeant Zapfe, our thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends during this difficult time.

We thank Sergeant Zapfe for his service and for answering the call to protect our great Nation.

INTERIM REPORT SHOWS THAT A NEW DIRECTION IS NEEDED IN IRAQ

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, last week the White House released an interim report on Iraq that unfortunately reaffirms what we have known for quite some time: The President's troop escalation plan is not working and we are desperately in need of a new direction in Iraq.

Since the President announced his surge 6 months ago, we have lost 600 American troops and spent another $60 billion. And yet by the Bush administration's own admission, there is unsatisfactory progress on all of the political reconciliation benchmarks announced by the President in January.

Mr. Speaker, just days after this report was released, the White House once again asked for more time to pursue the President's failed strategy. But the American people and this Democratic Congress know that more time and lower standards are no substitute for real progress.

It is time for a new direction in Iraq. The House acted last week. The Senate has the opportunity this week. They should join us in changing course.

SCHIP TAX INCREASE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as the body here begins the debate on the SCHIP reauthorization plan, separate from Medicaid, I would encourage my colleagues not to lose sight of the purpose of this program, which is insuring underprivileged children.

When we created this program in 1997, it was intended to provide health insurance for children at or around 200 percent of the poverty line. Today in States like Minnesota, almost 40,000 people are enrolled in SCHIP; 34,000 of them are adults.

The Democrats want to expand this program up to 400 percent of the Federal poverty line. This type of expansion would allow a family of four with an income level of more than $80,000 to be eligible for the SCHIP program in some parts of this country.

Let's get our priorities straight. We want to provide insurance for underprivileged children, not adults who can afford to pay for it themselves.

LET'S FOCUS ON THE REAL THREAT

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, President Bush said last week al Qaeda in Iraq attacked us on 9/11.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is there was no al Qaeda in Iraq on 9/11. In fact, we helped create al Qaeda in Iraq by our invasion. And what we are going to learn today from our intelligence service report is 4 years in Iraq has made al Qaeda stronger around the world.

So let's get our facts straight in this war and focus on the real threat in a smart and intelligent way.

NYPD OFFICER RUSSEL TIMOSHENKO

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, those who wear the badge of a peace officer do so with valor and the determination to serve their community. NYPD Officer Russel Timoshenko was one of those peace officers.

Officer Timoshenko chose to be an American citizen and legally immigrated to the United States from Russia in 1993. He followed the law to get here and then became a protector of the law as a member of New York City's Finest.

Around 2:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 10, 2007 Officers Timoshenko and Herman Yan stopped an SUV on a dark New York City street. As the officers approached the SUV, the passengers turned and gunned down both officers. Officer Yan was shot in the chest and arm, and he will recover. Russel Timoshenko was shot twice in the face, and Saturday the 23-year-old officer died. He had been a New York City cop for only 18 months. Two outlaws have been arrested for murder.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Russel Timoshenko was the American Dream, a naturalized citizen who dedicated his life and service to American citizens. America can use more American immigrant citizens who wear the badge.

And that's just the way it is.

COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING AND DETECTION COVERAGE ACT

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the importance of access to colorectal cancer screening tests for Americans.

Like far too many other Americans, my life has been touched by cancer. Nine years ago I lost my mother, Janna, to colon cancer. I understand too well the importance of catching cancer early.

Colorectal cancer is a leading killer in the United States that will unnecessarily take the lives of more than 52,000 of our constituents. This is a tragedy because we have every tool necessary to prevent suffering and almost all death from this disease.

Last September I took very seriously the fact that I signed the 2015 Pledge to

do anything possible to eliminate suffering and death due to cancer by the year 2015. Today I take a step in that direction.

Twenty-two States and the District of Columbia have protections in place to provide access to screening and early detection for colorectal cancer. It is time that the rest of the country has the same access that could save their lives.

Please join me and my friend from Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, as we introduce the Colorectal Cancer Screening and Detection Coverage Act.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today the liberal leadership of this House will call up H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employee-Employer Cooperation Act.

It sounds harmless. But let's not mince words. This bill is not concerned with public safety. It's a payoff from the left to the powerful labor unions that finance many of their campaigns.

The liberal leadership already bowed to union pressure by passing legislation to strip workers of the right to vote in a private ballot election. Now they are attempting to federalize collective bargaining for public safety professionals.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police opposes the legislation because it would effectively take power from State and local governments during labor-management relations. I oppose it because it will likely make our communities less safe.

Mr. Speaker, there is a time and there is a place for politics, but not when our lives and the safety of our communities is at stake.

□ 1030

SENATE HAS A CHANCE TO TAKE ACTION TO CHANGE THE COURSE OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, for weeks now, the Republican Senators have been coming forward saying that the status quo in Iraq cannot continue. They're right. This week they have an opportunity to act on those words. We'll see if they join us in changing the course of the war, or if they find another excuse as to why they must continue to support President Bush's failed policy. I would hope that they would stand by their words.

Senator LUGAR correctly stated, ''The President and some of his advisers may be tempted to pursue the surge strategy to the end of his administration, but such a course contains extreme risks for United States national security.'' Senator VOINOVICH correctly stated, ''A policy of responsive military disengagement, with a corresponding increase in nonmilitary support, is the best way to advance our Nation's interests in Iraq and achieve our primary goals.'' Senator DOMENICI again correctly stated, ''There's nothing to wait for.''

We agree. That's why this House voted last week to bring most of our troops home by next April. The Senate has the chance to take that same action this week. I hope that these Senators will stand by their words and join us in changing the course.

BUSH ANNOUNCES THAT IRAQ HAS NOT MET ONE OF THE BENCHMARKS THEY PROMISED TO MEET

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President's preliminary progress report on Iraq showed no progress at all. In fact, the Bush administration admitted that the Iraqi government failed to meet any of its targets for political or economic progress.

You would think that this report would serve as a wake-up call to the Bush administration. It hasn't. It's clear that President Bush does not want to change a thing. In fact, the Washington Post reported that the administration is not considering a strategic change, but simply a shift in message.

Mr. Speaker, the failures in Iraq have nothing to do with message. President Bush promised that the Iraqi government would meet these benchmarks when he announced his troop escalation plan earlier this year. Many of us were skeptical that the Iraqis would actually follow through. And now that it's clear that the government has failed to meet any of the benchmarks, a shift in message is simply not enough.

Democrats have a plan to bring our troops home by April of next year. It's time for the Iraqis to take accountability for their own country. And that's why we passed the Republican Redeployment Act last week, and the Senate should follow our lead this week.

BOEHNER CALLING SENATORS ''WIMPS''; HOUSE REPUBLICANS REFUSE TO CHANGE COURSE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that 70 percent of Americans support withdrawing almost all U.S. troops from Iraq by April, and despite a growing number of retired generals and senior Republican Senators joining Democrats in calling for a new strategy in Iraq, many House Republicans remain staunchly in favor of the President's failed Iraq policy. In fact, just last week, the leader of the House Republicans referred to the Senate Republicans who have spoken out against President Bush's failed policy as ''wimps.'' And it begs the question, doesn't the minority leader believe 70 percent of Americans and numerous retired generals are wimps as well?

It's a much easier thing to toe the line and keep rubber-stamping the President's failed Iraq policy, as many Republicans in this body continue to do. It's a lot easier to do that than break from your party and the will of our President to take a principled stand for what you believe. Those Republicans who are against the President's policies are the true patriots.

Mr. Speaker, despite the name calling, Democrats will continue to push for a responsible redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq, and we hope that some of our Republican colleagues here in the House will join with us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COOPERATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 980) to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 980

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Labor-management relationships and partnerships are based on trust, mutual respect, open communication, bilateral consensual problem solving, and shared accountability. In many public safety agencies it is the union that provides the institutional stability as elected leaders and appointees come and go.

(2) State and local public safety officers play an essential role in the efforts of the United States to detect, prevent, and respond to terrorist attacks, and to respond to natural disasters, hazardous materials, and other mass casualty incidents. As the first to arrive on scene, State and local public safety officers must be prepared to protect life and property and to preserve scarce and vital Federal resources, avoid substantial and debilitating interference with

interstate and foreign commerce, and to protect the national security of the United States. Public safety employer-employee cooperation is essential in meeting these needs and is, therefore, in the National interest.

(3) The health and safety of the Nation and the best interests of public safety employers and employees may be furthered by the settlement of issues through the processes of collective bargaining.

(4) The Federal Government is in the position to encourage conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration to aid and encourage employers and the representatives of their employees to reach and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, and to make all reasonable efforts through negotiations to settle their differences by mutual agreement reached through collective bargaining or by such methods as may be provided for in any applicable agreement for the settlement of disputes.

(5) The potential absence of adequate cooperation between public safety employers and employees has implications for the security of employees, impacts the upgrading of police and fire services of local communities, the health and well-being of public safety officers, and the morale of the fire and police departments, and can affect interstate and intrastate commerce.

(6) Many States and localities already provide public safety officers with collective bargaining rights comparable to or greater than the rights and responsibilities set forth in this Act, and such State laws should be respected.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term ''Authority'' means the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

(2) The term ''public safety officer''—

(A) means an employee of a public safety agency who is a law enforcement officer, a firefighter, or emergency medical services personnel;

(B) includes an individual who is temporarily transferred to a supervisory or management position; and

(C) does not include a permanent supervisory or management employee.

(3) The term ''firefighter'' has the same meaning given the term ''employee in fire protection activities'' defined in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 203(y)).

(4) The term ''emergency medical services personnel'' means an individual who provides out-of-hospital emergency medical care, including an emergency medical technician, paramedic, or first responder.

(5) The term ''law enforcement officer'' has the same meaning given such term in section 1204(5) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b(5)).

(6) The term ''supervisory employee'' has the meaning given such term, or a substantially equivalent term, under applicable State law on the date of enactment of this Act. In the absence of such State law on the date of enactment of this Act, the term means an individual, employed by a public safety employer, who—

(A) has the authority in the interest of the employer to hire, direct, assign, promote, reward, transfer, furlough, lay off, recall, suspend, discipline, or remove public safety officers, to adjust their grievances, or to effectively recommend such action, if the exercise of the authority is not merely routine or clerical in nature but requires the consistent exercise of independent judgment; and

(B) devotes a preponderance of employment time exercising such authority.

(7) The term ''management employee'' has the meaning given such term, or a substantially equivalent term, under applicable State law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act. If no such State law is in effect, the term means an individual employed by a public safety employer in a position that requires or authorizes the individual to formulate, determine, or influence the policies of the employer.

(8) The terms ''employer'' and ''public safety agency'' mean any State, political subdivision of a State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States that employs public safety officers.

(9) The term ''labor organization'' means an organization composed in whole or in part of employees, in which employees participate, and the purpose of which is to represent such employees before public safety agencies concerning grievances, conditions of employment and related matters.

(10) The term ''substantially provides'' means substantial compliance with the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b).

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Authority shall make a determination as to whether a State substantially provides for the rights and responsibilities described in subsection (b). In making such determinations, the Authority shall consider the opinion of affected employers and labor organizations. Where the Authority is notified by an employer and an affected labor organization that both parties agree that the law applicable to such employer and labor organization substantially provides for the rights and responsibilities described in subsection (b), the Authority shall give such agreement weight to the maximum extent practicable in making its determination under this subsection.

(2) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATIONS.—(A) A determination made pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain in effect unless and until the Authority issues a subsequent determination, in accordance with the procedures set forth in subparagraph (B).

(B) An employer or a labor organization may submit a written request for a subsequent determination, on the basis of a material change in State law or its interpretation. If the Authority determines that a material change in State law or its interpretation has occurred, the Authority shall issue a subsequent determination not later than 30 days after receipt of such request.

(3) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any person aggrieved by a determination of the Authority under this section may, during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the determination was made, petition any United States Court of Appeals in the circuit in which the person resides or transacts business or in District of Columbia circuit, for judicial review. In any judicial review of a determination by the Authority, the procedures contained in section 7123(c) of title 5, United States Code, shall be followed.

(b) RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—In making a determination described in subsection (a), the Authority shall consider a State's law to provide adequate rights and responsibilities unless such law fails to substantially provide rights and responsibilities comparable to or greater than each of the following:

(1) Granting public safety officers the right to form and join a labor organization, which may exclude management and supervisory employees, that is, or seeks to be, recognized as the exclusive bargaining representative of such employees.

(2) Requiring public safety employers to recognize the employees' labor organization (freely chosen by a majority of the employees), to agree to bargain with the labor organization, and to commit any agreements to writing in a contract or memorandum of understanding.

(3) Providing for bargaining over hours, wages, and terms and conditions of employment.

(4) Making available an interest impasse resolution mechanism, such as fact-finding, mediation, arbitration, or comparable procedures.

(5) Requiring enforcement through State courts of—

(A) all rights, responsibilities, and protections provided by State law and enumerated in this subsection; and

(B) any written contract or memorandum of understanding.

(c) FAILURE TO MEET REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Authority determines, acting pursuant to its authority under subsection (a), that a State does not substantially provide for the rights and responsibilities described in subsection (b), such State shall be subject to the regulations and procedures described in section 5.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall apply in each State on the later of—

(A) 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) the date of the end of the first regular session of the legislature of that State that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. ROLE OF THE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Authority shall issue regulations establishing procedures which provide the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b) for public safety employers and officers in States which the Authority has determined, acting pursuant to its authority under section 4(a), do not substantially provide for such rights and responsibilities.

(b) ROLE OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY.—The Authority, to the extent provided in this Act and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Authority, shall—

(1) determine the appropriateness of units for labor organization representation;

(2) supervise and conduct elections to determine whether a labor organization has been selected as an exclusive representative by a voting majority of the employees in an appropriate unit;

(3) resolve issues relating to the duty to bargain in good faith;

(4) conduct hearings and resolve complaints of unfair labor practices;

(5) resolve exceptions to the awards of arbitrators;

(6) protect the right of each employee to form, join, or assist any labor organization, or to refrain from any such activity, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, and protect each employee in the exercise of such right;

(7) if the Authority finds that any State is not in compliance with the regulations prescribed under subsection (a), direct compliance by such State by order; and

(8) take such other actions as are necessary and appropriate to effectively administer this Act, including issuing subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary or other evidence from any place in the United States, and administering oaths, taking or ordering the taking of depositions, ordering responses to written interrogatories, and receiving and examining witnesses.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) PETITION BY AUTHORITY.—If a State fails to comply with a final order issued by the Authority, the Authority shall petition any United States Court of Appeals with jurisdiction over the parties or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit to enforce any final orders under this section, and for appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order. Any petition under this section shall be conducted in accordance with section 7123(c) and (d) of title 5, United States Code, except that any final order of the Authority with respect to questions of fact shall be found to be conclusive unless the court determines that the Authority's decision was arbitrary and capricious.

(2) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Unless the Authority has filed a petition for enforcement as provided in paragraph (1), any interested party shall have the right to file suit against any political subdivision of a State, or, if the State has waived its sovereign immunity, against the State

itself, in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction to enforce compliance with the regulations issued by the Authority pursuant to subsection (b), to enforce compliance with any order issued by the Authority pursuant to this section, or to enforce section 6 of this Act. The right provided by this paragraph to bring a suit to enforce compliance with any order issued by the Authority pursuant to this section shall terminate upon the filing of a petition seeking the same relief by the Authority under paragraph (1).

SEC. 6. STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS PROHIBITED.

Notwithstanding any rights or responsibilities provided under State law or under regulations issued by the Authority under section 5—

(1) a public safety employer may not engage in a lockout of public safety officers;

(2) public safety officers may not engage in a strike against such public safety employer; and

(3) a labor organization may not call for a strike by public safety officers against their public safety employer.

SEC. 7. EXISTING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNITS AND AGREEMENTS.

This Act and the regulations issued under this Act shall not be construed to invalidate a certification, recognition, collective bargaining agreement, or memorandum of understanding which has been issued, approved, or ratified by any public employee relations board or commission or by any State or political subdivision or its agents (management officials) in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, or the results of any election held before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. CONSTRUCTION, COMPLIANCE, AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the regulations issued under this Act shall be construed—

(1) to preempt or limit the remedies, rights, and procedures of any law of any State or political subdivision of any State or jurisdiction that substantially provides greater or comparable rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b);

(2) to prevent a State from enforcing a State law which prohibits employers and labor organizations from negotiating provisions in a labor agreement that require union membership or payment of union fees as a condition of employment;

(3) to preempt any State law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that substantially provides for the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b) solely because—

(A) such State law permits an employee to appear in his or her own behalf with respect to his or her employment relations with the public safety agency involved;

(B) such State law excludes from its coverage employees of a state militia or national guard;

(C) such rights and responsibilities have not been extended to other categories of employees covered by this Act, in which case the Authority shall only exercise the powers provided in section 5 of this Act with respect to those categories of employees who have not been afforded the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b); or

(D) such laws or ordinances provide that a contract or memorandum of understanding between a public safety employer and a labor organization must be presented to a legislative body as part of the process for approving such contract or memorandum of understanding;

(4) to permit parties subject to the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) and the regulations under such Act to negotiate provisions that would prohibit an employee from engaging in part-time employment or volunteer activities during off-duty hours;

(5) to require a State to rescind or preempt laws or ordinances of any of its political subdivisions if such laws substantially provide rights and responsibilities for public safety officers that are comparable to or greater than the rights and responsibilities enumerated in section 4(b) of this Act; or

(6) preempt any State law that substantially provides for the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b) solely because such law does not require bargaining with respect to pension and retirement benefits.

(b) PARTIAL EXEMPTION.—A State may exempt from its State law, or from the requirements established under this Act, a political subdivision of the State that has a population of less than 5,000 or that employs fewer than 25 full time employees. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''employees'' includes each individual employed by the political subdivision except any individual elected by popular vote or appointed to serve on a board or commission.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of the Act, and in the absence of a waiver of a State's sovereign immunity, the Authority shall have the exclusive power to enforce the provisions of this Act with respect to public safety officers employed by a State.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material relevant to H.R. 980 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be sponsor of H.R. 980, along with my good friend from Tennessee, Mr. JOHN DUNCAN.

H.R. 980 extends to firefighters, police officers, corrections officers and other public safety officers the basic right to discuss workplace issues with their employers. Public safety officers, who risk their lives to protect us, deserve a say in decisions that affect their lives and their livelihood.

We have addressed concerns raised during the hearing held on the legislation in the Education and Labor Committee and strengthened this strongly bipartisan bill. This bipartisanship of this legislation is demonstrated by the 280 cosponsors of this bill and a 42–1 bipartisan vote in favor of this bill during the markup in the Education and Labor Committee.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER, Chairman ANDREWS and the committee staff for all their support on this important legislation. I wish to also thank Ranking Member MCKEON and Ranking Member KLINE and their staff for their work with us on this legislation.

I first introduced this legislation more than a decade ago back in 1995. It has been a long journey to today, and this legislation is long overdue for our Nation's public safety employees.

I would also like to thank the groups that we have worked with on this legislation, including, among others, the International Association of Firefighters, the Fraternal Order of Police, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the International Union of Police Associations and the National Association of Police Organizations.

The absence of the right to collectively bargain denies these public servants the opportunity to influence decisions that affect their work and their family. Our firefighters and police officers risk their lives to keep us safe, yet there are some States in this country that deny them the right to discuss workplace issues with their employers, a right most Americans have. At the very least, they should be allowed to negotiate for wages, hours and safe working conditions.

When I was in the State legislature in Michigan, I helped pass legislation that granted all public employees the right to collectively bargain. In Michigan, this has led to a working environment that effectively protects the public and that both employers and employees are proud of.

H.R. 980 would merely create a minimum standard that States have the flexibility to implement, regulate and enforce as they see fit. Many States, such as my own State of Michigan, have laws in place that go well beyond H.R. 980, and these States would not be affected by this legislation. Additionally, this legislation does not allow strikes or lockouts, and it preserves management rights.

Firefighters and police officers are very serious about their commitment to public safety. They deserve the basic right to sit down with their employers and discuss their work conditions.

The reasonableness of this legislation again is demonstrated by the wide bipartisan support it has from its 280 cosponsors. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this legislation.

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

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

I rise today in strong support of this legislation. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007.

Firefighters and police officers put their lives on the line to protect us, and they deserve the right to collectively bargain for safe working conditions and fair wages.

Recent events remind us of their heroism. It was a week ago today that a plane crashed into two homes in Sanford, Florida, just outside my hometown of Orlando, Florida. An off-duty firefighter named Ryan Cooper was nearby when he heard the plane roaring toward the houses. As the airplane smashed the two homes and exploded

them into flames, Ryan Cooper went into action. He rushed into the smoldering homes and brought out a 10-year year-old boy and his father.

Firefighter Ryan Cooper is a true hero. From his hospital bed, where he was being treated for smoke inhalation, Mr. Cooper humbly said that any firefighter would have done the same thing.

Sometimes firefighters pay the ultimate sacrifice. Just last month, nine firefighters in Charleston, South Carolina lost their lives fighting a blaze at a furniture store. These acts of heroism highlight the dangerous nature of public safety officers' jobs.

This legislation gets the ball in the strike zone. On the one hand, it allows firefighters and police officers to collectively bargain for better working conditions and fair wages. On the other hand, it expressly outlaws strikes, and it does not overturn State right-to-work laws. In short, this bill is fair and reasonable and deserves our bipartisan support.

Finally, let me address the main concern raised by some folks about this legislation. They say that this legislation would mandate compulsory unionism in right-to-work States. That simply isn't the case. Section 8, subsections 2 and 3, specifically state that this legislation would not preempt State right-to-work laws. In other words, this legislation allows States to enforce laws that prevent employers and unions from requiring union fees as a condition of employment.

Many people confuse collective bargaining with right to work. The two can coexist. For example, firefighters currently enjoy collective bargaining rights in my home State of Florida, yet Florida is a right-to-work State.

In closing, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for all his hard work on this bill. Mr. KILDEE has been a tireless advocate for this legislation.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. MILLER, and the majority staff for working with the minority to make some changes and improvements in this bill, particularly those that address issues which were raised during consideration of this bill in committee. I would also like to thank the lead Republican cosponsor of this legislation, Mr. JIMMY DUNCAN from Tennessee, for his work.

I will be voting for H.R. 980 today, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. KILDEE. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. KELLER for his hard work on this bill. He has made it a joy working on the bill, and I thank him for that.

I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Health, Employment, Labor and Pensions Subcommittee that had jurisdiction over this bill, such time as he may consume.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to begin by thanking Mr. KELLER for his strong statement of support of the legislation, Mr. DUNCAN for his very vigorous advocacy of this bill, Mr. MCKEON for his cooperation in getting it here today, obviously Chairman MILLER for his leadership, and especially my friend and colleague from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

For Mr. KILDEE, this has been a 12-year effort, an endurance test, where he has built a coalition of all different kinds of groups across party lines and around the country for a very worthy piece of legislation. So Mr. Speaker, I would commend my good friend for his persistence and congratulate him on a job beautifully done on this legislation.

There is a strong bipartisan consensus for this legislation because it's all about common sense.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans would agree that, almost without exception, every American should have the right to bargain collectively and organize and join or not join a union. This legislation gives that right to our career firefighters, police officers, emergency service personnel, corrections officers, and other public safety officials.

□ 1045

There is a commonsense consensus that because of the significant work that these individuals do, they should not have the right to strike if there is a difficult contract negotiation. Under this bill they do not. There is not a right to strike created by this bill because we recognize the difficulty that strikes would create in the public safety field.

There is a commonsense consensus that there should not be a one-size-fits-all national rule to govern police officers, firefighters and public safety personnel in each of the 50 States and other jurisdictions. That is not what this bill does.

It creates a set of standards. It says that if a State and local jurisdiction meet those standards, then public sector collective bargaining laws stay in place without exception or change. But it says, in those States with the right to bargain collectively, the right to organize, the right to grieve are not fully recognized, where those States do not come up to standard, then there is a new Federal procedure that would guarantee men and women these rights.

The critics of this legislation say it is a threat to public safety. There is not a shred of evidence that that is the case. Not a shred. There is not a difference in crime rates where there is collective bargaining among public safety professionals. There is not a negative difference in absenteeism or other chain-of-command type of issues.

Frankly, we saw a dramatic example of just how wrong that point of view is. On September the 11th, the police officers and firefighters and other public safety personnel in and around New York City, the Port Authority, the New York City Fire Department, the New York City Police Department, those public safety professionals who responded to this great crisis were all unionized. Many of them were in the middle of a difficult contract process where there was strong disagreement between the City of New York and the union as to what to do next.

Not one of those men or women failed to respond nobly and heroically to the crisis this country faced. Not one. When they went up the stairs in the towers as they were about to crumble, no one talked about whether they were in a union or not. When the New York City Fire Department lost more people in 1 day than it previously had done in months and years before that, no one talked about a contract dispute. These individuals responded nobly and heroically. So the suggestion that there is some corrosion of public safety because of unionization is unsupported by the evidence and just flat-out wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. KILDEE for the strong bipartisan coalition he has built. I would urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' in favor of this bill.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my fellow east Tennessean, JIMMY DUNCAN, who is the lead Republican and original cosponsor of this legislation and has been a true champion of this issue.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), who very rightly claims east Tennessee as a home also. I am pleased to join with him. I want to commend him for his work on this legislation. I also want to especially commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for their comments about this legislation.

I originally agreed to cosponsor H.R. 980 several years ago, several Congresses ago, at the request of firefighters and police officers from my district. I certainly am not anti-union, nor am I controlled by any union. I strongly believe, though, that no one should be forced to join a union. But I also feel that anyone who chooses to organize or join a labor union should have that right. Employees should be able to make this decision for themselves. In fact, I am a cosponsor, and have been in several Congresses, of H.R. 697, the National Right-to-Work Act. This legislation would prohibit compulsory union membership by applying the right-to-work laws that we have in Tennessee to the entire Nation.

In regard to H.R. 980, I want to emphasize four of the act's main points and then provide some additional details. First, this bill specifically prohibits strikes and lockouts by public safety employees and employers, as has been pointed out by previous speakers.

Second, the bill is not mandatory. It is totally voluntary and, therefore, is a right-to-work bill. Third, it does not federalize or nationalize this aspect of labor relations. The important details would still be governed by State law.

As has been pointed out by some other speakers, several States give their public safety employees more collective bargaining rights than this bill, and it certainly hasn't caused any problems that anyone knows of in those States.

Finally, this bill would simply give firefighters and police officers some, but not all, of the rights enjoyed by other workers. The legislation provides very limited collective bargaining rights and does not give State and local public safety employees the right to strike or numerous other rights that almost all other employees have.

Over the years, Congress has enacted a number of laws granting such rights to other workers and has expanded the scope of collective bargaining laws to govern private sector, nonprofit association, transportation and Federal Government employees.

Since the enactment of the Congressional Accountability Act, State and local public safety employees are the only workers left in America who do not have the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements with their employers. While most States provide collective bargaining rights for these employees, others do not.

When this legislation was being considered originally during the 105th Congress, local firefighters and police officers contacted me directly regarding the bill. Unfortunately, as local elected officials changed, these public safety workers have found that their benefits and wages have sometimes been subject to change, too. These firefighters and police officers feel that this legislation will help them establish consistency in their benefits between the administrations.

Firefighters and police officers have taken an oath to protect public safety. I believe that these individuals should have the opportunity to voice their concerns about issues affecting their livelihood. These brave people risk their lives for public safety every day and should have the same rights as workers in other fields.

Mr. Speaker, let me just mention, as others have, that the Fraternal Order of Police and other police of the National Association of Police Organizations are supporting this bill, and the International Association of Firefighters.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I will close just by emphasizing once again that this legislation would give firefighters and police officers an option to participate in collective bargaining discussions but would not require such action.

I think the good labor unions do not need compulsory unionism agreements. I believe that this is a bill that is encouraging and voluntary, and I urge its support.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank Mr. DUNCAN for his hard work on this bill. He is, as we all know, a study in civility, and civility certainly helps in this House. He also illustrates that we can sit down in a bipartisan way and seek solutions. I thank him for his work on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, both for the time and for his leadership in this bipartisan effort. I am so happy as a new Member of Congress to be here to join him and support this legislation today, because it is about fairness for those on the front lines protecting our neighborhoods and communities, our firefighters and law enforcement officers.

This bill is about ensuring these public safety employees, these heroes, have the right to ensure their voices are heard in the workplace. Not only do they deserve this right, we owe it to these public servants who risk their lives and put their safety on the line every day to protect our families and our communities.

Our legislation simply gives them the same rights that so many other workers around this Nation retain. These people who put the public first deserve to be heard on the matters that affect their livelihood.

For our firefighters, police officers, EMTs and other public safety officers, let's rise beyond the words of support, pass this bill, and make it clear that we respect and admire the work and sacrifice of these brave men and women.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill. I urge opposition of H.R. 980 because it will force unions' so-called representation on public safety employees.

Labor relations between States and their public employees have historically remained at the State level. H.R. 980 would impose Federal law on States that do not meet forced unionism standards defined in this piece of legislation. Furthermore, the bill fails to ensure a secret ballot election for public employees who would be given the right to unionize under this legislation.

H.R. 980 would deny thousands of police and firemen the freedom to negotiate directly with their employers. Those who attempt to negotiate on their own behalf could face fines and even firings. Unionizing a public sector workforce also requires hiring and training staff to negotiate with unions and administer union contracts which would impose unnecessary financial burdens on taxpayers.

Don't allow the Federal Government to impose costly and inappropriate requirements on State and local governments. State and local governments are capable of managing their own public employees. I urge opposition to H.R. 980, to ensure each State's right to define labor laws for their own public employees.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my chairman and the chairman of the full Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I want to thank Mr. KILDEE for his authorship of this legislation for over, I believe, 12 years now in support of this legislation, and Mr. DUNCAN, his cosponsor, for the same years, to try and provide for the organization of our public safety officers around the country.

I want to thank Mr. KELLER for his work on the subcommittee and Mr. ANDREWS for shepherding this bill through the committee. With the 280 cosponsors of this legislation, which obviously represents very strong bipartisan support, this legislation clearly demonstrates that this Congress is committed to protecting the rights and the livelihoods of our first responders, and this legislation stands in tribute to these dedicated men and women. I am proud that the Education and Labor Committee was able to pass H.R. 980 out of the committee almost unanimously by a vote of 42–1.

Firefighters, police officers, correction officers and emergency medical technicians risk their lives each and every day to protect our lives and this country. H.R. 980 will ensure that all public safety officers have a right to sit down with their employers and bargain over wages and working conditions.

While States and cities and towns have historically managed their own labor relations, approximately 28 States do not fully protect the collective bargaining rights of public safety employees. That is why this legislation is so necessary. This legislation would respect those States that already provide for collective bargaining rights for public safety employees, but it would extend those rights in all other States.

The bill would provide basic labor protections for State and local public safety workers, including the right to join a union, the right to have their union recognized by their employer, the right to bargain collectively over hours, wages, terms and conditions of employment, a mediation or arbitration process for resolving the impasse in negotiations, and enforcement through the courts.

H.R. 980 will give public safety officers a voice in issues like safety on the job and effective delivery of services. It will improve communications and cooperation between rank-and-file public safety employees and their employers, ensuring a more cohesive and coordinated operation.

□ 1100

That's the crux of this legislation. This gives the rights of these negotiations, the rights of these discussions, the rights to have a union, to the very same people that we trust every day to protect our lives, to protect our communities, to protect our country, both before and after a terrorist attack, before and after a criminal act. These are the people that we trust to do this.

This legislation, under the authorship of Mr. KILDEE and Mr. DUNCAN, also suggests that we trust them to have a responsible say in their workplace conditions, in how they carry out their job, to make suggestions, to negotiate with their employers, to more effectively carry out their duties. I think it is a long time coming. I think this legislation and its very broad cosponsorship indicate this could have been done much sooner, but it is going to be done today. It is going to pass the House today. I believe it will pass with large bipartisan support. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

I also want to say that the fact that this legislation is here today, although 12 years late, is maybe a hallmark of Mr. KILDEE's career, and that is persistence. He doesn't give up on an idea because others disagree. He has pushed for this legislation year in and year out. He was not allowed to have it heard for passage, and this year we were able to accommodate him and Mr. DUNCAN. When we do that, we are also accommodating and supporting our first responders all across the country who need these rights to better do the job that we have handed to them, a very difficult, a very dangerous job. I would hope that the House would pass this legislation overwhelmingly.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my next speaker, what is the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me this time.

There is no one who appreciates firefighters, police and other public safety personnel more than I do. However, I rise in opposition to H.R. 980 because public sector labor relations has never been and should not be an issue with which Congress meddles. Historically, the terms and conditions of employment for all State and local employees has been an issue decided on the State and local level. This is the way it should be.

Some States, such as my home State of North Carolina, have laws banning monopoly bargaining schemes, while others give unions total control over public sector labor relations. Most States fall somewhere in the middle.

But in a move that chips away at States rights, this bill requires all States to set up systems to impose monopoly bargaining on all public safety workers, in effect nullifying the pre-existing laws of 27 States. A move like this is a virtually unprecedented infringement on States rights.

I want to be perfectly clear. Every worker in America, whether public or private, already has the right to form and join a union. That is not the question here. What the unions are asking for is the power to force their so-called ''representation'' on police and firefighters who do not want it. While some States have made what I view as the mistaken decision of giving unions that kind of power, that is their right under our Federal system.

This bill is flawed in that it takes away the right of States to make the decision on their own. At the end of the day, this issue does not belong in our hands. It should be left to the States. And, frankly, it is not Congress's business.

More than half the States in the country have refused to grant union bosses the complete monopoly control over public safety employment mandated by H.R. 980. They have done this not only as a rightful exercise of their States rights, but in the interest of keeping costs low for their taxpayers.

Studies have shown that monopoly bargaining increases costs for taxpayers. Multiplied across dozens of States, this would impose millions of new costs on taxpayers. State and local governments should have jurisdiction over their own employees, not the Federal Government.

The fact that this bill inserts the Federal Government into an issue that has always been one left to the States should give us pause, and it ought to make us wonder why it is being passed under suspension today. Any bill that makes this sort of dramatic change to public policy should be subject to the regular order of full debate and amendments.

Please, I ask my colleagues to join me in protecting the rights of States and vote against H.R. 980 today.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I support the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act providing our first responders with a right that they deserve which has long been withheld, the right of collective bargaining. Many Americans have this right, and our first responders should not be left out.

In professions where working together can mean and does mean the difference between life and death for workers and citizens in our communities, cooperation in a healthy working environment is critical.

In my home State of Vermont, first responders have the right of collective bargaining. We are very proud of them. That right should be extended to their colleagues across the Nation.

Last fall I had an opportunity to participate in firefighting training at the Vermont Fire Academy in Pittsford, Vermont. I suited up in jackets, pants, and oxygen mask. And you know what I learned, the work they do is hard. The work they do is dangerous.

We must make certain that they feel fully entitled to represent themselves at the bargaining table for safe and decent conditions.

Representative KILDEE and Representative DUNCAN, thank you for your leadership in this overdue legislation.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Florida for yielding, and when I came to the floor today, I didn't come here to speak; but, you know, my father was a fireman for 26 years for the City of Atlanta. In fact, he died in an alarm. I know what it is like for these firefighters to answer the alarms. He suffered a heart attack while turning off an OS&Y valve in a pit. It was 18 degrees that December morning. I know what it is like for those firefighters. But, you know, my father never belonged to a firefighters union, and that is what this is. This is basically a union bill and payback to the unions.

But, you know, Georgia is a right-to-work State. We have a 10th amendment to our Constitution. I was very disappointed to hear from the chairman that this thing passed out of committee 42–1. That breaks my heart. That really breaks my heart that those Republicans were on that side. I don't know what the majority thinks about the 10th amendment, but I believe very strongly in it. This has something to do with States rights. And I am sorry and I am very disappointed that this House will do this under suspension and there won't be any opportunity for amendments or this thing to be looked at.

I hope that the majority of the Members here will realize what is going on, oppose this suspension and bring it up under regular order.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to respond to our friend from Georgia's comment about compulsory unionism and affirm something my friend from Florida said earlier about compulsory unionism.

Section 8(a)(2) of this bill says that nothing in this act or the regulations issued under this act shall be construed to prevent a State from enforcing a State law which prohibits employers and labor organizations from negotiating provisions in a labor agreement that require union membership or payment of union fees as a condition of employment.

This bill expressly preserves the rights of States to maintain so-called right-to-work laws in their State. I want the record to reflect that point, that the gentleman's concerns about the Georgia Constitution are met in this bill.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I have no further speakers, but I will say this. First of all, this has been a great example of bipartisanship on an issue that very often has divided us. This has brought us together. I think this is a great historical moment. Democrats and Republicans. It was 42–1 in committee, and I think that is something to be said in this body. I think this illustrates that on an issue that very often divides us, labor issues, when it comes to a specific group of these first responders, we can find a way to resolve that division.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I don't believe we have any other speakers.

Let me just begin by saying what this bill does not do to provide some reassurance to some of my Republican colleagues who may be concerned.

This bill expressly does not allow public safety officers to go on strike. This bill does not preempt State right-to-work laws. This bill does not require compulsory unionism. This bill does not require binding arbitration.

I think we all agree that firefighters and police officers risk their lives every single day and they are entitled to make fair wages and have working conditions that are as safe as possible. This legislation is fair and balanced, and that is why it has received such broad bipartisan support.

On the one hand it does allow firefighters and police officers to collectively bargain for better working conditions and fair wages. On the other hand, it expressly outlaws strikes and does not overturn State right-to-work laws. For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to do what I am about to do and vote ''yes'' on this important bipartisan legislation.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act. I commend my friend, Congressman KILDEE for bringing this legislation forward and I am honored to be a cosponsor.

As a former labor organizer, I know firsthand the importance of collective bargaining. I would not be here today as a Member of Congress if it were not for my union. Yet, 21 States do not fully protect the collective bargaining rights of public safety employees.

Firefighters, police officers and emergency medical personnel play a critical role in our Nation's homeland security. They are the first to respond to terrorist attacks, natural disasters and other mass casualty events. These workers deserve the same right to discuss workplace issues with their employer that the Federal Government already grants to most employees. Additionally, rank-and-file input improves communication and cooperation between employees and management for more efficient and coordinated operations that are necessary in our post 9/11 world.

This bill would establish minimum standards that States must meet regarding the process of collective bargaining with public safety employees.

Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important to our national security, public safety, and the rights of our first responders to pass H.R. 980. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act, I rise in strong support of the bill.

While most government employees enjoy the right to collectively bargain with their employer, many fire fighters, police officers and emergency medical personnel across the country are denied this right. We must take action to end this injustice.

The Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act would affirm the right of our Nation's State and local public safety officers to bargain collectively and work cooperatively with their employers. This critical legislation would do so by establishing minimum collective bargaining standards for all States. Such standards include: the right to collectively bargain over wages, hours and working conditions, establishment of a dispute resolution mechanism, and the enforcement of contracts through State courts.

Our public safety officers put their lives on the line every day to protect us. Yet, they are denied their right to collectively bargain to better protect themselves and their families. Collective bargaining leads to higher wages, greater access to health care and better retirement benefits. Furthermore, cooperation between public safety employees and employers reduces injuries and fatalities because first responders are more likely to have the safety equipment and resources they need. Studies also show that communities promoting communication between public safety officers and their employers enjoy more efficient and effective delivery of emergency services.

Over the years, we have expanded collective bargaining laws to protect private sector employees, non-profit association employees, transportation workers, and Federal Government employees. One of the few groups of workers not covered by these Federal laws is state and local public safety officers. They work tirelessly to protect us. We must take this opportunity to help protect them.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Public Employee-Employer Cooperation Act.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor and longtime supporter of H.R. 980, I am pleased this legislation is on the House floor today. This bill will take the important step of guaranteeing firefighters and police officers the right to discuss workplace issues with their employers.

It troubles me to know in many states, public safety employees lack basic collective bargaining rights.

Firefighters and police officers take seriously their oath to protect public safety and, as a result, they do not engage in work stoppages or slowdowns. The absence of collective bargaining denies these workers any opportunity to influence the decisions that affect their livelihoods.

H.R. 980 recognizes public safety officers' unique situation by creating a special collective bargaining right outside the scope of other federal labor law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act. I have been a cosponsor of this legislation in every Congress since I was first elected, and I am glad that under Democratic leadership, it has finally come to the floor of the House for a vote.

It is imperative that we do all that we can to assist the police and firefighters that sacrifice so much in order to protect us. This bill requires States to establish a collective bargaining floor to allow police and firefighters the chance to negotiate their labor agreements. Many States already have similar laws on the books, but for those that don't, this is a good starting point. Public safety officers should have just as much of a right as other workers to organize. When they do so, they not only benefit themselves, but also society as a whole.

We are not forcing unionization on States, nor are we doing anything here today that could in any way jeopardize public safety. We are simply allowing those brave men and women who provide for our safety the chance to negotiate a more livable wage, a better pension plan, and expanded health insurance coverage. We owe it to them, and I am glad that this body will finally take up this important bill. I urge passage of H.R. 980.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 980, which is designed to provide police officers, firefighters and other public safety I officers with basic collective bargaining rights, without undermining State authority or existing State laws. I would first like to commend our distinguished colleague, Mr. KILDEE of Michigan, for introducing this important resolution. In light of the post-9/11 era of protecting America from terrorism, in which we are asking our police officers, firefighters, and other public safety officers, to take on more—and more dangerous—responsibilities than they had before, the least we can do is ensure they enjoy the basic right to bargain for better wages and benefits.

State and local public safety officers play an essential role in the efforts of the United States to detect, prevent, and respond to terrorist attacks, and to respond to natural disasters, hazardous materials, and other mass casualty incidents. As the first to arrive on scene, State and local public safety officers must be prepared to protect life and property and to preserve scarce and vital Federal resources, avoid substantial and debilitating interference with interstate and foreign commerce, and to protect the national security of the United States. Public safety employer-employee cooperation is essential in meeting these needs and is, therefore, in the Nation's best interest.

Public safety agencies benefit from constructive relationships with their public safety officers. In fact, local communities also benefit by a more efficient delivery of safety and emergency services. This type of cooperation is promoted by providing public safety employees with the fundamental right to bargain with their employers. Public safety officers deserve the same right to discuss workplace issues with their employer that the Federal Government already grants to most other employees.

The Federal Government needs to encourage conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration to aid and encourage employers and the representatives of their employees to reach and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions; and to make all reasonable efforts through negotiation to settle differences by mutual agreement reached through collective bargaining or by such methods as may be provided for in any applicable agreement for the settlement of disputes.

Mr. Speaker, public sector membership gains are important because they demonstrate workers' willingness and ability to organize under conditions of relative management neutrality and non-interference. If the National Labor Relations Act had covered public safety officers 30 years ago—when health care and nonprofit entities were finally covered—it is likely that public sector unionization in the U.S. today would be at least 80 percent, strikingly similar to Canada, Europe, South Africa, Korea, Japan and every other democracy. Instead, the existence or scope of collective bargaining in half the States is still being determined by State legislators or Governors, who favor either no bargaining at all or limited ''meet and discuss'' arrangements.

If collective bargaining in public employment is indeed a public good, we need to focus more on explaining and defending that process, rather than just highlighting the obstacles that individual unions face while trying to boost their own membership. For example, in France, unions count only 10 percent of the workforce as dues-payers but unions negotiate in nearly all industrial sectors based on longstanding support for collective bargaining. Unions actively compete against each other—both for membership and votes for government-mandated workplace committee members open to all workers in the same workplace or firm. But the country's various labor federations then find ways to engage in common contract campaigns with management or the government; as a result, nearly 90 percent of French workers have collective bargaining agreements.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is very balanced. Given the unique responsibilities of the public safety community, the bill specifically outlaws strikes by firefighters, police officers, and other public safety personnel. The bill also does not interfere with State right-to-work laws; preserves the rights of volunteer firefighters; protects all existing certifications, recognitions, elections and collective bargaining agreements; and exempts all States with a State collective bargaining law for public safety officers equal to or greater than the bill's basic minimum standards.

Promoting collective bargaining is even more critical today, because the Nation is in much worse shape than half a century ago. What is the likelihood that we can address America's safety crisis, the collapse of retirement security, the threat of outsourcing, workplace safety and health hazards, or the growing income inequality without far more workers winning the right to bargain? We know the answer, and it is H.R. 980. For these reasons I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout my career, I have been a strong supporter of workers' rights to bargain collectively with their employers. And while I believe every worker should have the right to bargain collectively, I think there are few who have more earned that right than our Nation's first responders.

Historically, Congress has given States and localities wide discretion in determining how to negotiate with their public safety employees. The result of this has been a myriad of different rights for different workers depending on where they serve. Some States have very strong rules to protect collective bargaining. Other States have none at all.

Today, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act gives us an opportunity to ensure that our first responders have a minimum collective bargaining rights no matter what jurisdiction they serve.

This bill would ensure that police officers and firefighters have the basic rights to bargain over wages, hours, and working conditions. The bill also provides for a mediation or arbitration process to resolve disputes.

This legislation strikes the proper balance by prohibiting strikes and lockouts and does not infringe upon existing collective bargaining agreements.

Our Nation's police officers and fire fighters lay their lives on the line every day. At a moment's notice, they are ready to protect us from crime, fire, natural disasters, and, regrettably, from terrorists. And too often they offer their lives in the process.

Though we can never properly repay them for the things they do, this bill will ensure that their collective voice is heard at the bargaining table.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007. I applaud Mr. KILDEE and Mr. DUNCAN for their impressive work on this bill and I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation.

As a result of this legislation, public safety officers—police officers, fire fighters, and EMTs—will be able to discuss workplace issues and collectively bargain with their employers.

Public safety officers in Iowa and across our nation regularly put themselves in harms way and risk their lives so that we are safe. It's only right that they have a say in the decisions that affect their lives and their livelihoods. They should be able to negotiate for wages, hours, and safe working conditions.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support. It's the right thing to do and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concerns about H.R. 980. Unfortunately, this bill, like many under the new majority has come to the House floor under a closed process that prevents Members of Congress from offering any amendment to this bill.

Florida is a right-to-work State, and while the proponents of the legislation argue that this bill does not preempts states rights, the details of the bill simply do not match the rhetoric.

This bill, which is opposed by the National League of Cities, has the effect of forcing thousands of State and local governments to recognize union officials as the exclusive bargaining agents of public-safety officers. Under the process established in this bill—even in right to work states—if union organizers win the representation of 50 percent of workers plus one, they are recognized as the sole bargaining representative of each and every public safety officer. This preempts State laws and strips tens of thousands of police and firemen of their freedom to negotiate directly with their employer. This is tantamount to compulsory unionizing. The bill amounts to an unprecedented federalization of collective bargaining; an area traditionally left to State and local governments. This issue was succinctly stated by R. Theodore Clark who testified on behalf of the National Public Employer Labor Relations Association during the Committee hearing on H.R. 980 when he said:

> [My] opposition to federal collective bargaining legislation such as H.R. 980 is not because I oppose public sector collective bargaining, but rather because of my firm belief that the enactment of a federal collective bargaining law would severely limit the demonstrated innovative and creative abilities of the states and local jurisdictions to deal in a responsible manner with the many complex issues that the public sector collective bargaining poses.

Finally, concerns have been raised that H.R. 980 might endanger public safety by decimating volunteer fire departments that currently protect countless small communities across America. A fact well understood and opposed by small community mayors and volunteer firefighters across the country.

Our local cites and States are the best deciders of how to provide vital services to our citizens. We should not tie their hands by establishing a ''one size fits all'' Federal pattern that cannot hope to account for the unique conditions and structures that our states and localities face. It is for this reason and the decision by the majority leadership to deny the ability of members of Congress to address these shortcomings that I could not vote for final passage of H.R. 980.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 980, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1115

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3043, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 547 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 547

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. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies 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. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, 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. 3043 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. MATSUI. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MATSUI. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 547 provides for consideration of H.R. 3043, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Act for 2008 under an open rule. Under this rule, all Members of the House are afforded the opportunity to offer any amendment that is germane and otherwise complies with House rules.

Mr. Speaker, the phrase most often associated with this bill has been ''feast or famine.'' For instance, Congress first doubled funding for the National Institutes of Health between 1999 and 2003 and then flat-lined the agency's funds since then. It was actually cut for the first time in history in fiscal year 2006.

In contrast, this year's bill sticks to the principle of sustainable growth in strategic areas: health research, worker safety and education. I would like to applaud Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH for their hard work in crafting this fair and responsible blueprint for our Nation's future.

Nowhere is this broader strategy of sustainable growth more evident than at the NIH. The underlying legislation provides a modest 2.6 percent increase over last year's level. Such an increase is critical to maintaining America's global leadership in biomedical research. This research will expand the boundaries of human knowledge and keep America at the forefront of the field.

Unfortunately, low or frozen funding levels resulted in almost 1,300 fewer grants from 2003 to 2006. But this year's sustainable increase will allow those grants to expand responsibly.

In particular, I would like to thank the committee for its continued support of the National Children's Study. Its budget within the NIH is very modest, but its impact to children and families will be great. The study will examine environmental effects on childhood development, including autism, asthma and premature birth. For several years, I've been working with the committee and other Members to provide the study with proper support. I'm happy to report that the study has now received widespread and bipartisan support.

I'd also like to highlight the full funding of Ryan White AIDS programs within the bill. Cities and towns all across the country rely on these funds to provide vital health services to individuals with HIV or AIDS. With this funding, the victims of HIV and AIDS will have increased access to medications, primary care and home health care.

In addition to ensuring health care access and advancement, this bill also plans for our children's educational future.

We all realize that the cost of a college education is not getting any cheaper. In fact, it's growing by thousands of dollars a year. So I commend the committee's increase in the maximum Pell Grant by $390 to $4,700. It will permit over 5.5 million students to take advantage of this critical assistance, and it does so without having to reduce other student financial assistance programs, as the administration had proposed.

The underlying legislation also acts responsibly to prepare our Nation's students before they get to college by ensuring better performance at the K–12 grade levels.

Title I grants support schools in high-poverty areas, and they are the engine behind No Child Left Behind. Nonetheless, these grants have been flat-funded or even reduced in the past two school years. This has hindered the ability of title I schools to assist low-performing students. I commend the committee for increasing this fund so that nearly 55,000 title I schools can invest in their young people.

Make no mistake, in a world that increasingly depends on highly skilled employees, this legislation is an investment in the future of our students and in the future competitiveness of this Nation.

In conclusion, I urge all Members to support this rule and the underlying bill. It deals responsibly with the needs of our health care sector, our education system, and the labor market.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed rule would provide for consideration of the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill, the seventh out of 12 appropriation bills to be considered by the House this year.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that for the seventh time we are considering this appropriations bill under an open rule that allows every Member of the House the opportunity to come to the floor and to offer his or her amendment to the bill. Except for in the instance earlier this year when the House considered the final fiscal year 2007 spending bill, which allocated $463 billion of taxpayer dollars while denying all Members of the House the opportunity to amend the bill, this rule continues a long-standing tradition of openness on spending bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill provides over $607 billion to support the Federal Government's role in labor, health and education programs. Of this total, over $455 billion, or 75 percent, is comprised of spending for government programs that grow automatically every year with little congressional review. For the next fiscal year alone, these programs will increase by an estimated $54 billion, nearly 12 percent, which I might add, Mr. Speaker, is three or four times the rate of inflation.

Without question, these programs pose the largest threat to our long-term economic health because they essentially run on autopilot with little accountability to the taxpayers writing the checks. If we want to get spending under control, it is vital that we take a hard look at these programs sooner rather than later.

The remaining money in this appropriations bill is set by Congress each

year. For the last fiscal year, $144 billion was provided to support the Federal Government's role in labor, health and education programs, but for the upcoming fiscal year, the underlying bill provides for $151 billion, an increase of $7 billion.

Mr. Speaker, while I support some of the increases in the bill, such as an increased funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, I do have concerns with the overall increased spending level in this difficult budget year. I believe that Congress must always stop and remember that we are spending the American taxpayers' money when considering appropriations bills. Each time a decision is made to spend more money, taxpayers face a higher tax bill or the deficit faces an increase in leaving our children and grandchildren to foot the bill. Therefore, we must take a balanced approach that provides for the general welfare of our Nation while reducing the deficit.

It's important that taxpayers are aware that under the Democrat majority's budget plan, each taxpayer faces an average $3,000 increase in their Federal tax bill in order to pay for the Democrats' spending spree over the next 5 years, as reflected in their budget.

Throwing money at all of our Nation's problems will not make them go away. The American people expect more of Congress. They expect us to tackle the difficult issues, make tough decisions and lower the deficit through fiscal restraint.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few comments before I yield to the next speaker.

I'd like to say that the President's budget would have cut education programs, health care programs, energy assistance for seniors, avian flu by some $7.6 billion below last year after adjusted for inflation. This bill rejects most of those arbitrary cuts. As a result, some Members have criticized it.

But the bill only increases these funds by a modest 3 percent after adjusting for inflation and population growth. This increase puts the bill a full $2.9 billion below its funding level in 2005. It is interesting logic that when you're spending less than you did 2 years ago, it's out-of-control spending.

The subcommittee's ranking member testified to the Rules Committee last night that he would have written a very similar bill as Mr. OBEY did had he been in the chairman's seat. And most of the amendments offered in committee were by the minority seeking to increase various funding levels in the bill.

This bill funds our Nation's health care, education and worker protection programs in a responsible, sustainable manner.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress faces the challenge of acting on the direction of the American people, as expressed in the vote of November 2006, and that is to change the direction of this country and to restore a domestic agenda that serves all Americans.

We began, and again on a bipartisan basis, with 100 hours, raising the minimum wage, reversing wasteful subsidies to the big oil companies, and instead funding renewable energy, requiring price negotiations so our taxpayers didn't get ripped off in prescription drug prices, making college more affordable.

□ 1130

These measures are a down payment, but just a beginning. Today, the House takes up the eighth of 12 appropriation bills. This bill, under the leadership of Mr. OBEY, more than anything else, is going to put a stamp on a new direction that this Congress is moving in.

It's a direction that says all Americans have to be included, not just the wealthy, not just those who can afford corporate lobbyists. All Americans have a right to affordable education, to quality health care, to safe working conditions and to a financially secure retirement. Getting from here to there is a challenge, but this is the road that this bill takes us on.

Let me mention just four different areas. First, the legislation restores $7.6 billion in funding to vital programs that have been cut by the administration. At the same time, it saves $1.1 billion from lower priority programs. There is a commitment here to fiscal responsibility.

We must invest in America's future generations, and the bill does that.

Second, again, I will just mention a few things that are important to us in Vermont. We have had unfunded mandates. Special Ed, No Child Left Behind are the poster childs of that. This bill increases funding for No Child Left Behind by $8.6 billion over fiscal year 2007.

This bill invests in vital rural health care programs, something that we in Vermont are very familiar with, by increasing funding by $307 million. That provides real services to real people with real health care problems. This bill increases funding for the vital Low Income Heating Assistance Program. That was cut in the administration proposal by $379 million, or 17.5 percent, below last year's level. That's simply not sustainable. That's going to inflict real harm on people who have no ability to control the price of home heating oil.

This bill is taking us further on the road of having a Congress who is committed to the needs of all Americans.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 547 is an open rule providing for consideration of the fiscal year 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill.

The underlying legislation puts many of this Nation's most critical agencies on a responsible and sustainable funding path. Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH should be commended. As the Rules Committee heard in their testimony yesterday, they worked in a cooperative manner without partisan rancor to balance many competing needs funded through this bill.

This bill strengthens our families and prepares our workforce for the challenges that lay ahead. For instance, in just 7 years, nearly half of all the Nation's job growth will be concentrated in occupations requiring a college degree. This bill helps prepare our young people for this new world by increasing funding for students at K–12 or college level. In particular, it rejects an administration proposal to freeze Pell Grants. Instead, this legislation increases Pell Grants by $390 to $4,700 on top of a $260 increase provided in 2007 continuing appropriations resolution. These efforts will make great strides in making college more affordable.

The legislation also maintains our Nation's leadership in health care research by lifting a 2-year freeze on the average cost of new research grants to NIH, and it provides a responsible increase in employment, training and worker protection programs. These are just some of the ways in which the underlying legislation provides millions of Americans with access to affordable health care, a decent education, and strong worker protection.

I urge all my colleagues to support this open rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 1, IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Homeland Security, I move to take from the Speaker's table the

bill (H.R. 1) to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Blackburn moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1 be instructed to agree to section 1455 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

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

The motion to instruct would require the Secretary to deny a Transportation Worker Identification Credential, a TWIC, to any applicant who has been convicted of certain crimes.

This card is the access card to our Nation's critical and sensitive port and maritime facilities. We have over 750,000 workers who access our ports daily. TWIC was created to ensure that they are all screened and that they pose no threat of terrorism.

Now, our motion would specify that individuals convicted of certain crimes, such as treason, espionage, sedition or murder, would be permanently disqualified from receiving a TWIC card. This would further specify interim disqualifying crimes, such as smuggling, arson, kidnapping or robbery, that would disqualify an individual within a certain timeframe of conviction.

This provision provides the right balance between ensuring that our ports are safe while ensuring that we have the workers we need to get the job done in a timely manner.

We all agree that protecting our ports is one of the most critical duties that we have. All the guns, all the gates, all the guards in the world, every bit of that is useless if we give an individual a TWIC card to walk right past them.

This would ensure that the screening of these individuals is thorough, and that it is complete. While some may argue that this will unnecessarily disqualify too many individuals, we have already provided for an appeal and waiver process elsewhere to ensure that individuals can apply for a TWIC despite their past history.

This section that we are offering today in this motion to instruct passed the Senate 94–2. Our motion to instruct would accede to the language in the Senate provision.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House has passed its own language as it relates to the issuance of the TWIC cards. We have negotiated for the last 2 months with our Senate colleagues and, for the most part, we have a bipartisan agreement on the issuance of the transportation security cards to convicted felons.

That agreement talks about many of the things my colleague referenced in the report. It talks about treason, it talks about sedition, it talks about espionage, all those things.

Therefore, I think carrying it to the level that my colleague would want to carry it is not in the spirit of the conference report that we are negotiating with our colleagues in the Senate.

It is bipartisan. We have been meeting for 2 months to craft a language. It's good language.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the body's attention, we had last week on July 10, a front page article in The Hill talking about this.

The concerns with this clause, I know that this program, TSA is going to roll this TWIC card program out on September 1. I would hope that our security is of such importance to us that we would not weaken this program.

We know that the security of our ports is important. We want to make certain that the workers that we are sending in to these ports have gone through the appropriate clearances. We know that these are critical and sensitive areas. Why would we want to give a card to someone who has been convicted of crimes such as treason, espionage, sedition or murder?

I do not think that the American people want to see those individuals inspecting the cargo that's coming into these ports. We hear so much about security and food security, the issues that surround that. We are hearing about the security of human trafficking that is going through our ports. For goodness sakes, we want to be certain that the people that are walking into those ports to work every day are not convicted of these serious crimes.

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

□ 1145

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I now yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee, and to the Speaker, my good friend from Tennessee, we are here on this floor for a very serious deliberation.

Over the last 10 days we have heard a number of responses from the administration; and I have often said that if and when, if and when there was a turn of events that would generate a horrific and terrorist act against this Nation, it is the Members of the United States Congress and committees with names like Homeland Security and Defense that would have to be called to the carpet.

None of us, none of us, Mr. Speaker, have any desire to be on the list of those who are derelict in their duties. In fact, Chairman THOMPSON has been enormously zealous in constant oversight of the Department of Homeland Security, constant briefings, and I am reminded of one that occurred in the last 10 days where the term ''gut feeling'' was introduced to us. Out of that particular briefing, many of us tightened our belts and began to reflect on the oversight hearings and the legislative initiatives that will respond and have responded to that gut reaction. So the dilemma, or the discussion today, as we bring up the 9/11 bill, may I remind my colleagues, is about terrorism. It is about the thought and the fear that Americans have of who lives amongst us.

The TWIC card, as Transportation Security Administration is about to issue forward with regulations, is one of the elements to define who is in this country that would want to do us harm. Let me say this again, Mr. Speaker. It is a card to define who wants to harm us.

As the chairwoman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, Critical Infrastructure, we live every day with those individuals who are receiving identification, those at airports. We have done oversight about employees' ingress and egress, about the back side of the airport. We are well aware, my colleague Representative SANCHEZ, LORETTA SANCHEZ and her committee, well aware of the massiveness of the Nation's ports. We could give you a list of times that we have been to look at the intimacies of the port. But what my good friend is speaking about clearly has no direct relationship to ensuring America's security and releasing or eliminating the fear that Americans have about the next-door terrorist cell. This amendment, this motion to instruct is not constructive. For what it says is that age-long workers, union workers who through an early lifetime had the ups and downs of a criminal record, have now been cast as terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in opening the doors to criminal elements. I don't disrespect the fact that we are concerned about murderers and others who have done dastardly deeds. But what you are talking about is taking an age-old seasoned port worker, union member, and eliminate their livelihood by projecting onto them the question of whether or not they are in line to perpetrate a terrorist act.

The TWIC card is an identification document to ensure that those who are in possession of that card have no connection to any elements of terrorism. It is to safeguard the American public.

It is not, it is not, if you will, the sledgehammer on hardworking, taxpaying Americans. And let me be very clear: The TWIC card is no wimp. There is a serious review process that goes forward that takes into account everyone's record and includes any elements that would lead us to believe that this person might perpetrate a terrorist act.

I respect the gentlelady from Tennessee because I know that she is, as we all are, warriors against terrorism, and this Congress has to be united on this factor. I would raise the question, however, as to whether or not these modifications of a TWIC card that has already been vetted directed only at eliminating, firing, and terminating lifelong employees with strong records that have shown no inclination and no past history to terrorist acts is the appropriate direction to take.

I hope that we can join in this body, as Chairman THOMPSON has encouraged us as members of his committee, to focus in a bipartisan way on solutions to major problems: Critical infrastructure, nuclear and biological possibilities, the reconstruction of FEMA, the interests in protecting our ports and borders north and south. This is how, an intelligence response that shows who is here as it relates to terrorist cells and who is here to do damage. These are the key elements, along with the 9/11 bill, that lay down the underpinnings, the framework of the survival of this Nation. Let us not fall upon divisiveness in the redesign of a card that has been fully vetted in its structure, that will do what it is intended to do, which is to weed out the terrorists and to allow hardworking Americans to continue to work and provide for their families. They, too, are patriots. And we as patriots and lovers of this country must stand united together in doing the right thing to secure America.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi spoke of the compromise language, and the compromise language does not give our TSA the tool in its toolbox that it needs. Indeed, the compromise language would weaken that tool that they need in that toolbox to be certain that they are giving Americans the certainty that they want to view our Nation's ports security with. They want to know that certainly the people that are coming into those ports have our Nation's best interests at heart. And I fully believe that they do not want individuals who are convicted of these crimes of treason, espionage, sedition, murder and, further, interim disqualifying crimes such as smuggling, arson, kidnapping or robbery to be in there watching the cargo and the transportation that comes into our ports and maritime facilities. Certainly, this is a regulation that TSA uses now with our truck drivers who are moving hazardous material. So the compromise language would take a tool out of that toolbox that TSA uses to give Americans the certainty that they are doing their best.

Now, with respect to the question from the gentlelady from Texas, and I appreciate the hard work that she does at the Homeland Security Committee, but this would provide only a 7-year lookback, and I think that that is important to note in that screening process. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we want to be certain that screening is thorough, that it is complete, and that there is certainty given to the American public.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, for the record, I would like to say to my colleague from Tennessee, this bipartisan agreement was worked out in the spirit of making sure that those individuals who work in various capacities in high-risk areas, that they are, in fact, not security risks. So what we have done, we have taken espionage, we have taken sedition, we have taken treason, any felony crime of terrorism, crime involving a transportation security incident, improper transportation of hazardous material, unlawful possession, use, sale, distribution, manufacture, purchase, receipt, transfer, shipping, transporting, import, export, storage of or dealing with an explosive device, we have gone into great detail in defining those disqualifying areas.

In addition to that, we have laid out interim disqualifying criminal offenses that go toward unlawful possession, sale, manufacture, purchase, distribution of firearms; extortion, bribery, smuggling, immigration violations; distribution, possession with intent to distribute or importation of controlled substance; arson, kidnapping, rape, assault with intent to kill; robbery, conspiracy, fraudulent entry into a seaport, a violation of the Racketeering Influence and Corrupt Organization Act. Mr. Speaker, we have gone in great detail to list as many offenses as we could.

Now, from what I understand from the gentlelady's motion that we are debating, the only issue is that you don't want the Secretary of Homeland Security to have the ability to look at these things and say whether or not they should be modified. Now, if we are wrong in our interpretation, that is fine, but as we look upon what you have before us today, that is the only thing.

If we can't trust the people who run the Department to make certain administrative decisions, then who can we trust? And it is in this spirit that we left that particular modification language there for the Secretary to look at any unforeseen crime that may or may not have been excluded in this disqualifying criminal offense.

So clearly, Mr. Speaker, it was a bipartisan effort, and we wish to offer it.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was just making his point, and in part of that he is right, but the important part of this is that what we have to do is be certain that a Secretary doesn't delete these provisions. And if you are going to give them that flexibility and if they delete it, then you have that hole that is there. So, because of that, we need it in statute to be sure that it is not altered.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Our Secretary of Homeland Security is appointed by the President. I would think that he would appoint the best qualified person, someone who would have the interests of this country at heart every second that he or she may be in that position. So to take the ability of an individual who is running a department from making certain decisions is not in our best interests.

We should not micromanage the Department of Homeland Security. We should let the Secretary of Homeland Security run the Department. He should have the administrative authority to do it. This would not be in the best interests of us. We do not do this in other secretarial departments.

And so, again, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of identifying crimes that are disqualifying, but notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary should have some discretion over running his or her Department regardless of what that Department may be, this is the bipartisan spirit in the conference that we reached.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

□ 1200

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I speak on this motion with the greatest respect for the gentlelady from Tennessee. But I would say that in my prior life, before coming to the Congress I was a prosecuting attorney, and I was responsible for sending a lot of people to prison.

I also had a responsibility to go down and visit people that I'd sent to prison. And I remember the first visit that I made down to one of the prisons in Ohio, and there's these trustees outside the prison gates with white stripes on the side, and they were given trusted positions within the prison.

And I said, who are the trustees? How do you get to be qualified to be a trustee? And they said, well, they're murderers. And I said, what do you mean, they're murderers? They said, they're murderers.

What we find is that in the crime of murder, most murders in this country are committed in crimes of passion, a husband murders a wife, a wife murders a husband, a boyfriend and so forth and so on. But they are also the least likely people to ever commit crime again.

And what concerns me about the requirement of receding to the Senate provision in this is that it ignores the opportunity for rehabilitation. It ignores the opportunity that people

make mistakes, and they're not a threat to national security, and they can be good productive people. They can work in our ports.

And I am concerned that murder is one of the automatic disqualifiers. I am also concerned that the other list of crimes that have waiting periods of 5 to 7 years, they have nothing to do, in my mind, with terrorism or port security.

And I am all for a system where the Secretary or even in law the Congress of the United States says, you know what, if you committed a crime of violence we're going to take an extra look at you; but to be automatically disqualified, either forever or for a considerable period of time, I think disturbs me.

I intend to vote against the motion. I respect the gentlelady's opinion and why she's brought this motion, but sadly, I can't agree with it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, the appeals and waivers process was put in place for a reason, and that is why it is there, and that's why you've got the look-back provision and why it is stated as such.

Again, I will reemphasize the point. We don't want to do something that is going to weaken a tool that is in the TSA toolbox for being certain that we have the necessary security at our ports; that we know who is there and we know the reasons they are there, that we know that they have the appropriate clearances for being there.

And with all due respect to the chairman and the chairwoman who have worked on this legislation, our wording here, acceding to the language that passed over in the Senate, 94–2, would be certain that we have in statute something that is going to give our citizens the security that we have done our job.

It is the responsibility of this body to be certain that we have this national security interest at heart for the people of this good Nation, and certainly this language is one step in so doing.

And at this time, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Mississippi has no further speakers and is ready to yield back, then I will do so. But I want to be certain I have the right to close on this.

Mr. Speaker, I will reserve at this point.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have one additional speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman. To my good friend from Tennessee, let us be very clear that homeland security is a bipartisan issue.

What the chairman has indicated is that we are yielding to the Secretary of Homeland Security for a slight opportunity to be able to modify, if you will, in his reasoned judgment, that deals with securing America. We are not ignoring sedition and treason. I want my colleagues to know that.

But the individuals that will now be subjected to the TWIC card, which costs 137 dollars and 700,000 people will be processed the first year, and 1.5 million persons the second year, these are our neighbors, individuals who have been working in this capacity who have nothing in their background that would suggest that they are terrorists.

The gentlelady's motion would literally shut down America's ports. Commerce would come to a standstill. As my good friend from Ohio has said, people rehabilitate. Give the Secretary the opportunity to use his judgment and to use his discretion to be able to secure America on the real causes of sedition and treason.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Suspension of the rules on H.R. 980, by the yeas and nays;

Adoption of House Resolution 547, de novo;

Motion to instruct on H.R. 1, by the yeas and nays.

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

PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COOPERATION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 980, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 980, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 314, nays 97, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

YEAS—314

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt

Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—97

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Boozman
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Putnam
Radanovich
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Tanner
Taylor
Thornberry
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wolf

NOT VOTING—20

Alexander
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Gohmert
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (IL)
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
McCaul (TX)
Ortiz
Payne
Price (GA)
Sestak
Tancredo

□ 1232

Messrs. SALI, BOOZMAN, ISSA, PITTS, PICKERING, WICKER, PETERSON of Pennsylvania and MELANCON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WILSON of South Carolina, HASTERT, BURTON of Indiana and COLE of Oklahoma changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 633, I was detained while picking up my 6-year-old daughter who had become ill. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3043, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). The unfinished business is the question on adoption of House Resolution 547 which the Chair will put de novo.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 178, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

YEAS—232

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—178

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
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)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
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
Sullivan
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Alexander
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Gohmert
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (IL)
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
McCaul (TX)
Ortiz
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Tancredo
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1240

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.

Stated against:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 635, my vote was mistakenly recorded as "yea"; however, I intended to vote "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall Nos. 633 and 634 since I was at Walter Reed Army Hospital visiting injured troops. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 633 and 634 I was unavoidably detain and not able to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on 633 and "no" on 634.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 1, IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 1 offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 66, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]

YEAS—354

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—66

Abercrombie
Baldwin
Berman
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kingston
LaTourette
Lee
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
Melancon
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Murtha
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Price (NC)
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Alexander
Brown, Corrine
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Hinojosa
Johnson (IL)
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
McKeon
Payne
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1256

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 17, 2007, I was unable to vote on rollcall Nos. 634 and 635. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this morning I was unable to cast my votes on H.R. 980, H. Res. 547, and the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 1 and wish the RECORD to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 633 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act, I would have voted "yea."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 634 on passing H. Res. 547, the rule providing for consideration of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY 2008, I would have voted "nay."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 635 on the Motion to Instruct Conferees to H.R. 1, the Implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Conferees on H.R. 1 will be named later.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2641, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2641 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 481, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

An amendment by Mr. ROTHMAN limiting funds for the Green Maintenance Building in North Bergen, New Jersey;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting Army Corps of Engineers construction funding for the South Central Pennsylvania project;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Coastal Wind Ohio project;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Green Maintenance Building in North Bergen, New Jersey;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the National Center for Manufacturing Science in Michigan;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the University of North Alabama Green Campus Initiative;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure in Pennsylvania;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Alliance for NanoHealth in Texas;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Notre Dame Innovation Park in Indiana;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the ACE Program at Maricopa Community Colleges in Arizona;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for the South Carolina HBCU Science and Technology initiative in South Carolina;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for the Environmental Science Center, University of Dubuque, Iowa;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for the Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership in Massachusetts;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for Roosevelt University Biology Laboratory Equipment in Illinois;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for Nanosys, Inc.;

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL of California limiting funds for projects requested by Members of Congress and disclosed pursuant to the rules of the House, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes; and

An amendment or amendments by Mr. VISCLOSKY regarding funding levels.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and its Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material during further consideration of H.R. 2641.

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

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2641.

□ 1300

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. TIERNEY (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 40, line 18.

No further amendment to the bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of today, which is at the desk.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHMAN

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROTHMAN:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Green Maintenance Building in North Bergen, New Jersey.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent to claim the 5 minutes in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, even though I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not take my full 5 minutes. This amendment strikes an earmark for a project requested by myself and Congressman SIRES who together represent the town of North Bergen, New Jersey.

The funds allocated in this bill would have gone towards the construction of a new public works building in North Bergen, New Jersey, that would have repaired and maintained all of the vehicles for that municipality, as well as all of the fire trucks for the surrounding five towns of Weehawken, Guttenberg, West New York and Union City.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROTHMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, we would be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I want to set the stage for what is occurring on the House floor at this point in time because it is my privilege to submit to the House for final passage H.R. 2641, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2008, with its supplemental report.

On July 10, the Appropriations Committee approved the supplemental report unanimously by voice vote. As I have said before, this is a good bill and it merits the support of the entire House.

I would emphasize that the money spent in this bill, whether enumerated originally by the administration or by the Congress, are investments, investments in our national security, investments in our energy security, and investments in the health and safety of our citizens. They are investments to

create a climate and to build the infrastructure that encourages the development of new, good-paying jobs in our country.

To the extent we have made changes in the administration's priority, the changes have been to enhance the effectiveness of the programs in this bill and to complement them.

I would like to give two examples. All one needs to do is look at the West Sacramento Flood Control Project as proof that we are dealing with fundamental issues, like ensuring people and their families' lives are secure and their homes and their businesses are protected from devastating floods. In Tennessee, the Center Hill Dam is another project that Congress has funded to control flood waters and generate clean, safe and efficient hydroelectric power.

There are also examples of administration funding requests that originated in Congress years ago. For fiscal year 2006, Congress designated funds to support activities at the supervisory control and data acquisition test facilities at the Idaho National Laboratory. This system has proven itself so useful in helping to improve the reliability and robustness of the electric power grid that for fiscal year 2008 the administration has included the project as part of its project request. If nothing else, this shows how the executive and legislative branches can work together to fund important projects for the Nation, regardless of who initiated support for the idea.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider today's supplemental report to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, I urge my colleagues to keep these factors in mind. The specific projects enumerated in this report serve a purpose: To improve the quality of life for our citizenry and to make advances on key priorities facing our Nation.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fair and bipartisan manner in which the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) as our chairman has used to put this supplemental report together. I fully support the list of congressionally directed projects that it contains. I encourage Members to support these projects and to vote for final passage of the underlying Energy and Water bill.

When we first brought this bill to the floor roughly a month ago, I expressed my concern about the absence of detailed project guidance on how to spend this much money. The supplemental report that is before the committee today resolves that concern.

Chairman VISCLOSKY and I, and our respective staffs, engaged in a lengthy bipartisan effort to sort through the thousands of earmark requests that we received. We screened the large number of requests to select the projects that had the most merit and were the best fit for inclusion in the Energy and Water bill. We have complied fully with Chairman OBEY's direction to reduce the value of our energy earmarks by one-half compared to the amount we funded in fiscal year 2006.

The Corps of Engineers faces an enormous backlog of work, somewhere between $12 billion and $60 billion, and that is before the pending WRDA bill adds another $13 billion of unfunded requirements. There is a significant need for additional funding for water resources infrastructure, above and beyond what the administration requested. This supplement provides another $770 million for specific Corps water projects. Within a total appropriation of $5.58 billion for the Corps, less than 14 percent is dedicated to congressionally directed projects. Every one of those projects is already authorized, and every one has been reviewed by the Corps to be sure they have the capability to execute it. Until we make some progress with the backlog of ongoing work, we continue the past practice of not funding any Corps new starts.

On the Department of Energy side, the committee recommended $246.5 million for 263 specific projects, which represents a 50 percent reduction from the amount of DOE earmarks contained in our fiscal year 2006 bill. Many of these projects are intended to demonstrate alternative energy technologies. It is important to note that we are spending billions of dollars on DOE's energy security mission, which includes the research, development, demonstration and deployment of advanced energy technologies. If this research is to be worth the investment, and if this research is to improve our energy security by reducing our dependence on imported oil and reducing the environmental impact of burning fossil fuels, then these technologies must ultimately be adopted by the private sector.

Therefore, a significant number of our Department of Energy earmarks are "green" buildings to demonstrate alternative energy technologies. It is important that we show the American people that there are alternatives to burning fossil fuels for power generation, for transportation, and for heating and cooling, so that builders and consumers know these alternatives are available and affordable. We intentionally put these technology demonstrations in high-traffic settings designed to get a lot of public exposure, such as museums, educational institutions, and community buildings, in order to maximize the value of these demonstrations.

We have a constitutional responsibility to appropriate funds for the Federal agencies. That means we do not simply rubber-stamp the administration's project requests, but rather, we put our own mark on the annual agency budgets. That is what this supplement represents. I support this supplement to our bill, and I encourage the other Members to do so as well.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. 503. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Achieving a College Education Program at Maricopa Community Colleges.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Office of the Administrator" is hereby reduced by $1,000,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit a million dollars, and reduce the cost of the bill by a consistent amount, from being used to fund an earmark for the ACE Program at the Maricopa County Community Colleges.

While I am often criticized for meddling in the congressional districts of other Members in my attempts to make Federal spending on earmarks transparent, that accusation would be unfounded with this amendment.

As the saying goes, "all politics is local," and this amendment makes that a truism, with a portion of Maricopa County within the boundaries of the district I represent.

As I am sure the sponsor of this earmark will be proud to tell you, the Achieving a College Education program was started in 1988 at one of the community colleges in the Maricopa system, and has spread to all 10 of its institutions.

According to the ACE Program Web site, the program is a partnership between community colleges and local high schools that was designed to reduce dropouts among at-risk high school students and transition them to community colleges and university studies.

It would be foolish and not truthful for me to stand here and say the program is not making a valuable contribution to Maricopa County. However, the criteria for receiving another Federal handout of $1 million cannot and should not rest simply on whether a program is doing valuable things.

I am certain that at many, if not all, of the hundreds upon hundreds of community colleges across the country there are important programs that are making valuable contributions to their communities. Surely the taxpayer shouldn't have to fund all of those programs. So how do we choose? How does Congress decide which important, valuable programs get funded with taxpayer dollars and which do not?

The willingness of Members of Congress to give Federal handouts to a select few has led to more than $5 billion in earmarks in this appropriations bill, a bill that is more than $1 billion over the President's request and has garnered a veto threat because of it.

In addition, this earmark is focused on education and raises the question of

why it is being funded out of the account of the Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration. It is my understanding that Federal funding for the ACE Program came through the Department of Housing and Urban Development in previous years.

Other earmarks in the account of the Office of the Administrator for educational programs seem to highlight math and science education. While components of the ACE Program highlight math, science, technology or engineering, this appears to be only one facet of the program and not the sole purpose at all. In fact, other components also appear to highlight health services, business industry technology, community service, adult education, personal finance, and other areas.

I would submit to my colleagues again that if simply having a program that makes a valuable contribution were enough to warrant being awarded millions of dollars, the Treasury would soon be empty.

Further, I would submit that an earmark of this variety is misplaced in the Energy and Water appropriations bill, and should at the very least be considered in the upcoming Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, as the sponsor of this program, as my colleague from Arizona has told you, it has been in existence for a number of years and has in the past received Federal funding. With the Federal funding, we have expanded this program to all of the community colleges in the Maricopa County Community College System.

My colleague asked the question why in DOE and why the Office of the Administrator? Four or 5 years ago, the Department of Energy, through the Secretary then, it was decided that the Department of Energy was going to get involved in the educational programs dealing with historically black colleges and also with Spanish-serving institutions. It was to ensure that there would be a stream of people into math and science programs.

As you know, our President has a number of times emphasized and has began initiatives through the Department of Energy that would help recruit students into the math and science classes. So when the Secretary of Energy made that commitment, knowing that that program was available to colleges and universities, a presentation was made to the Department of Energy whether this program, ACE, would be one that they had an interest in. In one of the hearings ACE was brought up.

So the Department of Energy with the board and administrators of the Maricopa County Community College System began negotiating and set up this program. The intent is to serve minority students that are enrolled in schools throughout Maricopa county, to assist them in a path of math and science. It is in cooperation with the community colleges, because MCCG is encouraging these students to go through the community college system and then take them to the university.

As this program was presented to me 3 years ago by the Maricopa County community colleges and was presented to the Department of Energy, because of the many success stories and it is a program that needs to continue.

The reason it is in DOE is because that is where the program is and that is where the moneys are allocated for this type of program.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman who just spoke, Mr. PASTOR, and I know of his concern for education and his commitment there.

The point I would make again is there are many valuable programs out there. There are thousands and thousands of community colleges out there. I would think that we simply have to stop saying all right, we are going to fund this one or we are going to fund that one without some kind of criteria that should be set by somebody else other than Members of Congress because we are in a position where it happens politically.

Now that is not to say that decisions by Federal agencies aren't political. They often are. That's the responsibility of oversight, for us to step in and say you ought to have this criteria or this merit-based selection process or this competitive grant process.

But for us to say we don't like the way the Federal agencies do it so we are going to do it ourselves, I would think is not the wisest course. With that, I would urge support of the amendment. We simply can't fund all of the programs, the good programs that are out there, and maintain any type of position here in Congress of being equal or being good stewards of the taxpayer dollars. With that, I would urge support of the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, the program in the Department of Energy is geared to get minority students into a pathway of math and science. I did not write the program. All I did was act as a facilitator between the community college system and the Department of Energy. There is an agreement. The agreement was signed 3 years ago between the Department of Energy and the Maricopa County community colleges. In that agreement, DOE has filled out the requirements of the program that the community colleges have had to adhere to, it is an agreement between the Department of Energy and the community college system.

□ 1315

All I did was facilitated between the community college and the Department of Energy, and I would ask my colleagues to reject this amendment, because the program assists minority students to achieve a college education. It's an initiative that the President has put forward, and the Department of Energy has taken on the initiative. This agreement is between the community college system and the Department of Energy.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. 503. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Alliance for NanoHealth.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Energy—Science'' is hereby reduced by $750,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit $750,000, and reduce the cost of the bill by a consistent amount, from being used to fund an earmark for the Alliance for NanoHealth, or ANH.

The ANH is comprised of seven universities and scientific institutions headquartered in Houston, Texas.

ANH's mission is to collectively bridge the disciplines to develop nanotechnology-based solutions to unresolved problems in medicine.

This earmark, according to the certification letters submitted by the sponsor, will be used for electron microscopy equipment, a high-resolution CCD camera, freezing apparatuses as well, for training and for upgrades for shared equipment purchases.

In 2004, the Federal Government provided $2.4 million in start-up funding for the alliance through an earmark in the Department of Defense appropriations bill. In fiscal year 2005, the Alliance for NanoHealth received a total of $7.4 million in Federal earmarks.

In addition to the earmark in this bill, ANH is scheduled to receive another $1 million for fiscal year 2008 in the Commerce, Justice and Science appropriations bill.

There is a competitive and transparent process for awarding Federal research contracts and Federal grants, but this is not it.

Let me be clear. I congratulate the alliance for its work and for its contributions to society. I believe that we, as lawmakers, should do everything we can to encourage more private sector research and development activity, but there is a troubling and growing tendency to replace private sector activity with governmental intervention. This earmark bears witness to that.

Just look at the 2006 endowment ratings for the university members of the Alliance for NanoHealth: Number 4 on the list, University of Texas system, $13.2 billion; number 10 on the list, Texas A&M, $5.6 billion; number 55, Baylor Medical School, $1.1 billion; and the list goes on.

Let us not allow the Federal Government to push private donors aside and remove the incentive for them to contribute in this or any other endeavor.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some kind of discussion on this, but apparently not. Apparently the sponsor of the earmark doesn't want to speak to it or we're just going to leave it.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

We used a bipartisan process, and I was very involved in strict adherence to the applicable House rules and a thorough examination of Member requests. This process resulted in funding recommendations for the projects that we considered the most meritorious. This project that this amendment attacks is a legitimate use of Federal funds to further the development of the Department of Energy's mission.

In closing, I believe this amendment has no basis and should be defeated, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, there is another disturbing trend here. It's often thought that if there is a bipartisan basis for the offering of these earmarks that it's okay. As long as 60 percent goes to the majority, 40 percent to the minority, then it's okay whatever you fund. That shouldn't be the basis on which we distribute taxpayer dollars at all.

In this case, for science grants there is a competitive and transparent process at the Federal agency level. If we're not happy with that process, we should intervene in that process, change it, mandate a more competitive process or a change in the process, instead of supplanting that process with one of our own that is far less competitive, that really is just political, because it pits one Member against another or one committee against another.

That's not how money should be awarded. If the agencies have too much money, we should cut it. If they don't have enough, we should add more. We should stipulate, we should mandate, we should have oversight of those agencies. But basically saying we're just going to have our own process because we don't like what they're doing over there is not the right way to go.

And I would say that this earmark is a good example of that, and for that reason, I offer the amendment and would urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. 503. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Concurrent Technology Corporation.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Energy—Fossil Energy Research and Development'' is hereby reduced by $1,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I was tempted just not to offer any other amendments and just offer this one because this one is important for everyone to focus on because it points at problems not just with the earmark itself but with the process that we have in the House. And I would submit that we are not following that process as we should.

This amendment would strike funding for the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure. The center is to receive $1 million in taxpayer funding in this bill.

When searching on the Web, my staff and I were unable to find the center's Web site. I'm not sure whether the center currently exists or whether this earmark creates the center. I would appreciate if the sponsor of this earmark would clear that up.

All the bill says is that it funds $1 million for the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure in Pennsylvania. However, when you look at the certification letter that each Member now, according to our earmark rule, is required to submit, you see that the earmark is actually going to the Concurrent Technology Corporation based in Jonestown, Pennsylvania. This is a leading earmark recipient in multiple appropriation bills over the years.

Currently in this year, I believe in the Intelligence authorization bill this same group, Concurrent Technology, received two other earmarks. Why isn't that in the earmark itself in what we were handed? We only learned that through the certification letter. Is the earmark to go to the Instrumented Critical Infrastructure Center or to Concurrent Technology? I would love to have that clarified here.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I take it the sponsor of this earmark is not here to talk about it, but if I could ask the chairman where the earmark is supposed to go. Does the earmark go to this Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure or to Concurrent Technology?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I'm sorry, I did not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. FLAKE. I'm wondering, in the report that accompanied the bill, it mentioned that the earmark was to go to the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure, but the certification letter says that it's going to go to that but the earmark should actually go to Concurrent Technology Corporation. Which is it?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. It is my understanding that it will go to the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure.

Mr. FLAKE. Does that center currently exist?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. At this time, I do not know, but if it does not exist, the moneys could not go to it.

Mr. FLAKE. We were told in this process early on by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that a different process was needed, that the earmarks should be added later in conference and not now because the Appropriations Committee simply couldn't vet or scrub these earmarks well enough. I would submit that this is a perfect example of that.

We've had another example. One earmark was actually withdrawn, one on the list that I was to offer, because it hadn't been adequately scrubbed. I would submit that this one should be as well, when the chairman of the relevant subcommittee can't tell us if this

center even exists. We don't know if it even exists, if it's created by this earmark.

Concurrent Technology has been the recipient of millions upon millions of dollars over the years. The executives in Concurrent Technology contribute handsomely to Members of Congress. So it receives a lot of earmarks. It seems to be an earmark incubator of some type, an earmark that begets more earmarks.

And yet we have the report that comes with the bill that doesn't even mention Concurrent Technology. It just mentions this center as if it already existed. We don't even know if it does. We can't even find any information on it, and apparently we can't even get that information from the Appropriations Committee.

So I would submit that this is what this process is about. This is why we come to the floor. This is why we invite the sponsor of the earmark to defend the earmark. But I would say again, does this center exist? Do we even know if it exists? How do we know if it's a good center or a bad center? Is this Concurrent Technology, which already receives millions and millions of dollars in other bills, worthy of another earmark to create another center?

These are the questions that we have to ask.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would continue to reserve my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I guess I will finish off. I will call for a vote on this one, but I think it's important when Members are voting on this earmark and whether to retain it that we have to know what we know and know what we don't know.

We don't know if this center even exists. We are appropriating money for a center where the Appropriations Committee that has a responsibility to vet this earmark can't even tell us here if this even exists. We don't know that. We're voting on an earmark where in the report it says it goes to the center, but here in the certification letter it mentions Concurrent Technology, a private company. Which is it?

If we don't know these facts, we don't know what's going on here, I would say the thing to do is to vote this down, to actually vote for the amendment and wait until the Appropriations Committee actually has time to scrub and to vet these earmarks a little more carefully.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, 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. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Homeland Security, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Mr. Dicks, Ms. Harman, Mrs. Lowey, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Mrs. Christensen, Messrs. Etheridge, Langevin, Cuellar, Al Green of Texas, Perlmutter, King of New York, Smith of Texas, Souder, Tom Davis of Virginia, Daniel E. Lungren of California, Rogers of Alabama, McCaul of Texas, Dent, and Ms. Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida.

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of secs. 1202, 1211, 1221, 1232, 1233, and 1241 of the House bill, and section 703 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Skelton, Spratt, and Saxton.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of Title I, Title II, secs. 743 and 901 of the House bill, and Title III, secs. 1002, 1481, 1482, 1484, and Title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Dingell, Markey, and Barton of Texas.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of secs. 601, 1202, 1211, 1221, 1222, 1232, 1233, 1241, 1302, 1311, 1312, 1322, 1323, 1331–1333, 1412, 1414, 1422, 1431, and 1441–1443 of the House bill, and secs. 502, 1301, Title XVIII, secs. 1911–1913, and 1951 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Lantos, Ackerman, and Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs. 406, 501, 601, 702, and Title VIII of the House bill, and secs. 123, 501–503, 601–603, 1002, and 1432 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Conyers, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, and Mr. Sensenbrenner.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sec. 408 and subtitle A of title VIII of the House bill, and secs. 114, 601, 602, 903, 904, 1203, 1205, and 1601 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Waxman, Clay, and Issa.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of secs. 601, 712, 723, 732, 733, 741, 742, and subtitle A of title VIII of the House bill, and secs. 111–113, 121, 122, 131, 502, 601, 602, 703, 1201–1203, 1205, 1206, and 1606 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Reyes, Cramer, and Hoekstra.

From the Committee on Science and Technology, for consideration of secs. 703, 1301, 1464, 1467, and 1507 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Gordon of Tennessee, Wu, and Gingrey.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of Titles I–III, sec. 1002, and Title XI of the House bill, and secs. 202, 301, Title IV, secs. 801–803, 807, 901, 1001, 1002, 1101–1103, 1422–1424, 1426, 1427, 1429, 1430, 1433, 1436–1438, 1441, 1443, 1444, 1446, 1449, 1464, 1473, 1503, and 1605 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Oberstar, DeFazio, and Mica.

For consideration of Title II of the House bill, and Title III and subtitle C of title XIV of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Larson of Connecticut.

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2641.

□ 1335

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. TIERNEY (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 35 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the South Carolina HBCU Science and Technology initiative (SC).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment would save the taxpayers $1.5 billion. This would

strike the funding for the South Carolina HBCU Science and Technology initiative.

Let me say at the outset that I have no doubt that good use could be made of these funds by this institution in South Carolina. Let me also stipulate I have no doubt that the gentleman from South Carolina, who has offered this earmark, knows far more about the good work they do at this institution than do I.

But I do believe that it is critical that every single penny of Federal spending be put in the context of its impact, not only on the taxpayer, but of future generations. I think if you are going to lead, you have to lead by example.

Now, I wish we had the opportunity to come to the floor each and every day and debate what will happen to future generations if we don't alter the spending patterns that we presently have in Congress today.

In fact, the chairman of the Federal Reserve has recently spoken, ''Without early and meaningful action to address the rapid growth of entitlements, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened with future generations bearing much of the cost.''

A report from the Government Accountability Office, the rising cost of government entitlements are a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America.

I know that principally our spending patterns are driven by entitlement spending. But as the late Everett Dirksen once said, $1 billion here, $1 billion, we are starting to talk about real money. By one estimation, we already have 10,000 Federal programs spread across 600 agencies, and it seems like week in, week out, we just add, add to those particular programs.

The question I have here today again is when we look at this one expenditure, and, yes, earmarks are a small part of Federal spending, but I believe that they are a large portion of the culture of Federal spending. I am not religiously opposed to earmarks.

Again, maybe good things can be done with this money. But looking at the fact that the Federal budget is going way beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for it, at what point do we say that maybe, maybe the Federal taxpayer shouldn't be asked to spend money that goes to, I believe in this case, a private college.

Again, as I understand it, the funding would be used for math and science research at the respective institutions.

Well, we have got some of these institutions in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas. I am sure they could use the money at Eastfield College. I am sure they could use the money at Trinity Valley Community College. I am sure my alma mater, Texas A&M University, which is not in my district, could use this money as well.

But out of the hundreds of thousands of institutions of higher learning, why are we deciding that the taxpayer is supposed to fund this one? Is there any good purpose, any good program, any good project in America that shouldn't receive a Federal subsidy? That's kind of the question that we have here today.

When I see a group of earmarks that are going to institutions in Members' districts, and I reflect upon the fact that we are now on a collision course to either double taxes on the next generation, or, for all intents and purposes, have no Federal Government, save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, we have got to start saving the pennies. When we start saving the pennies, eventually, the dollars will take care of themselves.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and claim the time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would be happy to yield time to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my chairman for giving me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

In fiscal year 2003, while I was a member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, I requested an analysis of the Department of Energy funding, which had been historically received by historically black colleges and universities.

When I met with the subcommittee staff to go over these numbers, I think it is fair to say that we were all shocked. At that time, Mr. HOBSON was chair of this subcommittee, and he summoned me to his office, and we sat down to discuss these numbers.

What we found was that over the prior 5 years funding to these institutions by the Department of Energy had been somewhere around 6.8 percent of all of their funding to colleges and universities across the country. In that 5-year period, that number had dropped to 2.8 percent, and we decided that it would be good to take a look at whether or not this could be reversed. I want you to just think about that.

Less than 3 percent of the funding by the Department of Energy was going to these institutions, yet over 25 percent of all black students in higher education were attending these institutions.

Now, my congressional district has seven, I would say to the gentleman from Texas, seven historical black colleges and universities, and he seemed to be discussing this amendment as if it were one.

I would also say to the gentleman that in my congressional district, you will find the University of South Carolina, The Citadel, the College of Charleston, Columbia College, Francis Marion University. And I would say that as far as the University of South Carolina is concerned, in this same subcommittee, you will see some earmarks, if you please, I call it targeted funding, to that institution. Yet I would ask the gentleman why has he singled out the HBCUs with no attention given to the University of South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman from Texas that this funding, $10.5 million, is a very small investment for these students. I applaud the gentleman's desire to be a good steward of the taxpayers' money. But our suggestion is that his focus is misguided. This small investment will pay huge dividends to the constituents I represent, and I rise in the strongest objection to this amendment.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I would just add, there is a number of amendments I have, not just simply those in the gentleman's district, I suppose I could be here all day speaking about them.

I might also add that I am pleased to have a historically black college in my district, Jarvis Christian College in Wood County, Texas. Last I looked they don't have any money in this particular bill.

But the question again is, if we are going to help people with education, doubling taxes on the American families, which the budget resolution has done, which this bill is a part of, is no way to help an education.

I would urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1345

Mr. HOBSON. Let me say this: as the gentleman spoke, this came about when I was chairman of the committee. We relooked at what we were doing for HBCU. I happen to have two in my district. These institutions are generally underfunded and generally don't have the ability to put the emphasis on science and technologies that many of us believe these students should have. This is an effort by the committee to direct that money so we can increase taxes and can increase funding to the Federal Government and to other agencies by getting these people involved in science and technology. So I wholeheartedly support the committee's recommendation and would urge to vote down the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 36 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the Environmental Science Center, University of Dubuque, IA.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue on somewhat with some of the themes that were touched upon in the last amendment. But before I do, I do want to say a few words about the overall bill.

I do want to say that I think a lot of good work was done by the committee, by the chairman, by our ranking member. It is my understanding that the dollar value of the earmarks has declined substantially from the last bill. I am going to say that I view that as progress. But I also want to say that when we are approaching as a Nation a very nasty fiscal fork in the road, and in this institution unfortunately there is a nasty habit of just kicking that can down the road as I mix my metaphors; but, again, don't take my word for it, look at the analysis of the Congressional Budget Office, look at the analysis of the General Accountability Office, look at the Office of Management and Budget.

Just dealing with the government that we have today, if Congress just disappeared and created no new government, we are going to reach this fiscal fork in the road in the next generation, where we are either going to have to double taxes on our children and grandchildren, or for all intents and purposes there will be no Federal Government save Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

It is not my analysis. Look at the analysis of these other bodies. And so I believe again that, unfortunately, although earmarks today are a small portion of the Federal budget, they are a large portion of the culture of Federal spending.

Another reservation I have is my fear that too often they teach people and teach institutions to become dependent upon the Federal Government. I come from Dallas, Texas, and a part of the Fifth Congressional District takes in the eastern part of the City of Dallas. I was dealing not long ago, taking a tour with one of the very revered and esteemed medical institutions within the City of Dallas that said that for years and years and years they were always happy to competitively bid through the NIH process or other processes for their research grant money. But they have awakened to the dawn of a new day now to where so many of their other competing medical education, medical research institutions were receiving their Federal funding via the earmark track. And so finally, after all these years, they broke down and invested in a Federal lobbyist. Now, they were happy with a competitive system, but they have realized that, unfortunately, that is increasingly not where this Congress is headed.

And so I believe that that is a bad thing, again, to try to somehow move away from what should be a more competitive process into one that does something else. Now, again, I think there is a lot of wonderful earmarks here. I have no doubt about it. But, unfortunately, more often than not we see earmarks representing a victory of the special interests over the national interests, a victory of seniority over merit, and too often a victory of secrecy over transparency.

I am glad that the Democrat leadership recently reversed themselves to allow the transparency that we see today, and I believe that that is a good thing. But two things we have to remember as we hand out money to one specific educational institution, and in this particular case the Environmental Science Center at the University of Dubuque. Maybe good things can be done with that money, but how about the good things that the taxpayers who fund this, how about the good things they could have done?

I recently received some correspondence from a lady in my district, Joyce of Tennessee Colony, Texas: ''Dear Congressman, please do what you can to stop the wasteful spending. I am retired; I am disabled. I am raising three grandchildren and now one great grandchild. I sometimes cannot afford my own medicine. It takes everything I have to get us from month to month. Gas has become a problem. I can't go to church at the end of the month because I don't have gas to get to town.''

So here we are, Mr. Chairman, in an energy and water bill, and we are harming the energy program of American families to put energy earmarks in this bill.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply make the observation that for collectively the decisions made for congressional changes in the administration's request represent about 1 percent of the total funding for the Department of Energy in this bill, and they were very thoughtfully made. And whether they be, in this instance, in Dubuque, Iowa, or any other community around the United States, it is certainly the committee's position and belief that those investments are urged for the greater good of everyone living in this country, and that is certainly to the advantage of every taxpayer in the United States of America.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the amendment by the gentleman from Texas, which would prohibit funding in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill for the new Environmental Science Center at the University of Dubuque in Iowa. When opened, this Center will provide State, regional, and national benefit through educating undergraduate and graduate level students in the environmental sciences, and helping to create the next generation of science professionals.

The need for greater science education has received a lot of attention in recent years, and is an integral component of ensuring America's global competitiveness. As a Member of the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math Caucus, I believe strongly in the need for investment in science education, and I recognize the direct role that the Environmental Science Center plays in keeping America competitive.

The University of Dubuque has offered an interdisciplinary major in Environmental Science since 1980, with many graduates currently working in scientific fields. The environmental science program at the university is unique because of its hands-on focus and strict scientific training. In nearly every course, a field laboratory provides direct, applied experiences for all types of students. Furthermore, University of Dubuque's tri-state location affords students the opportunity to work with three State natural resource agencies—Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin. Even as an undergraduate, students are able to receive a regionally based scientific education.

The new Environmental Science Center will allow the university to expand on its proven record of educating national scientific leaders. The Center will specialize in hands-on, applied learning for current science teachers, environmental agency personnel, undergraduate environmental science majors, and education majors to teach the next generation of American scientists. A failure to fund the Environmental Science Center would be a step backward for America's scientific proficiency.

This funding is consistent with the President's goal to, ''encourage innovation throughout our economy and to give our Nation's children a firm grounding in math and science.'' [President George W. Bush, State of the Union Address, February 1, 2006] America needs facilities like the University of Dubuque's Environmental Science Center to provide a grounding in science, and help move America forward.

I strongly oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, because it will set America back in terms of global competitiveness and will endanger programs that will educate the next generation and allow them to

compete with the likes of China, Europe, Japan, and Asia.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 37 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership, MA.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, in specific, this amendment would strike the earmark that would fund the computer and science equipment at Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership.

Again, following up on some of the debate in the earlier amendments, I simply question why, at a time when our Nation continues to face great fiscal challenges in the future, that although these individual earmarks may be small amounts, I almost feel like the story of the three bears, whether the porridge is too hot or too cold. You come to debate spending on the floor, and sometimes people will tell you, well, that program is so big it is a sacred cow, you can't touch it. And then other times, Mr. Chairman, you hear, well, we are dealing with a very small amount of money here, so why are we bothering with that? You almost believe it is part of the NIMBY syndrome, the ''Not in My Back Yard.''

And, again, I will say I am sure the sponsor of this earmark knows far more about it than I do, knows far more about the educational institutional, and I have no doubt that good things could be done with that money. But that is not really the relevant question. The relevant question ought to be, number one, is this something the Federal Government ought to be doing in the first place, given all the other challenges and needs that we have.

Second of all, is this a priority? Is this a priority? Because we know now that as, recently, Congress voted to increase the debt ceiling, continues to raid the Social Security fund. Is it worth taking money out of the Social Security trust fund to fund this particular earmark or any other particular earmark? And that is what Members have to decide.

And although I am sure the sponsor of the earmark can make a very good defense and tell us all the wonderful good ways that this money will be used, and I am sure he will tell us that he knows his district better than anybody else, I stipulate that. I stipulate that. But, Mr. Chairman, I think I know my district, the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, better than anybody else in this institution; and I am fearful that every time the people of the Fifth Congressional District are called upon to fund somebody else's earmark somewhere else across the Nation, because, again, as we are trying to fund Federal energy and water programs, we are taking away from family energy and water programs, including in many of those in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas.

Recently, I heard from Ken of Mabank, Texas. He was concerned about this single largest tax increase in the history that was passed as part of the Democrat budget. And as you spend more money, you have to tax more money. And so we know that the average American family in the next 5 years is going to be faced with an extra tax burden of about $3,000 a year, and part of it pays for earmarks like these. I heard from Ken in Mabank, and he said: ''Dear Congressman, any increase in taxes will hurt my family budget and cause us to cut back in other key areas. The rising gas prices have already made us cut back on spending. Why does the Federal Government continue to have an open checkbook based on the backs of the taxpayer, me?''

Well, I get letters like these every day, Mr. Chairman. And, again, we have to be cognizant as these so-called investments are made in Washington, we are taking away the ability of families including those in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas to make their investments in energy, their investments in water. And, again, I have no doubt that the sponsor of this amendment believes that good things can be done with the money, but is every good thing in America due to receive a Federal subsidy? Shall we start to subsidize Girl Scout cookies? How about cut flowers in everybody's home? My children, who are age 3 and 5, are just now learning to swim. Maybe we should subsidize swimming pools in every community across America. Where does it all end? Where does the madness stop?

This kind of spending fuels the single largest tax increase in history and threatens, threatens, to double taxes on our children. I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. At this point I would yield time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, several questions I guess I heard. Number one, about earmarks in general. I respect that. That is a legitimate debate to have. I personally thought I wasn't elected just to rubber-stamp the President's desires or his administration's; I was elected to also exercise judgment, judgment on behalf of my constituents and judgment on behalf of the people of America. One of the things I think is important is to educate the children of America.

This particular earmark goes to a private college that has entered into a private, private partnership with Merck to build a new science lab, to educate the children from, I would dare say, some of them might be from the Fifth District of Texas. This is a private university run by nuns. And, by the way, if Sister Janet ever called you and asked you for a favor, you would do it, too, if you had any brains, because I wouldn't say no to Sister Janet. So I don't know exactly what the debate is. This particular one is to educate our own children in an merging field of biotechnology and other sciences.

Now, I know that some of the people that don't like this amendment also don't want us to bring people from overseas for those jobs. I question, where would they come from? Who will we hire? If we don't want people coming from overseas, which is a fair comment, and we don't want to educate our own children, where is the next generation of scientists coming from if we don't help?

Mr. Chairman, this is just another ploy to get some kind of philosophical opportunity to make marks. It doesn't help the country, it doesn't address the specific item at hand, it is just a way to make some television time; and I urge this amendment be defeated.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, now, I have never met Sister Janet, but I have heard from Melanie in Chandler, who said: ''If I have to pay more taxes, then I can't afford to go to school.'' I have heard from Rose in Garland who says: ''I am a divorced mother with a child in college. An increase in taxes would wipe out hope of the first college graduate in the family.''

Fueling earmarks like these take away from family education programs, Mr. Chairman. And that is why I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I understand that people don't like to pay taxes. Neither do I, unless those taxes are used for wise and important purposes. And if the gentleman is so concerned about every taxpayer that doesn't want to pay taxes, then why are we still in Iraq?

The amounts of money you are concerned with you said is a very small

amount of money. And it is, to you. It is not to Sister Janet and to the students at Emmanuel College. And if you are that concerned with it, all you have to do is just shut down Iraq for less than 30 seconds and you would have this money available to us. So I don't believe that the real concern is tax money, because if it were, we wouldn't be having this debate. We would be having a debate on another matter that is much more financially irresponsible.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for Roosevelt University Biology Laboratory Equipment (IL).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike the earmark used to fund the equipping of two laboratories, creating 48 state-of-the-art work stations at Roosevelt University Biology Laboratory.

Again, Mr. Chairman, there are so many great colleges, so many great universities across our Nation. How do we get into the business of subsidizing some and not subsidizing others?

□ 1400

Again, there are many worthy colleges in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, Jarvis Christian College, Eastfield College, Trinity Valley Community College, and a much greater list beyond that. And so somehow, the students who attend those colleges in the Fifth District of Texas, either they or their peers are being asked to take money that would be destined for their education programs and send them somewhere else, in this case Illinois, to fund somebody else's education, somebody else's research.

I again stipulate that I have no doubt that good things could be done with this money. I don't know what. I'm sure the gentleman who sponsored the earmark would be happy to let us know the good things that can be done with this money.

But too often, Mr. Chairman, we seem to forget whose money it is in the first place. And so that's why I bring these letters, this correspondence from people from the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, because we should never ever forget that as we're plussing up some Federal program, be it in energy or water or education, you're taking away from some family's program where they're trying to fund their energy, their water, their education.

And again, Mr. Chairman, I just don't know how people can be aware of the fact that this Nation is on a collision course for a fiscal calamity. Just the government we have today threatens to double taxes on the American people. Now, a lot of those people today can't vote. Some of those people aren't even born yet. But we know it's going to happen.

Go to the Congressional Budget Office. Go to the Office of Management and Budget. Listen to the Federal Reserve Chairman. Let me quote from some other sources. I quoted earlier from Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, that without early and meaningful action, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened, with future generations bearing much of the cost.

CBO, either a substantial reduction in the growth of spending, a significant increase in tax revenues relative to the size of the economy, or some combination will be necessary to promote the Nation's long-term fiscal stability.

A famous economist, Robert Samuelson, the rising cost of government retirement programs, mainly Social Security and Medicare, increase taxes or budget deficits so much that they could reduce economic growth and this could trigger an economic and political death spiral.

And so what I hear from too many of my colleagues is, well, this is just a few dollars in my particular district. Well, the challenge is great. The challenge is great. We must lead by example, and by leading by example, we shouldn't be bringing a bill to the floor, number one, that has a 4.3 percent increase over last year, 3.7 percent over the administration's request, and quite often they request too much, that I believe contains 5.6 billion in earmarks. Where does it all stop?

Is this truly a Federal priority? Or should the priority be to assure that we leave the next generation with greater freedom and greater opportunity?

That fight starts today. I know too often the focus in the Nation's capital is on the next election and not the next generation. We ought to put it on the next generation because if we don't there'll be no money for them to fund their education programs. There'll be no money at all. And so we need to start today, and in this area of earmarking funds to these private educational institutions is a good start.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. At this point I would like to recognize my colleague from the State of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

I've listened rather intently all afternoon to the gentleman from Texas and his amendments. I've tried to find some logic. I've tried to find some validity. I've tried to find some argument. And, you know, for the sake of me, I have not been able to find any.

You can talk to any educators in America, and they will talk about the great need that exists for science teachers. You can talk to any medical schools, anybody really interested in health care, and they will talk about the need for scientists. You can talk to researchers. You can talk to people who try and keep us competitive with other nations, and they will talk about the great need that exists. You can talk to school districts who are importing science teachers from other countries because we don't have an adequate supply here in the United States of America.

Then I hear the gentleman say, let's not fund these institutions. Let's not give the Roosevelt University, named for one of our great Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which provides opportunities for young people who would never, ever get the chance to go to college, to learn science.

Well, I can tell you that I still have not been able to find the logic of the gentleman's argument, other than to say let's not have earmarks. I'm sure that Jarvis Christian could use whatever resources that it could get, and of course it would have them if its Representative had requested and tried to get what they need.

So I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, urge that it be voted down, down, down, as far down as it can get, and that we provide the opportunity for young people in America to fulfill the dream of a college education, a chance to earn a living, raise their families, make America the Nation that it has not been.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the $700,000 from the Department of Energy—Science account for biology laboratory equipment for Roosevelt University in Chicago, IL. Roosevelt University seeks equipment assistance for its biology laboratory which supports student and faculty work in cell and molecular biology. These subjects are integral to majors in the sciences, pre-health career programs, and science education. This request would equip 2 laboratories, creating 48 state-of-the-art workstations and provide equipment for institutions advancing science and science education. The total cost of the project is

$6,000,000. Roosevelt University has partnered with the State of Illinois and local university funds are available for this project. This laboratory also supports the summer career pathways biotechnology program with Chicago Public Schools.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure we're having a debate over how much money we're going to spend over education. We are certainly having a debate over who should do that particular spending.

I'm sorry that the gentleman from Illinois doesn't see the logic of American families who are working hard trying to save money, trying to put their children through college, and yet he has an earmark that is helping being funded by the largest tax increase in American history.

I heard from Joy in Dallas, ''I could not pay for a semester of college for my daughter if I had to send $2,200 more dollars to the government.'' We can ask her about the logic of the gentleman's earmark.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 39 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for Nanosys, Inc.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment would strike the earmark for Nanosys, Inc. The funding would have been used to develop a fuel cell membrane electrode assembly to enable the production of lightweight fuel cells suitable for automotive applications and portable electronic devices.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that that is a very worthy expenditure of funds. I, myself, prior to coming to Congress, used to be an officer in what most typically know is a green energy company.

The issues surrounding fuel cells, the issues surrounding making energy more environmentally friendly, making America more energy independent are very, very important issues. But I wonder, I wonder about the wisdom, about earmarking funds to a specific, which I assume to be, for profit company, a private company. Otherwise why are they called Nanosys, Inc.?

There are hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of companies across America, all trying to do good things, trying to feed our people, educate our people, clothe our people, heat their homes in the winter, cool them in the summer, help them with transportation. What isn't a priority here?

And so now we give all the indication that, instead of having a company come and compete in some process, some kind of competitive bidding process, instead we have an earmark to a private company. Why is their fuel cell technology so superior to somebody else's?

Back when I was affiliated with Green Mountain Energy of Austin, Texas, they were doing a lot of good things to produce power from wind energy and solar energy and biomass. Perhaps I should encourage some of my former colleagues of that particular private company to, instead of competing in the halls and competing in the marketplace, to come compete in the halls of Congress for an earmark.

Now, again, this Nation desperately needs advances in fuel cell technology, but to start handing money, through earmarks, to individual companies, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe is the way to go.

And furthermore, once again we face such fiscal challenges. Our energy challenge, our educational challenge are not the only challenges we face. We face a great fiscal challenge. To paraphrase the Controller General Walker, he has said, we are on the verge, in America, of being the first generation in our Nation's history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living.

□ 1415

It has never been done in the history of America. And we will do that if we don't stop the ways that we spend the people's money.

So, again, I am faced with a bill here that spends 4.3 percent more than last year. I am faced with an earmark that is part of that process. I am looking at a Democrat budget plan, Mr. Chairman, that will be $21 billion over the President's request. I am looking at a Democrat budget resolution that is going to impose the single largest tax increase in America's history not only on the good people of the Fifth Congressional District of Texas but everybody. So, again, the relevant question is not can good things be done with the money. I am sure Nanosys can do a lot of good things with the earmark that they will mostly likely receive. But it is coming out of American families. It is coming out of their energy budget. It is coming out of their education budget. If we don't fund it through that, if we pass more debt on to our children, then what are they facing? They are facing doubling of their taxes and our generation passing on to them a lower standard of living. And, Mr. Chairman, I simply do not wish to be a part of that.

So I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the very good work that he has done, all the members of the committee, because I know that you have to make difficult choices.

I am pleased to speak on the floor today about this investment in new technologies. As so many Members of the House know, I have the privilege of representing a congressional district that is the home of innovation and technology, high technology, biotechnology in our Nation. So perhaps the gentleman from Texas should come to visit because he would quickly come to respect what our country has come to rely on as well as our national economy.

I believe that this is a small but very important investment, and it will make vehicles more fuel efficient. I think this is not only a value of the people of my congressional district but of the entire Nation.

Our country today is paying too high a price for not being fuel efficient, not being energy efficient; and to add insult to injury, we are depending upon our opponents and in some cases our enemies to supply us. That is a policy that I believe is on its head, and so I was pleased to request of the committee that we make an investment in this technology.

Now, what does it do? It develops a new type of cost-effective, energy-efficient fuel cell for automobiles. Now, fuel cells, we know that they can dramatically improve mileage per gallon, but the downside is that they require platinum, and platinum is expensive and it is in short supply. But it is needed because it is the catalyst for these fuel cells.

This particular investment actually will go a long way to dramatically increase the surface area of the platinum in a fuel cell. In other words, it will bring down the price. In fact, this project that I have requested funding for promises to produce a one-third cut in the overall cost of the fuel cell.

Now, we are respected around the world for the investments that we have made collectively, public and private, in new technologies. It seems to me that this is cutting edge, that it is smart, and that it is wise.

I would like to make two broader observations. Number one, when I listen to the gentleman from Texas, he registers the complaints from his constituents.

You know what? You don't have a corner on the market of constituents that care about how we spend money. Of course these things should be scrutinized. I welcome it.

But when there is an overall public good here where all of the American people win, not just my constituents from the 14th District in California or the gentleman's district in Texas but all Americans, that is a good investment.

Number two, my constituents pay taxes, just like yours. And guess what? Californians don't get back everything that they send here. So are some things appropriate, good investments? We have to scrutinize that. But mine pay a fair share just as everyone else's do. As a matter of fact, California sends more than it gets back, which includes my constituents.

And I would like to add a final point, and my mother used to say this, and now her words, I think, are truer than ever: ''There are some that know the cost of everything but value nothing.''

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently to the gentlewoman's debate. I would simply say that it sounds too good to be true. If the company is on the cusp of making such wonderful breakthroughs, I just wonder, then, why taxpayer funds are needed. It would seem like investors would be knocking on the door to have a part of this great technology that this company is about to produce. I would love to sometime be able to visit California, visit this particular company, although I am not sure how practical it is. And I would encourage the gentlewoman to come to the Fifth District of Texas and speak to the people who are having to pay for this bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the following:

Ala Wai Canal feasibility study
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for Wailupe Stream Flood Damage Reduction Investigation
Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, GA
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Funds, North Hempstead, New York
Fumer Creek, NY
Moyer Creek, NY
University of North Alabama Green Campus Initiative (AL)
Upper Mississippi River System Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program
Ouachita and Black Rivers Navigation Project
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for Bayou DeSiard, Monroe, LA
J Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana
Ouachita River Levees, Louisiana
Camp Ellis, Maine
Gulf of Maine Research Institute Laboratory Upgrades, Maine
Port of Pittsburgh Commission
Kennedy Health System, Voorhees, New Jersey
Steele Creek, NY
Upper Susquehanna River Basin Environ Rest, Cooperstown, NY
Stillwater, MN Flood and Retaining Wall Project, St. Croix River
Mt. St. Helens Sediment Control, Washington
Columbia River Channel Improvements, Oregon and Washington
Columbia River at Baker Bay, WA
Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Restoration, Washington
Comite River Diversion Canal, Louisiana
Bayou Sorrel Lock, Louisiana
Louisiana State University Ag Center
Lake Belle View, Wisconsin
BioEthanol Collaborative, SC
Augusta, Georgia U.S. Army Corps of Engineers study
City of Atlanta, Environmental Infrastructure
Biorefinery and Hydrogen Fuel Cell Research, Development and Demonstration Project, Georgia
Sustainable Energy Research Facility Construction, Frostburg State University, MD
Johnson Creek Project, Arlington, Texas
Advancing Texas Biofuel Production Project, Baylor University, Texas
Center for Renewable Energy, Science, and Technology (CREST)
Jupiter Oxygen Inc., Dallas, Texas
Army Corps of Engineers Des Plaines River Project
Army Corps of Engineers Squaw Creek (Round Lake Drain) project
Ballona Creek Restoration, CA
Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration, CA
Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan, County of Los Angeles, CA
Tujunga Wash Environmental Restoration, County of Los Angeles, CA
Arroyo Seco Watershed Management Plan Feasibility Study, CA
City of North Las Vegas Water Reuse Facility, NY
Las Vegas Wash Improvement Project, Nevada
Channel Improvement Program, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis District
White River, AR
White River Navigation Study, AR
Bayou Metro Basin, AR
Ethanol from Agriculture for Arkansas and America project, Arkansas State University, Arkansas
Ozark Powerhouse Rehabilitation project, Arkansas
Mississippi River Levees project, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis District
Orland Wetlands Project, IL
Aquatic Invasive Species Dispersal Barriers, Chicago District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, IL
Lockport Lock Upper Pool Major Rehabilitation and Maintenance, Rock Island District of the U.S.
Army Corps of Engineers, IL
North San Diego County Water Recycling Project, CA
Shoreline restoration Tarpon Springs, FL
Logan Cancer Center Equipment and Technology, Intermountain Health Care Logan Regional Hospital, UT
Chattahoochee Dam Removal, GA
Underground waste pipeline integrity, Albany, GA
Fire Island Montauk Point Study, NY
Wolf River, TN
Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration project, OR
Table Rock Lake, MO
High School Branch creek study, MO
Missouri Alternative Renewable Energy Technology Center, MO
Jordan Creek, Springfield, MO
USA Cancer Institute Oncology Medical Record System, University of South Alabama, AL
Coosa-Alabama civil works project, AL
Whitewater River Basin Flood Control project, CA
Murriets Creek Flood Control project, CA
Rancho California Water District water study project, CA
Pine Mountain Lake, AR
National Center for Reliable Electric Power Transmission, AR
Agana (Hagatna) River Flood Control, Guam
Webbers Falls Lock and Dam, OK
Beaver Creek flood control project, VA and TN
Philpott Lake, VA
Levisa and Tug Forks of Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, WV, KY, and VA
Calcasieu Lock, Louisiana
Southwest Coastal Louisiana Hurricane Protection Study, LA
Gulf Petro Initiative, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, LA
Florida State University Electric Grid System Study, FL
Horseshoe Cove, Dixie County, FL
Clinton Lake, Kansas
Manhattan Levee Study, KS
Kansas Flood Damage Reduction project, Topeka, KS
Town Bluff Dam, Texas
Schuylkill River at Grand Point, PA
MRI machine, Memorial Hermann Baptist Orange Hospital, TX
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard Seawall, Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation, PA
Environmental Science Center, University of Dubuque, IA
Lock and Dam 11 project, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Rock Island District, IL
Hogan's Creek Ecosystem Restoration, FL
Jacksonville Harbor, FL
Jacksonville Marine Science Research Institute, FL
Georgetown Harbor, South Carolina
Wauchula Municipal Electric Substation Rehabilitation, FL
Wares Creek Flood and Coastal Storm Damage project, FL
Port Manatee, FL
Pecan Creek, Texas
Center for Advanced Scientific Computing and Modeling, University of North Texas, TX
Upper Trinity River Basin, TX

EnerDel Inc., IN
Indiana Wesleyan University School of Nursing, IN
Martin County Hydrogen Fuel Cell Development, NC
Dismal Swamp Canal, VA
Heacock and Cactus Channels flood control, CA
San Clemente Shoreline, CA
Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Project, CA
Upper Newport Bay Ecosystem Restoration, CA
Santa Anna River Mainstem flood control, CA
Leland Harbor, MI
Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration, MI
Boardman River Dam project, MI
Imaging and Oncology Equipment, Intermountain Healthcare, UT
Central West Virginia, WV
Marmet Lock and Dam, WV
Santa Clara River Watershed Protection Plan Feasibility Study, CA
Capinteria Shoreline Study, CA
Matilija Dam Removal and Ecosystem Restoration, CA
Lake Cachuma Water and Sewage Treatment Replacement Project, CA
Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership, MA
Muddy River Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Damage Control Project, Massachusetts
San Joaquin County Urban Flood Protection Project, CA
San Joaquin River Salinity Management, CA
Saint Genevieve levee, MO
St. Louis North Riverfront feasibility study, MO and IL
St. Louis Flood Protection, MO
Nicholson Borough Authority, Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facility, PA
Towanda Municipal Authority Public Water Expansion, PA
Whitpan Township, Pennsylvania
White River (North) Flood Damage Reduction Project, Indianapolis
Williamson County Water Recycling Project, TX
Cardiac Catheterization Research and Equipment, Metroplex Hospital, TX
Middle Brazos Feasibility Study, Brazos River Authority, TX
Wilmington Harbor project, New Castle County, DE
Vehicle to Grid Demonstration Project, Delaware Energy Office, DE
Bethany/South Bethany Beach Replenishment Project, Delaware
Good Samaritan Hospital Specialty Cancer Center, OH
Xavier University Science Equipment, OH
Central Riverfront Project, OH
Eastern Kentucky University Chemical Research Instrumentation, KY
Bluegrass Pride, KY
Green Visitor Center, Brooklyn Botanic Garden, NY
Blue River Channel, Kansas City, MO
City of Kansas City Water Services Department, MO
Swope Park, Kansas City, MO
Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas City, MO
Brush Creek Basin, Kansas City Water Services Department, Kansas and Missouri
Kansas City Plant Multi-Disciplined Integrated Collaborative Environment, Kansas City, MO
Feasibility study Edisto Beach, South Carolina
Lake Marion Regional Water Agency, SC
EngenuitySC, Columbia, SC
South Carolina HBCU Science and Technology Initiative (SC)
Wolf River Harbor, Memphis, Tennessee
Memphis Riverfront Development Project, TN
O.C. Fisher Lake Ecosystem Restoration, TX
Lower Colorado River Basin Study, TX
J. Percy Priest modifications, US Army Corps of Engineers Nashville District
Mill Creek Watershed feasibility study, TN
SemiTropic Phase II Groundwater Banking project, CA
Alton to Gale Levees Districts, IL
Wood River Levee, IL
East St. Louis and Vicinity Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Damage Reduction, IL
Belleville (IL) project, Madison and St. Clair Counties
Mystic River Harbor Commission, CT
Long Island Sound Dredged Material Management Plan, Army Corps of Engineers New England District, CT and NY
Pinhook Creek Flood Control Project, Huntsville, AL
Integrated Environmental Research and Services (IERS), Alabama A and M, University Research Institute
Fernandina Beach shore protection project, FL
Bronx River Basin, Army Corps of Engineers New York District
Orchard Beach, Army Corps of Engineers New York District
Soundview Park, Army Corps of Engineers New York District
Casper College Renewable Energy Program, WY
Energy-Efficient Green Campus Research Initiative, Texas A and M International University (TX)
Alliance for Nanohealth, TX
Brays Bayou, Harris County Flood Control District
Buffalo Bayou flood control, Harris County Flood Control District
Marshall Fund, Minority Energy Science Initiative, MD
Baltimore Harbor and Channels project, Maryland Department of Transportation
Poplar Island project, Maryland Department of Transportation
Eastern Shore, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island project, Maryland Department of Transportation
McCook Reservoir Project, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, MD and VA
Tennessee-Tombigee Waterway, Tennessee Waterway Development Authority
Roosevelt University Biology Laboratory Equipment (IL)
Greenup Locks and Dam Ohio River, Huntington District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Coal Fuels Alliance, KY and IN
Cumberland County Water Supply, TN
Belmont Bay Science Center, VA
George Mason University Center for Biodefense and Infectious Disease Research (VA)
Broad Creek shallow draft navigation channel, Norfolk District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Utility Integration of Distributed Generation, San Diego Gas and Electric, CA
Buford Dam and Lake Sydney Lanier (GA), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mobile District
International Port of Coos Bay, OR
Siuslaw River project, Oregon
Port of Umpqua, OR
Wave Power Demonstration Project, Reedsport, OR
Chatfield Reservoir water reallocation study, CO
Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program and San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Upper Colorado Region
Ecosystem Restoration project, Treat's Pond, MA
Aunt Lydia's Cove, New England District of the Army Corps of Engineers
Sesuit Harbor (MA), New England District Army Corps of Engineers
Green Harbor (MA), New England District Army Corps of Engineers
Long Island Dredged Material Management Plan, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection
Lehigh River Basin Release, Army Corps of Engineers Philadelphia District
Advanced Cellular and Biomolecular Imaging, Lehigh University (PA)
Biodiesel Injection Blending Facilities, Independence Biofuels, PA
Air Products and Chemicals Inc., PA
Center for Collaborative Sciences and Research, Barry University, FL
University-Community Outreach, Research and Training Endeavor, St. Thomas University (FL)
Everglades Ecosystem Restoration, Seminole Tribe, FL
Makah Community Water supply project, Makah Tribe, WA
Grays Harbor Navigation Improvement Project, WA
Inland Northwest Research Alliance Water Research Consortium, WA
Pugent Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration study, WA
Skagit River Flood Control project, WA
Green Duwamish Ecosystem Restoration Project, Seattle District Army Corps of Engineers
Mud Mountain Dam, Army Corps of Engineers Seattle District
National Center for Manufacturing Sciences, MI
Port of Monroe, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Detroit
Great Lakes Sea Lamprey Barrier, Great Lakes Fishery Commission
Spring Lake Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Texas
Michigan City Harbor Dredging project, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Chicago
Notre Dame Innovation Park, IN
Placer County Subregional Wastewater Treatment Project, CA
Placer County Biomass Utilization Pilot Project, CA
American River Pump Station, CA
Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration Project, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Pittsburgh, PA
Lower Monongahela Improvement Project for Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, PA
Nuvision Engineering, PA
Lynnhaven River Environmental Restoration, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, VA
Norfolk Harbor, Craney Island, Army Corps of Engineers Norfolk, VA
Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicle Demonstration, South Coast Air Quality Management District, CA
San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund, CA
Pistol Creek, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville District
First Creek, Knoxville, TN
Nuclear Security Science and Policy Institute, Texas A&M University
Meridian Wetlands, Meridian, TX
Whitney Lake Powerhouse, Whitney, TX
San Antonio Channel Improvement, San Antonio, TX
Dallas Floodway Extension, Upper Trinity River Basin, TX
Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Conservation Project, Waco, TX
Houston-Galveston Navigation Channel, TX
Clear Creek, TX
Texas A&M University Port of Freeport, TX
Upper Trinity River Feasibility Study, TX

Texas City Ship Channel, Galveston, TX
The Brazos River Authority, TX
Lower Colorado River Basin Study
Guadalupe and San Antonio River Basins
Greens Bayou, Houston, TX
Brazos Island Harbor
Lake Whitney, TX
Brazos Island Harbor, TX
Houston Ship Channel, TX
Minnehahah Creek Watershed District, MN
University of Southern Indiana
John T. Myers Locks and Dam, IN and KY
Illinois Institute of Technology's Energy and Sustainability Institute
DePaul University's Interdisciplinary Science and Technology Center
Cape Girardeau Floodwall, MO
Rolla Distributed Energy Research Center, MO
Clearwater Dam Rehabilitation, Clearwater Lake, MO
Brois Brule Drainage and Levee District
Wappapello Lake, MO
St. Johns-New Madrid Floodway Flood Control Project, MO
Mississippi River Levees, MO
Ramapo and Mahwah River Project, NY
Rockland Community College Science Lab
Presque Isle Shoreline Erosion Control Project, PA
Clean and Efficient Diesel Locomotive Project, PA
Direct Carbon Technologies, CA
Nanosys, Inc, CA
San Mateo County Harbor District
California Coast Conservancy
Integrated Biomass Refining Institute, North Carolina State University, NC
Robert F. Henry Lock and Dam, AL
Ground Water Protection Council, OK
Watsonville Area Water Recycling Project, CA
Pajaro River Flood Control Project, Santa Cruz, CA
Moss Landing Harbor, CA
Education Advancement Alliance, PA
City of Philadelphia Water Department
Rosa Bay Environmental Restoration Project, FL
Florida Inland Navigation District
Raritan River, Green Brook Sub-Basin, NJ Flood Damage Reduction Project
Salton Sea Research Project, Temecula, CA
Dismal Swamp and Dismal Swamp Canal Feasibility Project, Chesapeake, VA
Tyler's Beach Boat Harbor and Channel/Upland Disposal Site, Isle of Wight, VA
Appomattox River Federal Navigation Dredging Project, VA
Chesapeake Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway-Dismal Swamp Canal, VA
Antelope Creek Flood Damage Reduction Project, Fremont, NE
Sand Creek Environmental Restoration Project, NE
Western Sarpy-Clear Creek Flood Damage Reduction Project, NE
Lower Platte North Natural Resources District, NE
Rio Puerto Nuevo Flood Control Project, Puerto Rico
Portugues and Bucana Rivers Flood Control Project, Puerto Rico
Appalachian State University
Wake Forest University Health Sciences, Winston Salem, NC
Muddy River Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Damage Control Project, MA
Westport River and Harbor, MA
Colorado River Transmission Line Upgrade, Phoenix, AZ
Saint Clare's Hospital, Denville, NJ
Upper Passaic River & Tributaries, NJ Project
New York and New Jersey Harbor Deepening Project, Port Authority of NY and NJ
Raritan River, Green Brook Sub-Basin, NJ Project
Jackson Brook, NJ Flood Damage Reduction Project
Hudson River Estuary Lower Passaic River Restoration Project, NJ
Calleguas Municipal Water District, CA
Albright College, Reading, PA
St. Joseph's University, PA
Johnson Matthey Fuel Cells North America, PA
University of Arizona, Tuscon, AZ
Big Elk Creek, Elkton, MD
Chesapeake Bay Restoration, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District
Upper Delaware River Basin
New York City Watershed, NY
Office of Sponsored Programs and Research, Bowling Green State University, Green, OH
Defiance County, Office of the Commissioners, Defiance, OH
Lake Allatoona Operations and Maintenance, Allatoona, GA
Nueces River Basin, San Antonio, TX
John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, VA and NC
Center for Energy Efficient Design, Rocky Mount, VA
Roanoke River Flood Control, Roanoke, VA
J Percy Priest Greenway, Nashville, TN
Oaklands and Murfree Springs, Nashville, TN
Dale Hollow Lake, Nashville, TN
Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, TN
Central City Corps Project, Fort Worth, TX
Farmers Branch, Fort Worth, TX
Benbrook Lake Recreational Facilities, Forth Worth, TX
Harris Country Flood Control District, Houston, TX
Yuma East Wetlands Restoration, Yuma, AZ
Chicago Public Schools Science Laboratory, Chicago, IL
Northeast Texas Community College, Mt. Pleasant, TX
Photovoltaic System Demonstration, NY
Lock and Dam 24, IL and MO
Mill Creek South Slough, Rock Island, IL
Rock Island Sunset Marina, Rock Island, IL
Intelligent Optical Systems, Inc, Torrance, CA
West Basin Municipal Water District, Carson, CA
County of Los Angeles Department of Beaches and Harbors, Marina del Rey, CA
Sherman Hospital, Elgin, IL
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Pacific Northwest Regional Office, Boise, ID
Herbert Hoover Dike, West Palm Beach, FL
St. Lucie Inlet, St. Lucie Country, FL
Levine Children's Hospital, Charlotte, NC
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC
Nye County, Pahrump, NY
Photovoltaic green buildings technology art RPI, NY
Truckers Meadow Water Reclamation Facility, Sparks, NY
Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, CA
Hamilton City, CA
Yuba River, Sacramento, CA
Sutter County, CA
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Sacramento, CA
Perkins Country Rural Water System, Bison, SD
Mni Wiconi Rural Water System, Ft. Pierre, SD
Lewis and Clark Rural Water System, Sioux Falls, SD
Buffalo Harbor, NY
Buffalo River, Buffalo, NY
NanoDynamics, Buffalo, NY
Ohio River Greenway Development Commission, Jeffersonville, IN
Next Wave Systems, H.H.C., Pekin, IN
Solar Consortium, New Paltz, NY
Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, HI
Kawaihae Deep Draft Harbor, HI
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Honolulu District, Fort Shafter, HI
Mason Run Watershed, City of Whitehall, OH
Airpark Ohio Sewer Utility, Springfield, OH
Village of Blooming burg, OH
Culpepper Area Water System, OH
Euclid Creek, OH
Decision Support Tools for Complex Analysis, Springfield, OH
Hydro Partners Brazil, Solon, OH
IntelliTech, Fairborn, OH
Columbus Children's Hospital, Columbus, OH
Ohio University, Lancaster, OH
Brown Street, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH
Laboratory for Advanced Laser-Target Interactions, College of Math and Physical Science, Ohio State University
New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, Concord, Columbus, NH
Arcadia Harbor, MI
Pentwater Harbor, MI
Saugatuck Harbor, MI
White Lake Harbor, MI
Sweet Arrow Lake, PA
SiGNa Chemistry, New York, NY
Assunpink Creek, Trenton, NJ
Delaware River Basin, NY, NJ, PA, DE
Guadalupe River, CA
San Luis Reservoir, CA
Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, CA
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Tillamook, OR
Yaquina River, OR
Paint Branch Fish Passage and Stream, MD
Parish Creek, Anne Arundel County, MD
St. Jerome Creek, St. Mary's County, MD
Anacostia River and Tributaries, MD
Clemson University, Columbia, SC
Northport Harbor, Huntington, NY
New York Institute of Technology, NY
San Luis Rey River, Los Angeles, CA
Science and Technology Center, Chicago State University, Chicago, IL
Indian Ridge Marsh, Chicago, IL
Chicago Shoreline, Chicago, IL
Cook County, IL
Alexandria, LA to the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Protection Project, New Orleans, LA
Lake Shelbyville Wildlife Management Area, Shelbyville, IL
Dallas Floodway/Trinity Lakes Title XVI Study, City of Dallas, TX
Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, IL
Dansby Hall, Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA
City of Mayfield Heights, OH
Wind Spires, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH
Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH
Green Bay Harbor, Detroit, MI
Kewaunee Harbor, Detroit, MI
Sturgeon Bay Harbor and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, MI
Lackawanna River, Scranton, PA
Wynn Road, Oregon, OH
Pit-in-Bay, Put-in-Bay, OH
Huron Harbor, OH
Ten Mile River, MA
Saginaw River, MI
Wyandotte Municipal Services, Wyandotte, MI
City of Alma Fish and Wildlife Service, Alma, WI
Driftless Area Initiative, Lancaster, WI
Jones Inlet, Town of Hempstead, NY
Glen Cove Creek, Glen Cove, NY
Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, GA
Savannah Harbor, GA
Brunswick Harbor, GA
Waukegan Harbor, IL
Des Plaines River, IL
Palm Beach Harbor, FL
Broward County, FL
National Center for Manufacturing Sciences, Ann Arbor, MI
Wavecrest Labs, Rochester Hills, MI

Federal Technology Group, Cleveland, OH
Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY
Spunky Bottoms, Brown County, IL
Upper Missouri River Restoration, IL
Meredosia, IL
Illinois River Basin, IL
Lakeview Museum, Peoria, IL
Memorial Medical Center, Springfield, IL
Fountain Creek Watershed, Colorado Springs, CO
Charlestown Breachway Project, Massachusetts
Harbor of Refuge, Block Island, Rhode Island
San Francisco Bay Harbor—Main Ship Channel, California
Photovoltaic Demonstration Project, Connecticut
Southington Water Supply Study, Connecticut
The Winnebago River reconnaissance study, Iowa
General Investigations study in Perry, Iowa
Iowa Stored Energy Project
Luther College Science building renovation, Decorah, Iowa
Iowa Central Community College Renewable Fuel Labs
West Jackson Street Water Main Replacement, Painesville, Ohio
Allen Road/McCauley Road Waterline Construction, Stowe, Ohio
Ashtabula River and Harbor, Ashtabula, Ohio
Oakland Harbor, California
Clinton River, Michigan
Loma Linda University Medical Center, Loma Linda, CA
South Coast Air Quality Management District, Diamond Bar, CA
Hi-Desert Water District, Palms Highway, Yucca Valley, CA
Mojave Water Agency, Apple Valley, CA
Santa Ana River, San Bernardino, California
San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, 1350 South E. Street, San Bernardino, CA 92408
Mission Springs Water District, Desert Hot Springs
Morehouse School of Medicine, 720 Westview Drive, SW, Atlanta, GA 30310–1495
University of Kentucky's Center for Applied Energy Research, Kentucky
Northern Illinois University Fuel Research and Development, DeKalb, Illinois
Cook County Environmental Infrastructure Fund, Chicago, Illinois
Townsend Inlet, Cape May, New Jersey
City of Pennsville, New Jersey
New Jersey shore protection, New Jersey
Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Santa Clara Valley Water District, Santa Clara, California
South County Nature Preserve, Irvington, New York
Saw Mill River feasibility study, New York
Bronx River Basin, New York
University of Oklahoma Center for Biofuels Refining Engineering, Norman, Oklahoma
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, Sacramento, California
Parametric Technology Corporation, Needham, Massachusetts
Muddy River, Massachusetts
Massachusetts Port Authority, East Boston, Massachusetts
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Lee County, Sarasota County and Manatee County, Florida
Naples to Big Marco Pass, Collier County, Florida
Estero and Gasparilla Islands, Florida
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville, Florida
St. Lucie Inlet, Florida
New York City Watershed, New York, New York
Solar 2—Green Energy, Arts & Education Center, New York, New York
McHenry County Groundwater/Stormwater Protection program, Chicago, lllinois
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
Malden River, Malden, Massachusetts
Town of Winchester, Massachusetts
Middlesex Community College, Lowell, Massachusetts
Ben Hill County Commission, Fitzgerald, Georgia
Clean Cities Program, Macon, Georgia
Olijato Chapter of the Navajo Nation, Monument Valley, Utah
Westminster College, Salt Lake City, Utah
Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York
City of Lancaster, California
CureSearch, Bethesda, Maryland
Harriet Island, St. Paul, Minnesota
Minnesota's New Museum of Natural History, Minneapolis, Minnesota
J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana
Shreveport-Bossier Community Renewal, Inc., Shreveport, Louisiana
Elliot Bay Seawall, Seattle, Washington
Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Study, Seattle, Washington
Duwamish/Green Ecosystem Restoration Program, Seattle, Washington
Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Restoration Program, Washington
Eikos Inc., Franklin, Massachusetts
Upper Blackstone Water Pollution Abatement District, Millbury, Massachusetts
Blackstone River Coalition, Massachusetts
NuVision Engineering, Mooresville, North Carolina
State University of New York at Oswego (SUNY Oswego), Oswego, New York
Catalyst Renewables Corporation, Lyons Falls, New York
New Topsail Inlet, North Carolina
Carolina Beach Inlet, North Carolina
Lockwoods Folly Inlet, North Carolina
Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina
Santa Clara River Restoration Project, California
Eastern Santa Clara River basin Perchlorate Remediation Initiative, California
Walla Walla Watershed Feasibility Report, Washington
Columbia Basin Development League, Royal City, Washington
Electric Utility Transmission and Distribution Line Engineering Program at Gonzaga University, Washington
Farmington Groundwater Recharge Project, California
San Francisco Bay to Stockton Project, California
Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine Cleanup, California
Mokelumne River Regional Water Storage and Conjunctive Use Project, California
State University of New York College of Agriculture and Technology at Cobleskill, New York
Virginia Key Beach project
Jamaica Bay (Port Authority of New York and New Jersey)
Atlantic Coast New York City, East Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, NY Shoreline Project
Houma navigation Cal Dredging and Beneficial Use
Flagler Beach feasibility study, Florida
Reconnaissance Study of Deep Creek for St. Johns County, Florida
Stetson University's Sage Hall, DeLand, Florida
Bucks Harbor, Machiasport, Maine
Greenville Steam Company, Greenville, Maine
Los Angeles River, California
Port of Long Beach, California
Long Beach Desalination Project, California
Long Beach Water Refuse Project, California
City of Creedmoor Corps Study, North Carolina
North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina
Lexington Harbor, Michigan
Port Sanilac Harbor, Michigan
Lepeer Regional Medical Center CT Stimulator, Michigan
Escambia and Conecuh Rivers, Florida
Santa Ana River Mainstem Project, California
Orange County regional water reclamation project, CA
Suisun Bay Channel, California
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, California
Pinole Shoal management study, California
Napa River Salt March Restoration Project, California
Lower Walnut Creek, California
Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine Cleanup, Costa County, California
Trinity River Restoration Program, Weaverville, California
Walnut Creek Basin (Grayson & Murderer's Creeks), Contra Costa County, California
Va Shly-Ay Akimel Salt River Restoration, AZ
Tres Rios Environmental Restoration, Arizona
Rio Salado, Phoenix and Tempe Reaches, Arizona
Parkersburg Riverfront Park project, New Martinsville, West Virginia
Monongahela Locks Automation project, Morgantown, Hildebrand and Opekiska Locks, West Virginia
West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control project, Philippi, Parsons and Belington West Virginia; Clymer Pennsylvania
Turkey Creek flood damage reduction project, Kansas City, Kansas and Missouri
Upper Turkey Creek project, Kansas
Kansas City Metropolitan flood protection system, Kansas and Missouri
Bush Creek Basin project, Johnson County, Kansas and Jackson County, Missouri
Four Mile Run environmental restoration project, Virginia
Tripps-Holmes-Cameron Run-Hunting Creek water resources study, Virginia
National Venter for Biodefense, Virginia
University of Kansas Medical Center Tele-Oncology Network, Kansas
Greater New Haven Clean Cities Coalition, New Haven, Connecticut
Electro Energy, Inc., Danbury, Connecticut
Environmental restoration feasibility study, Upper South Hampton Township, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia Navy Yard Seawall, Delaware River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Flood Plain Management Study, Pennsylvania
CENTRIA, Moon Township, Pennsylvania
Dams and Locks on the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania
Conversion of Waste Biomass into Biodegradable Plastics and Bioethanol: Research on a New Streamline Biomass to Sugar Conversion Process, Indiana, Pennsylvania
Concurrent Technology Corporation, Johnstown, Pennsylvania
South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Infrastructure Program
Structural and nonstructural flood control, stream bank protection, storm water management and channel clearing, Southwestern Pennsylvania
Sustainable Biofuels Development Center, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado
Upper Colorado River/San Juan River basin Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Colorado

Sorghum to Ethanol Research, Lubbock, Texas
Building Materials Reclamation Program, Charlotte, North Carolina
RenewableNY project, New York, New York
New School University Green Building, New York
Coney Island Area Shore Protection Project, New York, New York
Norwalk, California, Water Supply Improvement
Pioneer Valley Life Sciences Institute ($2 million), Springfield, Massachusetts
Wind Science and Engineering Research Center, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas
J. Strom Thurmond O_2 System for Richard B. Russell Pumped Storage
Success Dam Seismic Remediation Project, California
Upper San Joaquin River Storage Investigation, California
Laurentian Energy Authority, Minnesota
Garrison-Kathio-West Mille Lacs Lake Sanitary District, Minnesota
Section 569 authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Minnesota
St. Lawrence Seaway Study
Duluth-Superior Harbor maintenance and operations, Minnesota and Wisconsin
Northern Wisconsin Environmental Assistance Program
Protection of endangered mussels, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan
City of St. Croix Falls, Wisconsin
Lake Superior Small Harbor Dredging, Michigan
A second lock at Sault St. Marie, Michigan
St. Croix River Basin Reconnaissance Study, Minnesota and Wisconsin
Mt. Wachusett Community College Wind Project, Massachusetts
Integrative Science Building, UMASS, Amherst, Massachusetts
Milford Pond, Milford, Massachusetts
Hoosic River Restoration Design, Massachusetts
Berkshire Environmental Resources Center, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, North Adams, Massachusetts
Popular Brook Continuing Authorities Program, New Jersey
Shark River Maintenance Dredging project, New Jersey
Nutley Board of Education, Nutley, New Jersey
Peckman River and Tributaries, New Jersey
Rio Salado Oeste project, Salt River, AZ
Achieving a College Education (ACE) program, Maricopa Community Colleges, Arizona
Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reuse project, Arizona
Rio de Flag project, Flagstaff, Arizona
Seton Hall University Science and Technology Center, South Orange, New Jersey
Newark Bay, Hackensack, and Passaic Rivers operation or maintenance, New York and New Jersey
High Efficiency Cascade Solar Cells, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico
San Francisco MUNI Solar Energy Facility Project, California
Hamilton Army Airfield Wetland Restoration Project, California
San Francisco Bay Harbor and Bay Drift Removal project, California
San Francisco Bay Long Term Site-Monitoring Strategy, California
University of San Francisco Science Facility and Hamey Science Center, California
Renewable & Logistical Fuels for Fuel Cells at the Colorado School of Mines, Colorado
Jefferson County Bioenergy Initiative, Colorado
White Earth Tribal Nation Wind Energy Project, Minnesota
Willmar Municipal Utilities Power Generation Study, Minnesota
Stripper Well Consortium, Penn State University, College Park, Pennsylvania
Bath house and camping area at Tioga-Hammond Lake, Pennsylvania
Bath house and playground equipment at Tionesta Dam, Pennsylvania
Bath house and camping area at Cowanesque Lake, Pennsylvania
Campground improvements at East Branch Clarion River Chippewa River at Montevideo, Minnesota
Strategic Biomass Initiative of the Mississippi Technology Alliance, Mississippi
Sustainable Energy Research Center, Mississippi State University, Starkville, Mississippi
Laboratory facilities, Messiah College, Grantham, Pennsylvania
Garrison Diversion Project, North Dakota
Fargo-Ridgewood Flood Control Project, North Dakota
Garrison Dam and Power Plant, North Dakota
Sierra Trauma Center, St. Rose Dominican Hospitals, Las Vegas, Nevada
West Cary Stream Restoration project, Cary, North Carolina
Upground reservoir, Marysville, Ohio
5th Avenue Dam removal, Olentangy River, Columbus Ohio
Timberlake Wastewater upgrades, Franklin County, Ohio
Florida Renewable Energy Program, University of Florida, Gainesville
Friant-Kern and Madera Canals Capacity Improvement, California
Greenbrier River Basin, West Virginia
Robert C. Byrd Locks and Dam, Ohio River, West Virginia, and Ohio
Southern West Virginia environmental infrastructure projects, West Virginia
Fuel Cell balance-of-Plant Reliability Testing Prototype High Altitude Airship Project, Stark State College of Technology, North Canton, Ohio
Louisville Wastewater Treatment Plant, Louisville, Ohio
Orrville water main replacement, Orrville, Ohio
Rolls-Royce Solid Oxide fuel cell systems development, Fuel Cell Proto typing Center at Stark State College
Center for Zero Emissions Research and Technology, Montana
State University, Bozeman, Montana
Western Environmental Technology Office, MSE Technology Applications, Inc., Butte, Montana
Fort Peck / Dry Prairie Rural Water System, Montana
King County Biogas and Nutrient Reduction Project, Washington
Seattle Cancer Care Alliance Proton Beam Therapy, Washington
Dine Power Authority Project, Window Rock, Arizona
Little Colorado River Levee project, Winslow, Arizona
Sparks Arroyo Flood Control, Colonia, El Paso, Texas
El Paso Flood Control project, El Paso, Texas
Mill Seat Landfill Bioreactor Renewable Green Power Project, Monroe County, New York
Alternative Energy/Geothermal Technology Demonstration Program, Daemen College, Amherst New York
Pikeville Medical Center medical science research facility, Pikeville, Kentucky
Paintsville Lake recreational improvements, Johnson County, Kentucky
Southern and Eastern Kentucky Environmental Restoration Initiative, Kentucky
Wolf Creek Dam Seepage project, Kentucky
Southeast Bioenergy Initiative, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama
MBI International biomass research, Lansing, Michigan
Intermediary BioChemicals, Okemos, Michigan
Energy Efficient Press and Sinter of Titanium Powder, Glendale Heights, Illinois
Miami Museum of Science Renewable Energy Project, Miami, Florida
Florida Keys Water Quality Improvement, Monroe County Florida
Lower Saddle River Project, New Jersey
Hackensack Meadowlands Environmental Restoration, New Jersey
Port of Los Angeles, Main Channel Deepening Project, California
Water Replenishment District Regional Groundwater Monitoring Program, Lakewood, California
Jackson Park Hospital Green Medical Office Building, Chicago, Illinois
Parker Hannifin Corporation Hybrid Hydraulic Drive Train Demonstration, Youngstown, Ohio
NorthEast Ohio Pipeline Scooping Study, Mentor, Ohio
Baard Energy L.L.C., CO2 Production & Emissions Study, Mentor, Ohio
Lower Girard Dam Repairs, Girard, Ohio
Struthers South Interceptor Sewer Project, Youngstown, Ohio
Windham to Ravenna Arsenal Infrastructure Project, Ravenna, Ohio
Brookfield Center North Sanitary Sewer—Phase II, Vienna, Ohio
Animas-LaPlata Project, Durango, Colorado
Arkansas River Fisheries Habitat Restoration, Pueblo, Colorado
Los Angeles Basin Water Supply Augmentation Study, California
La Mirada Flood Control and Drainage Study, California
Barnegat Inlet Navigation Project, New Jersey
Solid Acid Fuel Cell Research, California
Metropolitan Region of Cincinnati flood control project, Duck Creek, Ohio
Perry Township Waterline Extension, Ohio
Williamsburg Water Treatment Plant Expansion, Ohio
Borough of Hatfield wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements, Pennsylvania
Elizabeth River sediment remediation, Hampton Roads, Virginia
Cheyney University Science and Technology Building, Cheyney, Pennsylvania
Stamford Waste-to-Energy Project, Conecticut
Bridgeport Harbor, Conecticut
Norwalk Harbor Federal Navigation Project, Connecticut
Portsmouth Harbor/Pascataqua River Feasibility Study for Navigation Improvement, Portsmouth, NH
Wiswall Dam Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, New Hampshire Fish and Game Department, Durham, NH
Cocheco River Federal Navigation Project, Maintenance Dredging, Dover, NH
Hampton Harbor Improvement Project, Pease Development Authority, Division of Ports and Harbors, Portsmouth, NH
Hampton Harbor Maintenance Project, Pease Development Authority, Division of Ports and Harbors, Portsmouth, NH
Olmstead Lock and Dam Project, USACE Louisville District, Louisville, KY
Energy Xchange, Yancey County Local Government, Burnsville, NC
Western North Carolina Clean Energy Business Incubator Consortium, Asheville, NC

South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Improvement Program, Altoona-Blair County County Development Corporation, Altoona, PA
Eastern Idaho Regional Wastewater Authority, City of Shelley, Idaho
Harbor Deepening Project at the Port of New York and New Jersey, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, New York, NY
Green Department of Public Works/Fleet Maintenance Project, Town of North Bergen's Green
Maintenance Building, Township of North Bergen, North Bergen, NJ
Olcott Outer Harbor Breakwater Project, Niagara County Department of Economic Development, Sanborn, NY
Dredging of the Genesee River at the Rochester Harbor, Buffalo District
Nanosystems Initiatives at the University of Rochester, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY
Nanostructured Solar Cell Project, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Little Rock, AR
University of Saint Francis Achatz Hall, University of Saint Francis, Fort Wayne, IN
Monday Creek Watershed, Hocking River, Huntington, WV
Arbaugh-Hope Water Project, Vinton County Commissioners, McArthur, OH
South Carolina Lambda Rail Portal, Clemson University, Clemson, SC
National Energy Resource Center, York Technical College National Energy Resource Center, York Technical College, Rock Hill, SC
Estudillo Canal Feasibility Study, San Francisco, CA
Jack D. Maltester Channel (San Leandro Marina), San Francisco, CA
Dredging of Menominee Harbor, Menominee River, Detroit, MI
Michigan Technological University Nanostructured Materials Development project, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI
Traverse City Harbor Dredging at Northwestern Michigan College, Traverse City, MI
McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Locks and Dams, Tulsa, OK
City of Elyria Water Treatment Plant Water Intake Project, Elyria, OH
Flood Control Project, Sandy Creek, TN
Flood Control Demonstration Project, West Tennessee Tributaries, Obion and Forked Deer River, West, TN
Pinole Shoal Management CA/Delta Long Term Management Strategy for Delta Levee rehabilitation, Contra Costa County, CA
Contra Costa Water District Alternative Intake Project, Contra Costa County, CA
Napa River Shallow Draft Dredging, San Francisco, CA
West Sacramento Flood Control Project Deficiency Study and Repair, Sacramento, CA
Dredging of Noyo Harbor, Fort Bragg, CA
Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Dredging, Sacramento, CA
Warm Springs Dam Inundation maps, San Francisco, CA
EI Dorado Lake, KS (O&M), Tulsa, OK
Oologah Lake Watershed, Oklahoma and Kansas, Tulsa, OK
Equus Beds Division of the Wichita Project, City of Wichita, Wichita, KS
Sustainable Energy Solutions, Wichita State University, Wichita, KS
Federal Maintenance Dredging of the Newburyport Harbor Entrance Channel, Concord, MA
Silicon Based Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Chip for Portable Consumer Electronics, Lilliputian Systems, Wilmington, MA
Urban Environmental Research Center and Greenhouse Project, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, NY
Holes Creek Flood Protection Project, Miami Conservancy District, Dayton, OH
Edison Materials Technology Center (EMTEC) Hydrogen Energy Production and Storage—Phase IV, Edison Materials Technology Center, Dayton, OH
South Goose Creek, Cottonwood Pond, Boulder County, CO
Canyon Road Water Treatment Plant Upgrade, Sante Fe County, Sante Fe, NM
Jicarilla Apache Reservation Rural Water System, Rio Arriba County, Dulce, NM
Navajo Hopi Land Commission Office Renewable Energy Generation Project, Window Rock, AZ
St. Joseph Harbor, St. Joseph, Detroit, MI
Dredging the harbor at South Haven, MI, Detroit, MI
Sustainable Energy Center, Biodiesel from farmed algae, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI
Bioscience Education Center, Germantown Innovation Center, Life Sciences and Technology Park of the Germantown Biotechnology Project, Germantown, MD
Jupiter Oxy Fuel Technology Project, Illinois
Northwest Indiana Computation Grid, Indiana
Pilot Energy Cost Control Evaluations, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Indiana
Purdue Calumet Island Water Institute, Indiana
Purdue Hydrogen Technologies Program, Indiana
Waste-to-Energy Cogeneration Project, Munster, Indiana
CIMTRAK Cyber Security software, Indiana
Bioenergy Cooperative ethanol biomass fuel plant, Indiana
Little Calumet River, Indiana
Indiana Harbor—Grand Calumet River Environmental Dredging, Indiana
Burns Waterway Small Boat Harbor, Indiana
Burns Waterway and the Bailey intake pipe, Indiana
Calumet Region Environmental Infrastructure, Indiana
Cedar Lake, Indiana
Notre Dame Geothennal Ionic Liquids Research, Indiana
Purdue Technology Center, Indiana
Indiana Shoreline, Indiana
Oregon Institute of Technology Geo-Heat Center, Klamath Falls, Oregon
Port of Umatilla biodiesel refining plant, Pendleton, Oregon
Savage Rapids Pumping Plant, Rogue River Basin, Oregon
Umatilla Basin Project, Umatilla County, Oregon
Elk Creek Lake permanent trap-and-haul facility, Oregon
Walla Walla River Restoration Feasibility Study, Oregon
Environmental System Center at Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York
Rochester Institute of Technology Integrated Power Microsystems, Rochester, New York
Woody Biomass Project at State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Limestone Creek, Fayetteville, New York
Onondaga Lake, New York
Irondequoit Harbor, New York
Minnesota Center for Renewable Energy, Minnesota State University Mankato
Blue Earth Ecosystem Restorations, MN, SD, IA, ND
Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee River, TN
Port Everglades Future Dredging Program, Florida
Seminole Big Cypress Critical Project, Everglades and South Florida
The Methanol Economy, University of Southern California
Science and Technology Facility, Bennett College, Greensboro, North Carolina
Vermont Independent Colleges Zero-Energy Campaigns, Vermont
Canaveral Harbor, Florida
Illinois State University Biomass Research, Illinois
Perry Memorial Hospital Picture Archiving and Communication System (PACS), Illinois
Will County Government, Illinois
Port Everglades Dredging Reimbursement Project, Broward County, Florida
Kentucky Lock and Dam Addition Project, Tennessee River, Kentucky
Elvis J. Stahr Harbor Project, Hickman-Fulton County, Kentucky
DeSoto County Wastewater Treatment Facility, Mississippi
New Albany Electrical Substation, Mississippi
Carbon sequestration study, Mentor, Ohio
New Mexico Center for Isotopes in Medicine, University of New Mexico
Ecosystem Revitalization at Route 66, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Rio Grande Bosque Rehabilitation (Bosque wildfires), New Mexico
Middle Rio Grande Bosque, New Mexico
Petaluma River Flood Control, California
Corte Madera Creek, California
North Bay Water Reuse Project, CA
San Rafael Channel Dredging, California
Tools for the Nanotechnology Education Development Program, Oregon
Tualatin Basin water supply project, Oregon
CVD Single-Crystal Diamond Optical Switch, Maryland
Water Infrastructure Project, Mill Creek basin, Louisville, KY
Water Infrastructure Project, Louisville, KY
McAlpine Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Louisville, KY
Math and Science Educational Project, Louisville Science Center, Louisville, KY
Pinellas County Beach Erosion Control Project, Pinellas County Board of Commissioners, Clearwater, FL
WaterReuse Foundation Research Activities, WaterReuse Foundation, Alexandria, VA
Eckerd College Science Center, Eckerd College, St. Petersburg, FL
Chenega IRA Council, Chenega Bay, AK
Technology Initiative for Print Disabled Community, Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Princeton, NJ
Kotzebue Electric Association's Wind Program, Kotzebue Electric Association, Kotzebue, AK
Renewable Energy Biomass Utilization Program, Alaska Village Initiatives, Anchorage, AK
Tanadgusix Foundation's Hydrogen Project, Tanadgusix Foundation (TDX), Anchorage, AK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This particular amendment would eliminate all the earmarks in the bill, all 800 of them, all $1.1 billion of them.

Now, I have two confessions to make about this amendment before I proceed

here. Confession number one is that the amendment is rather inartfully drafted. And the way it is drafted, it may actually catch some things, some elements of spending, that were not technically part of the 800 earmarks in the bill. But the reason for that is that the 800 earmarks are not actually in the bill. Something I would like to address later. But the amendment is drafted the only way it can be drafted under the current situation, under the current process, to eliminate all of these 800 earmarks and $1.1 billion.

The second confession I would like to make is that one of those 800 earmarks that is in the bill is one I requested. Now, I believe a couple other Members requested it as well, but it is definitely one that I requested.

So you may be asking why would I be proposing an amendment to eliminate an earmark that I requested. Do I suddenly believe that the earmark that I requested is somehow not valid or somehow not appropriate? No. Had I believed it was not valid or not appropriate when I requested it some months ago, I would not have requested it.

But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the process by which these earmarks happen stinks. And I believe that this process is terrible and that until we reform this process, we should eliminate all earmarks.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is why I offer this amendment to you today. It is not because I think that necessarily all 800 earmarks, including my own, in this bill are inappropriate. I do think $1.1 billion is more money than I would like to see relative to this or any earmarks. But it is because until we reform this process and have a process that works, I don't think we should do any earmarks at all.

The earmark process has, I believe, actually hurt not just Republicans and Democrats and not just taxpayers, but I believe it has hurt this institution. And I believe that is why Chairman OBEY, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has expressed his own distaste for earmarks and the earmark process.

So let me make a few suggestions, 10 of them precisely, if I may, as to how this process might be reformed, how we might get it right.

First, put the earmarks in the bill. The reason we have had to draft this amendment so oddly is because the earmarks are not actually written in the text of the bill. If we are going to spend the taxpayers' money as Members of Congress on specific things, those specific things we are spending it on should be in the language of the bill that appropriates those expenditures.

Second, let's have full disclosure of all the earmarks in the bill and let's have it at least a week before the vote. I think we got the list of these earmarks last, I think it was, Thursday or Friday, and here we are debating these today. There are 800 earmarks in this bill. It is a little tough for us or anyone else to go through 800 earmarks in just a couple of days.

Third, let's have full disclosure of all earmark requests. Every earmark in this bill in theory has a certification from the Member who requested it claiming what they have requested and why and also claiming that they have no financial interest in that earmark. Let's make those public. Those were turned in, I can't remember exactly whether it was February or March. I think it was March. Why should those be under some secrecy? Why should all those earmark requests not be available to the public? And when we have full disclosure of earmarks, let's have real disclosure of earmarks. The disclosure that we got last week was one list that has the earmark amount and the project and another list that has the project and the Member requesting. So if you want to take the Member requesting and match it up with the amount, you have to match up the two lists somehow. Now, if there are only 10 earmarks, you could do that. But with 800 it is really hard to do, and not in a searchable database. In fact, in a few cases where we were able to get disclosure of the actual earmark request, which only happened yesterday afternoon, the description of the project in the earmark request is not the same as the description of the project on the earmark list. So what we have now is an attempt at some late partial disclosure. It is not full disclosure in any way, shape, or form of earmarks or earmark requests.

Mr. OBEY has suggested that Members often feel like they are ATMs. That is what this earmark process does. It diminishes, I think, the value of all of us that serve in this institution. We are here to make public policy. We are not ATMs. I was stunned when, in my first few months as a Member of this House, 70 different people came into my office not asking for a certain element of public policy, not encouraging me to support this or that or the other, but asking for money, asking for earmarks, because they saw Members of Congress as an ATM.

Number four, we should not have any earmarks for programs that are not authorized; otherwise, why do we bother to authorize programs? If we are not going to go through the process of authorizing a program, then earmarks can come in and be about anything. I think that is what you have seen in some of Mr. HENSARLING's and Mr. FLAKE's objections is that earmarks have become about almost anything.

Number five, we should not have earmarks that do not serve a Federal interest and have a Federal nexus. This is Federal taxpayers' money.

□ 1430

There are many great needs out there in cities, counties and States, but cities and counties and States have sources of revenue. It's not like we don't have enough to do here. It's not like we don't have other things that we could spend the money on. God forbid we might give it actually back to the taxpayers. But even if we weren't going to do that, there are obviously plenty of truly Federal priorities that we should not be fixing sewers and other things like that, which are clearly local priorities.

Six, we should not be including earmarks that are requested outside of the State of a Member of Congress. Now, the point of these earmarks is to direct funds for things that our constituencies need. Why would we ever be wanting to direct funds for things that some other constituency needs? We know why. It's because some lobbyist or something somewhere requested it. So let's not be requesting or honoring earmarks that are outside of one's State.

Seven, we shouldn't be giving earmarks to private entities without some kind of a competitive bidding process. You know, if other elements of the Federal Government were to award contracts for millions of dollars to private entities without some kind of bidding process, we would complain about it here. And we do complain about it when we see it, and we should complain about it when we see it. But yet under this earmark process, many earmarks are given directly to private entities without any competitive bidding process.

Eight, conference reports should never increase an earmark. Now, everything we could do here in the House to disclose and provide sunshine for earmarks could be null and void if you simply can drop earmarks into a conference report that were not in either the House or the Senate version of the bill. So we should never have earmarks coming back to this floor that are more than the amount that was in either the House or the Senate version of that bill.

Nine, earmarks should be available for discussion at a hearing. We're spending the public's money. It should be exposed, what we're doing; it should be clear to people what we're doing; and we should talk about it and be willing to stand up and defend it, or not do it.

Ten, when we eliminate earmarks, the money we save should go into debt reduction. It should save the taxpayers' money. It should go to reduce the Federal deficit.

Now unfortunately, if this amendment were to pass, I would love to tell you that the $1.1 billion to the taxpayers would be saved, but the way the rules are, it would take another amendment, a subsequent amendment to then save that money for the taxpayers.

Mr. CULBERSON of Texas offered an amendment in the Appropriations Committee to change that rule so that if we do strike and/or eliminate any number of earmarks, that that money saved is actually saved, that it goes to debt reduction. But that amendment was defeated.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are 10 things that could put sunshine on this earmark process. But we are a long ways

from that sunshine. We are a long ways from that accountability. We are a long, long ways from all these earmarks being visible, justifiable and, in fact, justified.

So until then, I have made and will continue to make proposals to eliminate all the earmarks in any bill regardless of whose they are, myself included, or others, until we reform the process.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would be happy to recognize my friend and ranking member, Mr. HOBSON from Ohio, for such time as he may consume.

Mr. HOBSON. I would like to thank my chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have put together, I think, a very good bill. This bill is $31.6 billion. The earmarks and the directed spending in this supplemental we're talking about today is about 3 percent of the bill, it's $1.09 billion. There are 777 projects. This includes the plus-ups to the administration's request. In some cases the administration asked for some money, we decided it wasn't quite enough to finish off something, so we added money to it.

Let me talk a little bit about the Corps. The administration requested $4.08 billion for 837 projects. The House adds $777 million for 466 projects. There are no new authorizations or new starts. And sometimes the President asks for new starts, Members ask for new starts; we don't have enough money to do new starts, so we stopped new starts.

The earmarks are 14 percent of the total Corps' budget. I might add, when we started with the Corps of Engineers, the Corps didn't have a 5-year development plan, they had no vision of where it really wanted to go. It didn't come from the administration to change that, it came with the chairman and myself working together. We changed that in the Corps. That didn't come out of the administration, those nameless people down there who somehow figure out how they're going to spend the money. At least here we know who's spending the money and we know the projects that we're looking at.

Title II. The administration requested $551 million for 146 projects. The House added $72 million for 47 projects.

In DOE, in title III, the House adds $246.5 million for 263 projects. This represents less than 1 percent of the total DOE budget, which is $32 billion. This is a 50 percent cut to the fiscal year 2006 level. And I might say on the Republican side, it is now a 40 percent split versus the 60 percent as the majority changed. I think we've done a good job at looking at people's needs.

Let me give an example. In my State, ODOT is the big highway people, and they always want to do these big projects. And when I want to do something in my town that really impacts people within my city, they don't have time to do it. And even when I do an earmark, they fight me on the earmark because they want to do the big deals. They want to do the big projects that cost a lot of money. And they take care of people, too. But at the local community, I think sometimes we are better off at what we want to do versus what the large agencies want to do.

So I want to thank the chairman, and frankly, the staff, who has looked through all these projects. We've looked through all these projects. We've vetted these projects. And we've done as good a job as I think we can in looking at them. And we're not the technical people, but the staff is more technical. We've gone back on the Corps projects and talked to Corps of Engineers and said, do these projects make sense? Are they executable? Can we get them done? And they've come back and said yes. So we have had a review.

I think this is a well done bill. I think the earmarks are essential to Congress doing its oversight. I wish, frankly, we could work better with the administration on their earmarks. We don't know what they're going to do. They don't come and talk to us. Even in the hearings, we have no idea where they're going to spend all their money on the projects they want.

I think it would be a better process if we could all work together and have more transparency, and did more things at the local level. And we could take out a lot of the bureaucracy that exists in those huge bureaucracies that we tend to fund without anybody ever questioning how much money they're spending there.

And I don't want to pay more taxes either. I think the projects here that we do help the quality of life within the communities where we live.

I support the bill. I'm opposed to this amendment. And I would request that Members oppose this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for this wonderful amendment.

I rise today out of a concern for what earmarks are doing to this body. Those of us on the Republican side understand very well the perils of unfettered earmarks. It's part of the reason we're squarely in the minority today. But there are greater concerns than which party is in the majority. I hope that each of us, Republicans and Democrats, would recognize this.

Proponents of earmarking defend the practice by noting that Article I of the Constitution gives Congress the power of the purse, and that earmarking is consistent with that responsibility. It is true that Congress has the power of the purse. But the contemporary practice of earmarking circumvents, rather than enhances, the careful execution of our responsibility as stewards of the public purse.

Take the Labor-HHS bill that will be coming up later today; it contains 1,300 earmarks. Are we to assume that each of these 1,300 has been properly vetted and scrubbed? No way. I suspect that, just as the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee noted a couple of weeks ago, there is no way to adequately screen these earmarks given the tight appropriations schedule. The question needs to be asked, why are we so bent on moving forward with 1,300 earmarks?

I should note that last year there were no House earmarks in the Labor-HHS bill. The world didn't come crashing to a halt. The year before there were no House earmarks in the Labor-H bill. The planets are still in order today.

Why are we so bent on moving forward when we can't adequately vet these earmarks?

Perhaps the most frequent justification for the contemporary practice of earmarking is that ''Members of Congress know their districts better than some faceless bureaucrat in Washington.'' Now, I'm not here to defend faceless bureaucrats. They waste a lot of money in my district, as well as others. Faceless bureaucrats in Federal agencies waste so much money that somebody needs to be constantly looking over their shoulder and providing oversight. That's why we're here. But let's face it, when we approve congressional earmarking for indoor rain forests in Iowa or teapot museums in North Carolina, we make the most spendthrift faceless bureaucrats look frugal.

Excess by Federal agencies does not excuse congressional excess. If Federal agencies don't follow the procedures requiring competitive bidding or other processes, then we should cut their funding and/or mandate that they change their practice. We shouldn't try to one-up them with equally suspect appropriations.

Just as an aside, we saw just a couple of weeks ago that the majority of this Chamber chose to deny funding for one particular earmark. Now, for the RECORD, it was my amendment to cut funding for the ''Perfect Christmas Tree Project.'' There was no Federal nexus, and I didn't think it was a wise use of Federal dollars. But it was no less worthy than hundreds of projects funded by the same legislation.

The distribution of earmarks is based on politics, not policy. Most appropriation bills award 60 percent of the earmarks to the majority party and 40 percent to the minority party. Is there a policy reason for this allocation that has reversed with every legislation? Are well-positioned Members who award themselves with more earmarks than rank-and-file Members more deserving? Are their districts more

needy? In some appropriation bills, each member of the committee is given an equal share. Are we to assume here that these districts have exactly the same needs?

The truth is, we can try all we want to to conjure up some noble pedigree for the contemporary practice of earmarking, but we are just drinking our own bath water if we think the public is buying it.

It seems that over the past few years we've tried to increase the number of earmarks enough so that the plaudits we hear from earmark recipients will drown out the voices of taxpayers who have had enough. It hasn't worked, thank goodness. For every group that directly benefits from earmarks, there are hundreds who see it as a transparent gimmick to assure our own reelection.

Mr. Chairman, our constituents deserve better. This institution deserves better than we're giving it. Let's return to the time-honored process of authorization, appropriation and oversight that has served us well for so long.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would reserve the balance of my time, understanding I have the right to close, and I will be the final speaker on our side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, Mr. FLAKE said it very well. This House can do better than this earmark process. We can do better than what is going on. Their earmarks have led to some of our colleagues who are now in jail. It has led to other problems with other colleagues. Let's reform it or get rid of it.

This amendment is the beginning of that process. And Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members, even if they have earmarks in this bill, to support the beginning of reform or elimination of what has hurt this institution and has hurt taxpayers so much.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time and will begin my remarks in opposition, first of all, by again thanking my friend and colleague from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), all of the members of the subcommittee, and the staff, who have done a very good job on this bill and improved the circumstances for people's safety, health, security and employment opportunities.

I would like to make a couple of points. The first is, we've heard a lot about the expenditures that are enumerated in this legislation, and that certainly is worthy of debate. What has been lost today, but was covered earlier this year when the bill originally was on the floor, is the fact that there are significant cuts that have been made in this bill to programs that we felt could be either eliminated or reduced because they did not have the same value and merit as those contained in the legislation we're considering today.

And I would note that there were 37 different DOE weapons programs that were cut. There were an additional 20 programs, two in the Army Corps of Engineers, two in the Bureau of Reclamation, three within the independent agencies, and 13 others in the Department of Energy that were reduced because we did not feel that they cut mustard and did not make the same significant contribution to our country.

□ 1445

As far as our infrastructure, and I would want to focus on that for a few minutes, the investment in our water infrastructure, for example, in this legislation represents a little bit less than 20 percent of the overall spending. But I would note that in 2005, the American Society of Civil Engineers estimated that nearly 50 percent of the Corps of Engineers-maintained locks are functionally obsolete using a design life of 50 years. Many of our communities do not enjoy the benefit of adequate flood protection.

We think of moving the commerce of this country. We think of people's safety. We are woefully behind. There are numerous channels and harbors throughout our Nation, across this country, that are not maintained at usable depths, much less at the authorized levels. Again, for every ship that uses a channel or a harbor not at depth, they are coming in and they are leaving lighter. That is less efficient as far as the economy of our country.

The Corps of Engineers' backlog is $50 billion. One thing that I would note for the membership here is that during the last several years under Mr. HOBSON's leadership as chairman, one of the things that we have tried to do is, if you would, to focus funds on some programs to meet that backlog, to make sure that some projects ultimately are completed.

I would also point out that the committee is mindful of the responsibility that we all have in Congress regarding ensuring that Federal funds are spent in a responsible manner. This committee has been at the forefront of changes to the fiscal management of the Corps of Engineers.

In light of the challenges involved in modernizing this Nation's water resources infrastructure, we have required, again, over the last several years, a more disciplined and rigorous approach to fiscal and contract management by the corps. This bill continues financial management contracting reforms to ensure that the corps manages its budget in the best interests of the taxpayers. The recommendations include directing that the corps continue to take action in considering additional factors as they proceed in the planning of projects.

Outside of water infrastructure, we do have the Department of Energy that encompasses obviously more than three-quarters of the spending in this bill. As was noted when we brought the bill to the House floor, regrettably, as a citizen, as a public official, I would note that since 1990, the Department of Energy has been on the high-risk list of the GAO for project management.

That is all of our money. One of the things that we have, again, attempted to do in this bill is to begin to force the issue with the Department so these major construction projects are brought in on time and on budget.

As I mentioned, and I will close on this note, in my remarks at the beginning of the debate, we started today, the money spent in this bill, whether they were enumerated originally by the administration or by the Congress, are investments, investments in our national security and in the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons. They are investments in our energy security, which is now in economic crisis, a national security crisis and an environmental crisis. We have increased funding for biofuels. We have increased funding for vehicle technology. We have increased funding for renewable energy research. I am proud of the subcommittee's work in those areas.

We have made investments in the health of our people, in that if you have clean water to drink, you are going to enjoy good health. If you do not, you are going to become very sick. We have also looked at the health of those citizens around our country who live in and around former weapons sites and the nuclear cleanup that is going to unfortunately still take decades to accomplish. These are investments in the safety of our citizens. Think about those dams in this country. Think about one of those locks failing. Think about the gentleman in Highland, Indiana, who lost his life when the Little Calumet River flooded.

They are investments to create a climate and to build the infrastructure of our Nation that encourages the development of new, well-paying jobs. To the extent we have made changes in the administration's priorities, whether they be by earmarks or changes in programs, those changes have been to enhance the effectiveness of the programs in this bill and to complement them.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I certainly am opposed to the gentleman's amendment, I would ask my colleagues to oppose it, and I would ask for my colleagues' support of the underlying legislation.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I want to thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding, and I want to thank the body for its indulgence as we wrap up this important debate.

I want to describe and discuss an amendment I was going to offer but did not and some of the reasons for it. Contained in this bill is a $2 million earmark for the Parker Hannifin Company of Cleveland, Ohio, for the hybrid drivetrain program.

I am not going to offer the amendment for three very important reasons. One is the earmark was requested by my good friend and neighbor, Congressman Tim Ryan; two, in doing research on the hybrid drivetrain program, it is a good one, and three, Parker Hannifin is a great company that I am going to talking about in a minute.

But my amendment would have redirected the $2 million from the hybrid drivetrain program to their plant in Eastlake. Parker Hannifin has announced their intention in the near future to close a plant in Eastlake, Ohio, and cause the loss of 177 jobs.

Most of the folks that work there have been working there for a number of years and are members of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. But I want to talk a little bit about Parker Hannifin and why I am not offering the amendment and then have a request at the end.

Parker Hannifin Company was started in 1918 by a guy named Arthur Parker. Just to show you how some of our entrepreneurs have had tough experiences, in 1919 there was a truck accident that wiped out the entire inventory of the company, and he had to go back to another job. He started again; and at the height the Depression, he bought an auto plant in 1935 in the City of Cleveland, and then during the height of World War II, employed 5,000 people in Cleveland, Ohio, supplying the war effort.

The war ended. Mr. Parker died. Again, the defense contracts dried up. It looked like there wasn't going to be any progress for the company. His widow said no, and they continued to reinvest in northeastern Ohio and northeastern Ohio continued to reinvest in them and they rewarded them as well. Today, they are a $10 billion company employing 50,000 people worldwide.

My simple request is, I am not going to ask to redirect this money to the plant in Eastlake, Ohio, but as this bill moves forward, I would hope that we can continue to talk to the folks in Cleveland and Parker Hannifin, because if you think about this $2 million, some of those 177 machinists who potentially will lose their jobs paid into the Federal Treasury some of the money that comprises this $2 million that is going to the hybrid drivetrain project, and I hope that we are able to resolve this in a way that we not only have the new technology for fuel efficiency that comes from the hybrid drivetrain technology, but given northeastern Ohio's solid commitment to this company since 1918, that they take that into consideration as we move forward and they make tough decisions in this global economy as to whether or not these jobs remain in northeastern Ohio.

Again, I very much thank the ranking member and the chairman for their indulgence.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague would yield for a moment, I certainly appreciate the gentleman striking and yielding the time.

Again, I understand and appreciate the gentleman's concern and his passion about this. Obviously, I cannot make any representations, other than I would want to stay in touch with both gentlemen and see what can be done and to work closely with you.

But I appreciate again the circumstances you find yourself in and would be happy to try to work with you.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for their comments, and I yield back my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 35 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on an 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 98, noes 326, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]

AYES—98

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gohmert
Graves
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—326

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey

Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (GA)
Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega
Granger
Hill
Hoyer
Kucinich
Napolitano
Solis
Tancredo

□ 1519

Messrs. POMEROY, CROWLEY and KANJORSKI changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Messrs. SHIMKUS, NUNES, CARNEY and Mrs. BIGGERT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 636, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 636 on H.R. 2641 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Remaining votes in this series of votes will be 2-minute votes. There will be a 1-minute warning and then a 2-minute vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 70, noes 357, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 637]

AYES—70

Akin
Bachmann
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Graves
Hastert
Heller
Hensarling
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Mack
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Westmoreland

NOES—357

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega
Granger
Hoyer
Kagen
Kucinich
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining to vote.

□ 1524

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 337, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 638]

AYES—79

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Graves
Hastert
Heller
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—337

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman
Bordallo
Boswell
Brown, Corrine
Carnahan
Christensen
Davis, Jo Ann
Dicks
Faleomavaega
Gonzalez
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
Kirk
Kucinich
Marchant
Napolitano
Radanovich
Tancredo
Welch (VT)
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1527

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 348, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 639]

AYES—81

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Heller
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—348

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)

Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega
Hoyer
Kucinich
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1533

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 39, noes 388, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 640]

AYES—39

Akin
Blackburn
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Goode
Heller
Hensarling
Issa
Jindal
Jordan
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Westmoreland

NOES—388

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

NOT VOTING—9

Abercrombie
Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega
Hoyer
Kucinich
Tancredo

□ 1537

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008''.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues, my good friend from Indiana and chair of the subcommittee, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Chairman OBEY, for bringing up this important piece of legislation.

I rise in support of the supplemental report on H.R. 2641.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the subcommittee leadership for their inclusion of $18.3 million for the Houston Ship Channel Navigation project, which is $2 million more than the President's budget, and for including $15.442 million in operations and maintenance

for the Houston Ship Channel, which is $1 million over the President's request.

While I understand the tight fiscal constraints this Congress is under, I hope we increase funding for these projects in the future.

The continued O&M funding would be used to keep the channel at its authorized depth, which is critical to keeping the channel navigable for the tankers that bring in crude oil to our refineries. The navigation funding goes towards important environmental restoration work in the deepening and widening project. We are at the end of that project now.

Our area relies heavily on Corps of Engineers' funding, since we're not only an energy-producing area but also a low-lying area in the middle of a flood plain.

I requested funding through the Army Corps of Engineers for Greens Bayou, Hunting Bayou and Halls Bayou, which were flooded during Tropical Storm Allison in 2001. These authorized projects are located in blue-collar residential areas in my district, where the threat of future flooding is all too real.

I am grateful the subcommittee included $588,000 for Greens Bayou, which will help conclude the study portion of the project and now the project is fast approaching its construction phase. The Greens Bayou project has a high 3.7 benefit to cost ratio, and in 2001, over 15,000 homes in this watershed flooded in Tropical Storm Allison.

I appreciate the committee's continued understanding of the pressing flood control needs in our area, but am disappointed only Greens Bayou received funding in this appropriations cycle.

Hunting Bayou has already started construction and a cut-off of Federal funding threatens to put this project into danger of falling further behind schedule. Fortunately, this is a 211 (f) project which provides the local sponsor—the Harris County Flood Control District—flexibility to continue work on the project.

The Hunting Bayou project will reduce the number of homes and businesses in the 100-year flood plain by 85 percent, from 7,400 structures to 1,000. Eight thousand homes flooded in this area during Tropical Storm Allison as well.

I also hope Halls Bayou will receive funding in the future; this project is authorized in WRDA 1990 and is included in the pending WRDA legislation to become a Sec. 211(t) project.

Greens Bayou, Hunting Bayou, and Halls Bayou are not projects to protect vacation homes or homes in obvious flood hazard areas. Most of these areas were outside the flood plain until upstream development expanded the flood plains.

In closing, I want to commend the Chairman, and especially my good friend from Texas, Congressman CHET EDWARDS, for their hard work on this legislation, and hope they will continue their progress on funding critical needs across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support the supplemental report.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with House earmark reforms, I would like to place into the record a listing of the Congressionally-directed project in my home state of Idaho that is contained within the report to this bill.

The project provides $4 million within the Army Corps of Engineers Section 595 program for rural water infrastructure upgrades in Idaho communities. The funding was authorized in the Water Resources Development Act.

This funding is critical to assisting rural Idaho communities in upgrading their water and wastewater treatment facilities. In many cases, this funding is required to comply with unfunded mandates passed down by this Congress and federal agencies.

Perhaps the most striking example of why the federal government has a responsibility to assist these communities is the burden the EPA's revised arsenic standard is having across America. In addition, these funds help rural communities in Idaho trying to attract new businesses and spur economic development. The vital water funding in this bill will assist rural communities in job creation and affordable housing by offering improved services at lower costs than would otherwise be possible.

I'm proud to have obtained this funding for Idaho communities and look forward to working with them in the future to meet their water resource challenges.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally-directed projects in my region and an explanation of my support for them.

1. Rural Idaho Environmental Infrastructure, $4,000,000.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2641, the Energy & Water Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2007. I applaud our colleagues on the Energy & Water subcommittee for producing a bill that fully funds some of this nation's most important basic research under the Office of Science.

In particular, I commend chairmen OBEY and VISCLOSKY, ranking member HOBSON, and my fellow Long Island colleague, Mr. ISRAEL, for their tireless support of ground-breaking research conducted at Brookhaven National Laboratory.

I'm proud to represent BNL and the talented scientists who keep our nation at the cutting edge of basic research with projects like the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider, which helps scientists unravel the big bang theory to explain the origins of our universe.

Fully funding this research will avert the same kind of uncertainty that threatened to derail it last year. Preserving BNL's status as a leading research institution will hopefully result in more decisions like yesterday's announcement that BNL will be the permanent home of the NSLS II, which uses intense light for x-ray imaging.

I also want to commend the committee for allocating $7 million for the Fire Island to Montauk Point project, which would protect 83 miles along Long Island's south shore.

Mr. Chairman, fully funding these research and infrastructure priorities are good for this nation and our economy. I am proud to support H.R. 2641 and again commend our colleagues for a good bill and their hard work.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 481, 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.

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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 312, nays 112, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 641]

YEAS—312

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston

Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—112

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Berkley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Graves
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (NY)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reynolds
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Tiahrt
Walberg
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

NOT VOTING—7

Bean
Brown, Corrine
Davis, Jo Ann
English (PA)
Jones (NC)
Kucinich
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1557

Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. BILBRAY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO THREATEN STABILIZATION EFFORTS IN IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–47)

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order blocking property of persons determined to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, an act or acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of threatening the peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq or undermining efforts to promote economic reconstruction and political reform in Iraq or to provide humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people. I issued this order to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, and expanded in Executive Order 13315 of August 28, 2003, and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13350 of July 29, 2004, and Executive Order 13364 of November 29, 2004. In these previous Executive Orders, I ordered various measures to address the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in that country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq.

My new order takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13303 and expanded in Executive Order 13315 by blocking the property and interests in property of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, an act or acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of threatening the peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq or undermining efforts to promote economic reconstruction and political reform in Iraq or to provide humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people. The order further authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, to designate for blocking those persons determined to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, logistical, or technical support for, or goods or services in support of, such an act or acts of violence or any person designated pursuant to this order, or to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order.

I delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, the authority to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of my order. I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 17, 2007*.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3043, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during consideration of H.R. 3043 pursuant to House Resolution 547, the Chair may reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 547 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. 3043.

□ 1601

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. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, this bill, more than any other, determines how willing we are to make the investment necessary to assure the future strength of this country and its working families. We strengthen the country when we strengthen our families. We strengthen our country when we invest in workers to have the most competitive workforce in the world.

The decisions we make in any one year are not decisive. But if we do not think in long term, if we do not recognize the kind of country we will be in 10 years, we will not make the investments necessary to prepare for that world and we will be shortchanging the future of every American.

Because he has chosen to put his desire to give $50 billion in tax breaks to those make $1 million a year, and his desire to spend $140 billion on Iraq ahead of those investments, the President has chosen to cut those investments by this bill by more than $7.5 billion in real terms.

This bill rejects most of those cuts because we cannot disinvest in the country's future without hurting national security and the future of every American family. Instead of cutting $7.5 billion, as the President requested, we eliminate or cut 41 programs, saving $1.1 billion. We then increase investments in critical programs by about $4.5 billion in real terms, or 2.8 percent over last year, after adjusting for inflation and population change.

Now, why do we do that? Because in 10 years there will be 27 million more Americans, 12 million more seniors needing health care, 2.7 million more kids in elementary and secondary school, 2.2 million more students in college, 11 million more Americans will be without health insurance, unless we wise up and wake up and change our policies. And within 7 years, half of the Nation's job growth will be in occupations requiring higher education skills.

To meet those challenges, with this bill we target modest increases to crucial high priority activities to attack deficits in worker training, deficits in health care, deficits in education access.

On a bipartisan basis, without a dissenting vote, we've provided $450 million above the President's inadequate request for Title I to help an additional 155,000 disadvantaged students. Instead of wiping out every student aid program except Pell and Work Study, we rejected the President's cuts and raised the maximum Pell Grant by $650 over the last year to help over 5 million students go to college.

We reversed the 3-year decline in Federal support for special education. Mr. WALSH, the ranking member of this subcommittee, has taken a leadership role in that regard.

We reversed the President's cuts in teacher training. We provided new after-school opportunities for 163,000 more students.

On health care, nobody has ever come up to me at home and said, ''OBEY, why don't you guys get your act together and cut cancer research?'' But that's exactly what Congress did the last 2 years, cutting NIH research grants by over 500 grants. Well, we've stopped that.

In January, we reversed the President's cuts and this bill adds another $1 billion above the President's request, which would again cut research grants.

We have also included a package of five initiatives to put health care within the reach of more than 2 million additional Americans; $200 million to expand access to health and dental care at community health centers, $75 million to help States expand health coverage for targeted populations, $50 million to help States provide affordable health insurance for 200,000 people who are medical high risks and cannot get insurance from the private market, $20 million to help trade impacted workers benefit from the Health Coverage Tax credit, and added funding to help Medicare beneficiaries to get health insurance counseling.

Because of high energy prices, we have added $880 million to the President's request for low income heating assistance, reversing half the cut Congress and the President made last year.

To discourage abortions, instead of lecturing, we provide a $1.4 billion package of incentives to provide real world help to women through expanded Head Start, child care, domestic violence programs, maternal and child health care, family planning and abstinence programs.

To help workers, we reverse the President's cuts in a range of workforce training programs. We also provide a $100 million increase above the President to help reduce Social Security claims backlogs and to keep more Social Security offices open.

Now the President claims that this bill amounts to runaway spending. Fact: From 1980 to today, domestic appropriations, as a percentage of total national income, have declined hugely. The President's budget would cut them to a level 48 percent below the 1980 level, and by 2012, to a level 57 percent below 1980. That's hardly runaway growth. That is a steady bleed of America's quality of life and America's future.

For the President to borrow $1.2 trillion to pay for tax cuts, and $600 billion to pay for Iraq, including another $140 billion next year, and then pretend that this modest 2 percent difference with him is the cause of fiscal irresponsibility is sheer nonsense, and many enlightened Republicans know it.

These investments are not just fiscally responsible, they are necessary for the future health and strength of the Nation.

One other point. We will today hear complaints about earmarks in this bill. Let us be clear, the last time Congress was in Democratic hands there were no earmarks in this bill. Under Republican rule, they exploded from zero to over 3,000.

This bill has cut back the dollar level for earmarks to half the level in the 2006 bill. Exactly two-tenths of 1 percent of the total funding in this bill go for congressionally directed earmarks.

And let me also point out that the amount of dollars in spending directed by the Congress is a tiny fraction of the amount directed by the Administration. First, for instance, the Administration in this bill requests specific earmarks, $10 million for Reach Out and Read, $10 million for Teach for America, $9 million for the Points of Light Foundation, $4.5 million for America's Promise, $1.7 million for the Mind and Body Institute, $1.4 million for the YMCA.

On top of that, in 2006 alone, the Health and Social Services Department directed spending of $1.9 billion through 21,000 contracts that were less than fully competed. That alone is more than seven times the amount of congressionally directed spending in this bill.

In the Labor Department, 90 percent of discretionary funding for the High Growth Job Training Program was spent on a noncompetitive basis.

The Office of Inspector General found that the Education Department strongarmed State and local school districts to select textbooks from favored publishers. Madison, Wisconsin, in my own State, lost its $2 million Reading First grant because they refused to purchase texts from an inferior program. Yet, the most thoroughly evaluated programs, like Success for All and Reading Recovery, were frozen out by the program administrators.

ABC reported that one publisher with good connections at the White House saw its corporate net worth rise from $5 million to $360 million, with a little help from their friends.

The Office of Inspector General has made criminal references to the Justice Department, and we have cut Reading First until the Administration changes its ways.

So I would simply say, Madam Chairman, spare us the Administration's sanctimony about earmarks or directed spending, and please spare us the pretense that this bill has anything to do

with the fiscal mess this country faces. It is a disciplined set of investments. Virtually every Republican amendment in committee did not seek to cut funding, rather it sought to increase it.

I appreciate the bipartisan support for the bill in committee. I appreciate the partnership with Mr. WALSH, the ranking member.

People who have reviewed it most closely, Republicans and Democrats alike, know this bill is responsible and disciplined.

Just one comparison. The Administration's defense request, even without counting the $140 billion in new money that they're asking for in their supplemental, that defense bill is still $43 billion above last year, which is at least four times as large as the difference between the committee and the Congress on this bill.

I would urge every Member who thinks about this country's future to support this bill.

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
100	TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						100	
150	EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION						150	
200	TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES						200	
250	Grants to States:						250	
300	Adult Training, current year	152,199	---	152,199	---	+152,199	300	FF
350	Advance from prior year	(712,000)	(712,000)	(712,000)	---	---	350	
400	FY 2009	712,000	712,000	712,000	---	---	400	
450	Adult Training	864,199	712,000	864,199	---	+152,199	450	
500	Youth Training	940,500	840,500	940,500	---	+100,000	500	FF
550	Dislocated Worker Assistance, current year	341,811	54,939	341,811	---	+286,872	550	FF
600	Advance from prior year	(848,000)	(848,000)	(848,000)	---	---	600	
650	FY 2009	848,000	848,000	848,000	---	---	650	
700	Dislocated Worker Assistance	1,189,811	902,939	1,189,811	---	+286,872	700	
710	Subtotal, Grants to States	2,994,510	2,455,439	2,994,510	---	+539,071	710	
720	Current Year	(1,434,510)	(895,439)	(1,434,510)	---	(+539,071)	720	
730	FY 2009	(1,560,000)	(1,560,000)	(1,560,000)	---	---	730	
750	Federally Administered Programs:						750	
755	Dislocated Worker Assistance National Reserve:						755	
760	Current year	70,092	---	70,092	---	+70,092	760	FF
770	Advance from prior year 1/	(212,000)	(212,000)	(212,000)	---	---	770	
780	FY 2009	212,000	212,000	212,000	---	---	780	
790	Dislocated Worker Assistance Nat'l Reserve	282,092	212,000	282,092	---	+70,092	790	
792	Less Community-based Job Training Grants (NA)	(-125,000)	---	(-125,000)	---	(-125,000)	792	
793	Dislocated Worker Assistance Nat'l Reserve	157,092	212,000	157,092	---	-54,908	793	
794	Total, Dislocated Worker Assistance	1,471,903	1,114,939	1,471,903	---	+356,964	794	
800	Native Americans	53,696	45,000	56,381	+2,685	+11,381	800	FF
850	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	79,752	---	83,740	+3,988	+83,740	850	FF
855	Women in apprenticeship	1,000	---	1,000	---	+1,000	855	FF
875	YouthBuild	49,500	50,000	60,000	+10,500	+10,000	875	FF
900	Subtotal, Federally Administered Programs	466,040	307,000	483,213	+17,173	+176,213	900	
910	Current Year	(254,040)	(95,000)	(271,213)	(+17,173)	(+176,213)	910	
920	FY 2009	(212,000)	(212,000)	(212,000)	---	---	920	
1300	National Activities:						1300	
1350	Pilots, Demonstrations and Research	14,700	13,000	28,140	+13,440	+15,140	1350	FF
1399	Responsible Reintegration of Youthful						1399	FF
1400	Offenders 4/	49,104	---	---	-49,104	---	1400	FF
1410	Prisoner Re-entry 4/	19,642	---	---	-19,642	---	1410	
1420	Reintegration of Ex-Offenders 4/	---	39,600	68,746	+68,746	+29,146	1420	FF
1450	Evaluation	4,921	7,000	4,921	---	-2,079	1450	FF
1515	Community-based Job Training Grants	---	150,000	---	---	-150,000	1515	
1516	Community-based Job Training Grants (NA)5/	(125,000)	---	(125,000)	---	(+125,000)	1516	
1517	Subtotal, program level	125,000	150,000	125,000	---	-25,000	1517	
1525	Denali Commission	6,875	---	---	-6,875	---	1525	
1550	Other	480	---	---	-480	---	1550	FF
1600	Subtotal, National activities	95,722	209,600	101,807	+6,085	-107,793	1600	
2100	Total, Training and Employment Services	3,556,272	2,972,039	3,579,530	+23,258	+607,491	2100	UA
2150	Current Year	(1,784,272)	(1,200,039)	(1,807,530)	(+23,258)	(+607,491)	2150	UA
2200	FY 2009	(1,772,000)	(1,772,000)	(1,772,000)	---	---	2200	UA

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
2300 COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS	483,611	350,000	530,900	+47,289	+180,900	2300	FF
2400 FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES	837,600	888,700	888,700	+51,100	---	2400	M UA
2600 STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT						2600	
2650 SERVICE OPERATIONS						2650	
2700 Unemployment Compensation:						2700	
2750 State Operations	2,497,770	2,550,723	2,550,723	+52,953	---	2750	
2850 National Activities	9,900	10,500	10,500	+600	---	2850	
2950 Subtotal, Unemployment Compensation	2,507,670	2,561,223	2,561,223	+53,553	---	2950	
3100 Employment Service:						3100	
3150 Allotments to States:						3150	
3200 Federal Funds	22,883	22,016	23,203	+320	+1,187	3200	
3250 Trust Funds	693,000	666,763	702,680	+9,680	+35,917	3250	
3300 Subtotal, Allotments to States	715,883	688,779	725,883	+10,000	+37,104	3300	
3350 ES National Activities	33,428	32,766	32,766	-662	---	3350	
3400 Subtotal, Employment Service	749,311	721,545	758,649	+9,338	+37,104	3400	
3450 Federal Funds	22,883	22,016	23,203	+320	+1,187	3450	
3500 Trust Funds	726,428	699,529	735,446	+9,018	+35,917	3500	
3550 One-Stop Career Centers/Labor Market Information	63,855	55,985	52,985	-10,870	-3,000	3550	
3600 Work Incentives Grants	19,514	---	9,757	-9,757	+9,757	3600	FF
3650 Total, State Unemployment & Employment Srvcs	3,340,350	3,338,753	3,382,614	+42,264	+43,861	3650	
3700 Federal Funds	106,252	78,001	85,945	-20,307	+7,944	3700	
3750 Trust Funds	(3,234,098)	(3,260,752)	(3,296,669)	(+62,571)	(+35,917)	3750	
3800 ADVANCES TO THE UI AND OTHER TRUST FUNDS 6/	465,000	437,000	437,000	-28,000	---	3800	M
3900 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION						3900	
3950 Adult Employment and Training	43,442	45,593	43,442	---	-2,151	3950	
4000 Trust Funds	7,846	8,283	7,846	---	-437	4000	
4050 Youth Employment and Training 3/	39,354	40,311	10,981	-28,373	-29,330	4050	
4100 Employment Security	6,354	6,376	6,354	---	-22	4100	
4150 Trust Funds	72,113	84,436	72,113	---	-12,323	4150	
4200 Apprenticeship Services	21,542	21,725	21,542	---	-183	4200	
4250 Executive Direction 3/	6,967	7,250	6,132	-835	-1,118	4250	
4300 Trust Funds	2,090	2,188	2,090	---	-98	4300	
4400 Total, Program Administration	199,708	216,162	170,500	-29,208	-45,662	4400	
4450 Federal Funds	117,659	121,255	88,451	-29,208	-32,804	4450	
4500 Trust Funds	82,049	94,907	82,049	---	-12,858	4500	
4550 Total, Employment and Training Administration	8,882,541	8,202,654	8,989,244	+106,703	+786,590	4550	
4600 Federal Funds	5,566,394	4,846,995	5,610,526	+44,132	+763,531	4600	
4650 Current Year	(3,794,394)	(3,074,995)	(3,838,526)	(+44,132)	(+763,531)	4650	
4700 FY 2009	(1,772,000)	(1,772,000)	(1,772,000)	---	---	4700	
4750 Trust Funds	3,316,147	3,355,659	3,378,718	+62,571	+23,059	4750	
4800 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS SECURITY ADMINISTRATION						4800	
4805 SALARIES AND EXPENSES						4805	
4850 Enforcement and Participant Assistance	118,718	123,163	118,663	-55	-4,500	4850	
4900 Policy and Compliance Assistance	17,585	18,315	18,315	+730	---	4900	
4950 Executive Leadership, Program Oversight and Admin	5,270	5,947	5,947	+677	---	4950	
5000 Total, EBSA	141,573	147,425	142,925	+1,352	-4,500	5000	
5050 PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION						5050	
5060 Pension insurance activities	(80,357)	(74,784)	(74,784)	(-5,573)	---	5060	
5070 Pension plan termination	(128,466)	(205,158)	(205,158)	(+76,692)	---	5070	
5080 Operational support	(196,567)	(131,209)	(131,209)	(-65,358)	---	5080	
5250 Total, PBGC (Program level)	(405,390)	(411,151)	(411,151)	(+5,761)	---	5250	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request	
5300 EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION						5300
5350 SALARIES AND EXPENSES						5350
5400 Enforcement of Wage and Hour Standards	170,220	182,365	182,365	+12,145	---	5400
5450 Office of Labor-Management Standards	47,753	56,888	45,737	-2,016	-11,151	5450
5500 Federal Contractor EEO Standards Enforcement	82,441	84,182	84,182	+1,741	---	5500
5550 Federal Programs for Workers' Compensation	100,889	104,478	104,478	+3,589	---	5550
5650 Trust Funds	2,042	2,111	2,111	+69	---	5650
5700 Program Direction and Support	17,526	17,635	17,635	+109	---	5700
5750 Total, ESA salaries and expenses	420,871	447,659	436,508	+15,637	-11,151	5750
5800 Federal Funds	418,829	445,548	434,397	+15,568	-11,151	5800
5850 Trust Funds	2,042	2,111	2,111	+69	---	5850
5900 SPECIAL BENEFITS						5900
5950 Federal employees' compensation benefits	224,000	200,000	200,000	-24,000	---	5950 M
6000 Longshore and harbor workers' benefits	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---	6000 M
6050 Total, Special Benefits	227,000	203,000	203,000	-24,000	---	6050
6060 SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS						6060
6065 Benefit payments	298,000	271,000	271,000	-27,000	---	6065 M
6070 Administration	5,373	5,221	5,221	-152	---	6070 M
6075 Subtotal, FY 2008 program level	303,373	276,221	276,221	-27,152	---	6075
6080 Less funds advanced in prior year	-74,000	-68,000	-68,000	+6,000	---	6080 M
6085 Total, Current Year, FY 2008	229,373	208,221	208,221	-21,152	---	6085
6090 New advances, 1st quarter FY 2009	68,000	62,000	62,000	-6,000	---	6090 M
6095 Total, Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners	297,373	270,221	270,221	-27,152	---	6095
6200 ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION						6200
6250 FUND, Part B Administrative Expenses	102,307	104,745	104,745	+2,438	---	6250 M
6350 BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND						6350
6400 Benefit payments and interest on advances	1,010,011	1,009,763	1,009,763	-248	---	6400 M
6450 Employment Standards Admin., Salaries and expenses	33,578	32,761	32,761	-817	---	6450 M
6500 Departmental Management, Salaries and expenses	25,255	24,785	24,785	-470	---	6500 M
6550 Departmental Management, Inspector General	346	335	335	-11	---	6550 M
6600 Subtotal, Black Lung Disability	1,069,190	1,067,644	1,067,644	-1,546	---	6600
6650 Treasury Department Administrative Costs	356	356	356	---	---	6650 M
6700 Total, Black Lung Disability Trust Fund	1,069,546	1,068,000	1,068,000	-1,546	---	6700
6750 Total, Employment Standards Administration	2,117,097	2,093,625	2,082,474	-34,623	-11,151	6750
6800 Federal Funds	2,115,055	2,091,514	2,080,363	-34,692	-11,151	6800
6810 Current year	(2,047,055)	(2,029,514)	(2,018,363)	(-28,692)	(-11,151)	6810
6820 FY 2009	(68,000)	(62,000)	(62,000)	(-6,000)	---	6820
6850 Trust Funds	2,042	2,111	2,111	+69	---	6850
6900 OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						6900
6950 SALARIES AND EXPENSES						6950
7000 Safety and Health Standards	16,892	16,851	16,933	+41	+82	7000
7050 Federal Enforcement	176,973	183,046	190,128	+13,155	+7,082	7050
7100 State Programs	91,093	91,093	91,093	---	---	7100
7150 Technical Support	22,392	22,066	22,066	-326	---	7150
7200 Compliance Assistance:						7200
7250 Federal Assistance	72,659	79,607	75,566	+2,907	-4,041	7250
7300 State Consultation Grants	53,357	54,531	54,531	+1,174	---	7300
7350 Training Grants	10,116	---	10,116	---	+10,116	7350
7400 Subtotal, Compliance Assistance	136,132	134,138	140,213	+4,081	+6,075	7400
7450 Safety and Health Statistics	32,274	32,082	32,082	-192	---	7450
7500 Executive Direction and Administration	11,169	11,001	11,001	-168	---	7500
7550 Total, OSHA	486,925	490,277	503,516	+16,591	+13,239	7550

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
7600	MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						7600	
7650	SALARIES AND EXPENSES						7650	
7700	Coal Enforcement	120,396	140,620	140,620	+20,224	---	7700	
7750	Metal/Non-Metal Enforcement	72,506	72,290	72,290	-216	---	7750	
7800	Standards Development	2,727	2,737	2,737	+10	---	7800	
7850	Assessments	6,556	5,743	5,743	-813	---	7850	
7900	Educational Policy and Development	35,326	34,256	34,256	-1,070	---	7900	
7950	Technical Support	29,237	28,200	28,200	-1,037	---	7950	
7975	Program evaluation and information resources (PEIR)	21,185	16,219	16,219	-4,966	---	7975	
8000	Program Administration	13,637	13,413	13,413	-224	---	8000	
8050	Total, Mine Safety and Health Administration	301,570	313,478	313,478	+11,908	---	8050	
8100	BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS						8100	
8150	SALARIES AND EXPENSES						8150	
8200	Employment and Unemployment Statistics	169,722	175,320	175,320	+5,598	---	8200	
8250	Labor Market Information	77,067	78,264	78,264	+1,197	---	8250	
8300	Prices and Cost of Living	177,847	192,149	192,599	+14,752	+450	8300	
8350	Compensation and Working Conditions	81,658	84,859	86,084	+4,426	+1,225	8350	
8400	Productivity and Technology	11,063	11,332	11,332	+269	---	8400	
8450	Executive Direction and Staff Services	30,766	32,519	32,519	+1,753	---	8450	
8500	Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics	548,123	574,443	576,118	+27,995	+1,675	8500	
8550	Federal Funds	471,056	496,179	497,854	+26,798	+1,675	8550	
8600	Trust Funds	77,067	78,264	78,264	+1,197	---	8600	
8650	OFFICE OF DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT POLICY						8650	
8700	Salaries and expenses	27,712	18,602	27,712	---	+9,110	8700	
8850	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT						8850	
8900	SALARIES AND EXPENSES						8900	
8950	Executive Direction	28,189	28,680	23,237	-4,952	-5,443	8950	
9000	Departmental IT Crosscut	29,462	31,405	18,000	-11,462	-13,405	9000	
9050	Departmental Management Crosscut	1,108	750	500	-608	-250	9050	
9100	Legal Services	85,488	95,162	94,937	+9,449	-225	9100	
9150	Trust Funds	308	318	318	+10	---	9150	
9200	International Labor Affairs	72,516	14,097	72,516	---	+58,419	9200	
9250	Administration and Management	32,865	33,362	32,865	---	-497	9250	
9275	Frances Perkins building security enhancements	---	---	---	---	---	9275	
9300	Adjudication	27,537	28,289	28,289	+752	---	9300	
9350	Women's Bureau	9,666	9,832	10,500	+834	+668	9350	
9400	Civil Rights Activities	6,445	6,763	6,763	+318	---	9400	
9450	Chief Financial Officer	5,336	5,578	5,336	---	-242	9450	
9500	Total, Salaries and expenses	298,920	254,236	293,261	-5,659	+39,025	9500	
9550	Federal Funds	298,612	253,918	292,943	-5,669	+39,025	9550	
9560	Trust Funds	308	318	318	+10	---	9560	
9600	OFFICE OF JOB CORPS 2/						9600	
9610	Administration 3/	---	---	28,872	+28,872	+28,872	9610	
9620	Operations	879,357	831,372	916,684	+37,327	+85,312	9620	FF
9630	Advance from prior year	(591,000)	(591,000)	(591,000)	---	---	9630	
9640	FY 2009	591,000	591,000	591,000	---	---	9640	
9650	Construction and Renovation	7,920	---	12,920	+5,000	+12,920	9650	FF
9670	Advance from prior year	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	---	---	9670	
9680	FY 2009	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---	9680	
9690	Total, Job Corps	1,578,277	1,522,372	1,649,476	+71,199	+127,104	9690	UA
9695	Current Year	(887,277)	(831,372)	(958,476)	(+71,199)	(+127,104)	9695	UA
9710	FY 2009	(691,000)	(691,000)	(691,000)	---	---	9710	UA
9880	VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING						9880	
9890	State administration, Grants	160,791	161,894	161,894	+1,103	---	9890	
9900	Federal Administration	31,187	33,282	33,282	+2,095	---	9900	
9925	National Veterans' Training Institute	1,967	1,949	1,967	---	+18	9925	
9950	Homeless Veterans Program	21,809	23,620	23,620	+1,811	---	9950	
10000	Veterans Workforce Investment Programs	7,435	7,351	7,435	---	+84	10000	UA FF
10050	Total, Veterans Employment and Training	223,189	228,096	228,198	+5,009	+102	10050	
10100	Federal Funds	29,244	30,971	31,055	+1,811	+84	10100	
10150	Trust Funds	193,945	197,125	197,143	+3,198	+18	10150	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
10200 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL						10200	
10250 Program Activities	67,214	72,929	72,929	+5,715	---	10250	
10300 Trust Funds	5,552	5,729	5,729	+177	---	10300	
10400 Total, Office of the Inspector General	72,766	78,658	78,658	+5,892	---	10400	
10450 Federal funds	67,214	72,929	72,929	+5,715	---	10450	
10500 Trust funds	5,552	5,729	5,729	+177	---	10500	
10550 Total, Departmental Management	2,173,152	2,083,362	2,249,593	+76,441	+166,231	10550	
10600 Federal Funds	1,973,347	1,880,190	2,046,403	+73,056	+166,213	10600	
10610 Current Year	(1,482,152)	(1,392,362)	(1,558,593)	(+76,441)	(+166,231)	10610	
10620 FY 2009	(691,000)	(691,000)	(691,000)	---	---	10620	
10650 Trust Funds	199,805	203,172	203,190	+3,385	+18	10650	
10675 WORKING CAPITAL FUND						10675	
10680 Working capital fund	6,168	12,000	---	-6,168	-12,000	10680	
10700 Total, Title I, Department of Labor	14,684,861	13,935,866	14,885,060	+200,199	+949,194	10700	
10750 Federal Funds	11,089,800	10,296,660	11,222,777	+132,977	+926,117	10750	
10800 Current Year	(8,558,800)	(7,771,660)	(8,697,777)	(+138,977)	(+926,117)	10800	
10850 FY 2009	(2,531,000)	(2,525,000)	(2,525,000)	(-6,000)	---	10850	
10900 Trust Funds	3,595,061	3,639,206	3,662,283	+67,222	+23,077	10900	
10920 Title I Footnotes:						10920	
10922 1/ Includes FY 2006 rescission of $125M for						10922	
10923 Community College Initiative						10923	
10924 2/ In FY 2007, Job Corps was requested and funded in						10924	
10925 ETA; FY 2008 requested in ETA but funded in Dept Mgmt						10925	
10927 3/ Administration for Job Corps funding was						10927	
10928 transferred from ETA to DM in FY 2006 Act and FY 2008.						10928	
10930 4/ In FY 2008, the Responsible Reintegration of						10930	
10931 Youthful Offenders and Prisoner Re-entry programs will						10931	
10932 be combined into Reintegration of Ex-Offenders program						10932	
10937 5/ Funding from the Dislocated Worker National Reserve						10937	
10938 6/ Two year availability						10938	
10950 TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						10950	
11000 HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION						11000	
11050 HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES						11050	
11060 BUREAU OF PRIMARY HEALTH CARE						11060	
11100 Community health centers	1,988,039	1,988,467	2,188,000	+199,961	+199,533	11100	UA
11115 State health access grants	---	---	75,000	+75,000	+75,000	11115	
11125 Free Clinics Medical Malpractice	41	100	40	-1	-60	11125	
11134 National Hansen's Disease Program	15,972	16,109	16,109	+137	---	11134	
11136 Buildings and Facilities	220	100	100	-120	---	11136	
11138 Payment to Hawaii, treatment of Hansen's	1,996	1,976	1,996	---	+20	11138	
11142 Subtotal, Bureau of Primary Health Care	2,006,268	2,006,752	2,281,245	+274,977	+274,493	11142	
11149 BUREAU OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS						11149	
11150 National Health Service Corps:						11150	
11200 Field placements	40,443	30,729	40,443	---	+9,714	11200	
11250 Recruitment	85,230	85,230	91,057	+5,827	+5,827	11250	
11300 Subtotal, National Health Service Corps	125,673	115,959	131,500	+5,827	+15,541	11300	UA
11400 Health Professions, Training for Diversity:						11400	
11450 Centers of excellence	11,880	---	28,431	+16,551	+28,431	11450	
11500 Health careers opportunity program	3,960	---	28,440	+24,480	+28,440	11500	
11550 Faculty loan repayment	1,289	---	1,289	---	+1,289	11550	
11600 Scholarships for disadvantaged students	46,657	9,733	46,657	---	+36,924	11600	
11650 Subtotal, Training for Diversity	63,786	9,733	104,817	+41,031	+95,084	11650	
11700 Training in Primary Care Medicine and Dentistry	48,851	---	48,851	---	+48,851	11700	
11750 Interdisciplinary Community-Based Linkages:						11750	
11800 Area health education centers	28,681	---	31,200	+2,519	+31,200	11800	
11900 Allied health and other disciplines	3,960	---	3,960	---	+3,960	11900	
11950 Geriatric programs	31,548	---	31,548	---	+31,548	11950	
12050 Subtotal, Interdisciplinary Comm. Linkages	64,189	---	66,708	+2,519	+66,708	12050	
12200 Public health, preventive med. and dental programs	7,920	---	7,920	---	+7,920	12200	
12399 Nursing Programs:						12399	
12400 Advanced Education Nursing	57,061	---	57,061	---	+57,061	12400	
12450 Nurse education, practice, and retention	37,291	37,291	37,291	---	---	12450	
12500 Nursing workforce diversity	16,107	16,107	16,107	---	---	12500	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
12505	Loan repayment and scholarship program	31,055	43,744	44,000	+12,945	+256	12505	
12515	Comprehensive geriatric education	3,392	3,392	3,392	---	---	12515	
12520	Nursing faculty loan program	4,773	4,773	7,773	+3,000	+3,000	12520	
12525	Subtotal, Nursing programs	149,679	105,307	165,624	+15,945	+60,317	12525	
12550	Subtotal, Health Professions	334,425	115,040	393,920	+59,495	+278,880	12550	UA
12600	Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education	297,009	110,018	307,009	+10,000	+196,991	12600	
12610	National Practitioner Data Bank	16,200	18,900	18,900	+2,700	---	12610	
12615	User Fees	-16,200	-18,900	-18,900	-2,700	---	12615	
12620	Health Care Integrity and Protection Data Bank	3,825	---	4,000	+175	+4,000	12620	
12625	User Fees	-3,825	---	-4,000	-175	-4,000	12625	
12630	Subtotal, Bureau of Health Professions	757,107	341,017	832,429	+75,322	+491,412	12630	
12745	MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH BUREAU						12745	
12750	Maternal and Child Health Block Grant	693,000	693,000	750,000	+57,000	+57,000	12750	
12775	Sickle cell anemia demonstration program	2,180	2,184	2,184	+4	---	12775	
12800	Traumatic Brain Injury	8,910	---	8,910	---	+8,910	12800	UA
12950	Healthy Start	101,518	100,503	120,000	+18,482	+19,497	12950	UA
13000	Universal Newborn Hearing	9,804	---	11,000	+1,196	+11,000	13000	UA
13005	Emergency medical services for children	19,800	---	19,800	---	+19,800	13005	UA
13015	Subtotal, Maternal and Child Health Bureau	835,212	795,687	911,894	+76,682	+116,207	13015	
13020	HIV/AIDS BUREAU						13020	
13025	Ryan White AIDS Programs:						13025	
13030	Emergency Assistance	603,993	603,993	636,300	+32,307	+32,307	13030	
13035	Comprehensive Care Programs	1,195,500	1,215,518	1,239,500	+44,000	+23,982	13035	
13040	AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) (NA)	(789,546)	(814,546)	(830,593)	(+41,047)	(+16,047)	13040	
13045	Early Intervention Program	193,721	199,821	216,700	+22,979	+16,879	13045	
13050	Children, Youth, Women, and Families	71,794	71,794	71,800	+6	+6	13050	
13055	AIDS Dental Services	13,086	13,086	13,086	---	---	13055	
13060	Education and Training Centers	34,701	28,700	34,700	-1	+6,000	13060	
13065	Subtotal, Ryan White AIDS programs	2,112,795	2,132,912	2,212,086	+99,291	+79,174	13065	
13070	Evaluation Tap Funding (NA)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---	13070	
13075	Subtotal, Ryan White AIDs program level	(2,137,795)	(2,157,912)	(2,237,086)	(+99,291)	(+79,174)	13075	
13110	Subtotal, HIV/AIDS Bureau	2,112,795	2,132,912	2,212,086	+99,291	+79,174	13110	
13200	HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS BUREAU						13200	
13205	Organ Transplantation	23,049	23,049	23,049	---	---	13205	UA
13210	National Cord Blood Inventory	3,963	1,966	3,963	---	+1,997	13210	
13215	Bone Marrow Program	25,168	22,701	25,168	---	+2,467	13215	
13220	Office of Pharmacy Affairs	---	2,940	2,940	+2,940	---	13220	
13225	Poison control	23,000	10,000	30,100	+7,100	+20,100	13225	
13230	Subtotal, Healthcare systems bureau	75,180	60,656	85,220	+10,040	+24,564	13230	
13300	RURAL HEALTH PROGRAMS						13300	
13305	Rural outreach grants	38,885	---	52,962	+14,077	+52,962	13305	UA
13310	Rural Health Research	8,737	8,737	9,500	+763	+763	13310	
13315	Rural Hospital Flexibility Grants	63,538	---	63,538	---	+63,538	13315	
13317	Delta Health Initiative 1/	---	---	---	---	---	13317	
13320	Rural and community access to emergency devices	1,487	---	2,000	+513	+2,000	13320	UA
13330	State Offices of Rural Health	8,141	8,141	9,000	+859	+859	13330	UA
13332	Black lung clinics 2/	5,891	5,886	5,891	---	+5	13332	
13333	Radiation Exposure Screening and Education Program 2/	1,919	1,904	1,917	-2	+13	13333	
13340	Subtotal, Rural health programs	128,598	24,668	144,808	+16,210	+120,140	13340	
14290	Denali Commission	39,283	---	---	-39,283	---	14290	UA
14300	Family Planning	283,146	283,103	310,910	+27,764	+27,807	14300	UA
14350	Health Care-related Facilities and activities	---	---	127,926	+127,926	+127,926	14350	
14450	Telehealth	6,819	6,819	7,000	+181	+181	14450	UA
14850	Program Management	146,294	144,191	142,191	-4,103	-2,000	14850	
14900	Total, Health resources and services	6,390,702	5,795,805	7,055,709	+665,007	+1,259,904	14900	
14910	Total, Health resources & services program level	(6,415,702)	(5,820,805)	(7,080,709)	(+665,007)	(+1,259,904)	14910	
14915	Evaluation tap funding	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---	14915	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
15050 HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS (HEAL) PROGRAM:						15050	
15100 Liquidating account	(4,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(-3,000)	---	15100	
15150 Program management	2,898	2,906	2,906	+8	---	15150	
15200 Total, HEAL	2,898	2,906	2,906	+8	---	15200	
15250 VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND:						15250	
15300 Post-FY 1988 claims	55,871	57,547	57,547	+1,676	---	15300	M
15350 HRSA administration	3,982	3,528	3,528	-454	---	15350	
15400 Total, Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	59,853	61,075	61,075	+1,222	---	15400	
15450 Total, Health Resources and Services Admin.	6,453,453	5,859,786	7,119,690	+666,237	+1,259,904	15450	
15475 Total, HRSA program level	(6,482,453)	(5,885,786)	(7,145,690)	(+663,237)	(+1,259,904)	15475	
15500 CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION						15500	
15590 Infectious Diseases	1,791,437	1,781,574	1,900,508	+109,071	+118,934	15590	UA
15601 Evaluation Tap Funding	(12,794)	(12,794)	(12,794)	---	---	15601	
15602 Subtotal, Program level	(1,804,231)	(1,794,368)	(1,913,302)	(+109,071)	(+118,934)	15602	
15650 Health Promotion	959,662	958,732	1,002,212	+42,550	+43,480	15650	UA
15700 Health Information and Service	88,418	108,361	70,104	-18,314	-38,257	15700	UA
15701 Evaluation Tap Funding	(134,235)	(135,135)	(183,924)	(+49,689)	(+48,789)	15701	
15702 Subtotal, Program level	(222,653)	(243,496)	(254,028)	(+31,375)	(+10,532)	15702	
15750 Environmental health and injury	288,104	287,674	305,151	+17,047	+17,477	15750	UA
15800 Occupational safety and health 4/	167,028	165,927	222,576	+55,548	+56,649	15800	
15805 Supplemental (P.L. 110-28) (emergency)	63,000	---	---	-63,000	---	15805	
15810 Evaluation Tap Funding	(87,071)	(87,071)	(88,361)	(+1,290)	(+1,290)	15810	
15815 Subtotal, Program level 4/	(317,099)	(252,998)	(310,937)	(-6,162)	(+57,939)	15815	
15850 Global health	334,038	379,719	381,337	+47,299	+1,618	15850	
15870 Terrorism preparedness and response 3/	1,541,300	1,504,375	1,598,751	+57,451	+94,376	15870	
15900 Public Health research:						15900	
15910 Evaluation Tap Funding	(31,000)	(31,000)	(31,000)	---	---	15910	
15950 Public health improvement and leadership	189,808	190,412	199,237	+9,429	+8,825	15950	
16000 Preventive health and health services block grant	99,000	---	109,000	+10,000	+109,000	16000	UA
16030 Undistributed reduction	---	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	16030	
16050 Buildings and Facilities	134,400	20,000	10,500	-123,900	-9,500	16050	
16150 Business services	344,377	319,877	344,377	---	+24,500	16150	
16395 Total, Centers for Disease Control	5,937,572	5,716,651	6,141,753	+204,181	+425,102	16395	
16420 Evaluation Tap Funding (NA)	(265,100)	(266,000)	(316,079)	(+50,979)	(+50,079)	16420	
16425 Total, Centers for Disease Control program level	(6,265,672)	(5,982,651)	(6,457,832)	(+192,160)	(+475,181)	16425	
16550 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH						16550	
16600 National Cancer Institute	4,797,639	4,782,114	4,870,382	+72,743	+88,268	16600	
16650 National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute	2,922,929	2,925,413	2,965,775	+42,846	+40,362	16650	
16700 National Institute of Dental & Craniofacial Research	389,703	389,722	395,753	+6,050	+6,031	16700	
16740 National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and						16740	
16750 Kidney Diseases	1,705,868	1,708,045	1,731,893	+26,025	+23,848	16750	
16775 Juvenile diabetes (mandatory)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	---	---	16775	M
16780 Subtotal, NIDDK	(1,855,868)	(1,858,045)	(1,881,893)	(+26,025)	(+23,848)	16780	
16800 National Institute of Neurological Disorders & Stroke	1,535,545	1,537,019	1,559,106	+23,561	+22,087	16800	
16850 National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	4,268,708	4,292,482	4,332,019	+63,311	+39,537	16850	
16900 Global HIV/AIDS Fund Transfer	99,000	300,000	300,000	+201,000	---	16900	
16950 Subtotal, NIAID	4,367,708	4,592,482	4,632,019	+264,311	+39,537	16950	
17000 National Institute of General Medical Sciences	1,935,808	1,941,462	1,966,019	+30,211	+24,557	17000	
17050 National Institute of Child Health & Human Development	1,254,707	1,264,946	1,273,863	+19,156	+8,917	17050	
17100 National Eye Institute	667,116	667,820	677,039	+9,923	+9,219	17100	
17150 National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	642,002	637,406	652,303	+10,301	+14,897	17150	
17250 National Institute on Aging	1,047,260	1,047,148	1,062,833	+15,573	+15,685	17250	
17300 National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal						17300	
17350 and Skin Diseases	508,240	508,082	516,044	+7,804	+7,962	17350	
17400 National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication						17400	
17450 Disorders	393,668	393,682	400,305	+6,637	+6,623	17450	
17500 National Institute of Nursing Research	137,404	137,800	139,527	+2,123	+1,727	17500	
17550 National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	436,259	436,505	442,870	+6,611	+6,365	17550	
17600 National Institute on Drug Abuse	1,000,621	1,000,365	1,015,559	+14,938	+15,194	17600	
17650 National Institute of Mental Health	1,404,494	1,405,421	1,425,531	+21,037	+20,110	17650	
17700 National Human Genome Research Institute	486,491	484,436	493,996	+7,505	+9,560	17700	
17750 National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and						17750	
17800 Bioengineering	296,887	300,463	303,318	+6,431	+2,855	17800	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request	
17850 National Center for Research Resources	1,133,240	1,112,498	1,171,095	+37,855	+58,597	17850
17900 National Center for Complementary and Alternative						17900
17950 Medicine	121,576	121,699	123,380	+1,804	+1,681	17950
18000 National Center on Minority Health and Health						18000
18050 Disparities	199,444	194,495	202,691	+3,247	+8,196	18050
18100 John E. Fogarty International Center	66,446	66,594	67,599	+1,153	+1,005	18100
18150 National Library of Medicine	320,850	312,562	325,484	+4,634	+12,922	18150
18155 Evaluation Tap Funding	(8,200)	(8,200)	(8,200)	---	---	18155
18157 Subtotal, NLM	329,050	320,762	333,684	+4,634	+12,922	18157
18200 Office of the Director 3/	1,046,901	517,062	1,114,422	+67,521	+597,360	18200
18205 Common fund	(483,000)	(121,540)	(495,153)	(+12,153)	(+373,613)	18205
18250 Buildings and Facilities	81,081	136,000	121,081	+40,000	-14,919	18250
18400 Total, National Institutes of Health (NIH)	28,899,887	28,621,241	29,649,887	+750,000	+1,028,646	18400
18450 Global HIV/AIDS Fund Transfer	-99,000	-300,000	-300,000	-201,000	---	18450
18480 Evaluation Tap Funding	(8,200)	(8,200)	(8,200)	---	---	18480
18500 Total, NIH, Program Level	(28,809,087)	(28,329,441)	(29,358,087)	(+549,000)	(+1,028,646)	18500
18600 SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES						18600
18601 ADMINISTRATION (SAMHSA)						18601
18650 Mental Health:						18650
18700 Programs of Regional and National Significance	263,263	186,633	277,030	+13,767	+90,397	18700
18750 Mental Health block grant	406,843	406,843	419,843	+13,000	+13,000	18750
18775 Evaluation Tap Funding	(21,413)	(21,413)	(21,413)	---	---	18775
18780 Subtotal, Program level	(428,256)	(428,256)	(441,256)	(+13,000)	(+13,000)	18780
18800 Children's Mental Health	104,078	104,078	104,078	---	---	18800
18850 Grants to States for the Homeless (PATH)	54,261	54,261	54,261	---	---	18850
18900 Protection and Advocacy	34,000	34,000	34,000	---	---	18900
18950 Subtotal, Mental Health	862,445	785,815	889,212	+26,767	+103,397	18950
18955 Subtotal, Program level	(883,858)	(807,228)	(910,625)	(+26,767)	(+103,397)	18955
19000 Substance Abuse Treatment:						19000
19050 Programs of Regional and National Significance	394,649	347,790	398,102	+3,453	+50,312	19050
19075 Evaluation Tap Funding	(4,300)	(4,300)	(4,300)	---	---	19075
19080 Subtotal, Program level	(398,949)	(352,090)	(402,402)	(+3,453)	(+50,312)	19080
19100 Substance Abuse block grant	1,679,391	1,679,391	1,714,391	+35,000	+35,000	19100
19125 Evaluation Tap Funding	(79,200)	(79,200)	(79,200)	---	---	19125
19130 Subtotal, Program level	(1,758,591)	(1,758,591)	(1,793,591)	(+35,000)	(+35,000)	19130
19150 Subtotal, Substance Abuse Treatment	2,074,040	2,027,181	2,112,493	+38,453	+85,312	19150
19155 Subtotal, Program level	(2,157,540)	(2,110,681)	(2,195,993)	(+38,453)	(+85,312)	19155
19200 Substance Abuse Prevention:						19200
19250 Programs of Regional and National Significance	192,902	156,461	194,502	+1,600	+38,041	19250
19350 Program Management	76,721	76,969	76,721	---	-248	19350
19352 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(16,000)	(16,250)	(16,000)	---	(-250)	19352
19353 Subtotal, Program level	92,721	93,219	92,721	---	-498	19353
19400 Total, SAMHSA	3,206,108	3,046,426	3,272,928	+66,820	+226,502	19400 UA
19405 Evaluation Tap funding	(120,913)	(121,163)	(120,913)	---	(-250)	19405
19410 Total, SAMHSA program level	(3,327,021)	(3,167,589)	(3,393,841)	(+66,820)	(+226,252)	19410

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
19500 AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY						19500	
19550 Research on Health Costs, Quality, and Outcomes:						19550	
19600 Federal Funds	---	---	271,564	+271,564	+271,564	19600	
19650 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(260,986)	(271,564)	---	(-260,986)	(-271,564)	19650	
19700 Clinical effectiveness research (NA)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(30,000)	(+15,000)	(+15,000)	19700	
19750 Patient safety research (NA)	(84,000)	(93,934)	(78,934)	(-5,066)	(-15,000)	19750	
19800 Subtotal, Program level	(260,986)	(271,564)	(271,564)	(+10,578)	---	19800	
19850 Medical Expenditures Panel Surveys:						19850	
19900 Federal Funds	---	---	8,236	+8,236	+8,236	19900	
19950 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(55,300)	(55,300)	(47,064)	(-8,236)	(-8,236)	19950	
19960 Subtotal, Medical Expenditures Panel Surveys	(55,300)	(55,300)	(55,300)	---	---	19960	
20100 Program Support:						20100	
20125 Federal Funds	---	---	2,700	+2,700	+2,700	20125	
20150 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(2,700)	(2,700)	---	(-2,700)	(-2,700)	20150	
20160 Subtotal, Program support	(2,700)	(2,700)	(2,700)	---	---	20160	
20290 Total, AHRQ	---	---	282,500	+282,500	+282,500	20290	UA
20300 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(318,986)	(329,564)	(47,064)	(-271,922)	(-282,500)	20300	
20310 Total, AHRQ program level	(318,986)	(329,564)	(329,564)	(+10,578)	---	20310	
20350 Total, Public Health Service appropriation	44,560,020	43,244,104	46,466,758	+1,906,738	+3,222,654	20350	
20355 Total, Public Health Service program level	(45,203,219)	(43,695,031)	(46,685,014)	(+1,481,795)	(+2,989,983)	20355	
20500 CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES						20500	
20550 GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID						20550	
20600 Medicaid current law benefits	155,467,869	194,109,000	194,109,000	+38,641,131	---	20600	M
20650 State and local administration	9,881,583	10,014,716	10,014,716	+133,133	---	20650	M
20700 Vaccines for Children	2,905,330	2,761,957	2,763,957	-141,373	+2,000	20700	M
20750 Subtotal, Medicaid program level	168,254,782	206,885,673	206,887,673	+38,632,891	+2,000	20750	
20850 Less funds advanced in prior year	-62,783,825	-65,257,617	-65,257,617	-2,473,792	---	20850	M
20900 Total, Grants to States for medicaid	105,470,957	141,628,056	141,630,056	+36,159,099	+2,000	20900	
20950 New advance, 1st quarter	65,257,617	67,292,669	67,292,669	+2,035,052	---	20950	M
20990 State Children's Health Insurance program						20990	
20991 shortfall payment (SCHIP) (emergency)	396,000	---	---	-396,000	---	20991	
21000 PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS						21000	
21050 Supplemental medical insurance	137,623,000	140,704,000	140,704,000	+3,081,000	---	21050	M
21100 Hospital insurance for the uninsured	239,000	269,000	269,000	+30,000	---	21100	M
21150 Federal uninsured payment	229,000	237,000	237,000	+8,000	---	21150	M
21200 Program management	175,000	192,000	192,000	+17,000	---	21200	M
21205 General revenue for Part D benefit	37,329,000	46,299,000	46,299,000	+8,970,000	---	21205	M
21210 General revenue for Part D administration	703,480	744,000	744,000	+40,520	---	21210	M
21220 HCFAC reimbursement	---	183,000	383,000	+383,000	+200,000	21220	M
21250 Subtotal, Payments to Trust Funds, current law	176,298,480	188,628,000	188,828,000	+12,529,520	+200,000	21250	
21260 Less funds advanced in prior year	---	---	---	---	---	21260	M
21280 Total, Payments to Trust Funds, current law	176,298,480	188,628,000	188,828,000	+12,529,520	+200,000	21280	
21300 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT 5/						21300	
21400 Research, Demonstration, Evaluation	57,420	33,700	23,070	-34,350	-10,630	21400	
21450 Medicare Operations 6/	2,159,242	2,303,615	2,221,215	+61,973	-82,400	21450	
21680 Revitalization plan	23,963	---	---	-23,963	---	21680	
21700 State Survey and Certification	258,128	293,524	293,524	+35,396	---	21700	
21750 High risk insurance pools	---	---	50,000	+50,000	+50,000	21750	
21800 Federal Administration 6/	642,354	643,187	642,354	---	-833	21800	
21950 Total, Program management, Limitation on new BA	3,141,107	3,274,026	3,230,163	+89,056	-43,863	21950	
21960 Survey and Certification user fee	---	(-35,000)	---	---	(+35,000)	21960	05
22000 Total, Program management, program level	(3,141,107)	(3,239,026)	(3,230,163)	(+89,056)	(-8,863)	22000	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
22010 HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL						22010	
22015 Part D drug benefit/medicare advantage (MIP)	---	137,840	288,480	+288,480	+150,640	22015	
22017 HHS Office of Inspector General	---	17,530	36,690	+36,690	+19,160	22017	
22019 Department of Justice	---	17,530	36,690	+36,690	+19,160	22019	
22020 Medicaid and SCHIP financial management	---	10,100	21,140	+21,140	+11,040	22020	
22025 Total, Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control	---	183,000	383,000	+383,000	+200,000	22025	
22050 Total, Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services	350,564,161	401,005,751	401,363,888	+50,799,727	+358,137	22050	
22100 Federal funds	347,423,054	397,548,725	397,750,725	+50,327,671	+202,000	22100	
22150 Current year	(282,165,437)	(330,256,056)	(330,458,056)	(+48,292,619)	(+202,000)	22150	
22200 New advance, FY 2009	(65,257,617)	(67,292,669)	(67,292,669)	(+2,035,052)	---	22200	
22250 Trust Funds	3,141,107	3,457,026	3,613,163	+472,056	+156,137	22250	
22300 ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES						22300	
22350 FAMILY SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO STATES						22350	
22400 Payments to territories	38,000	38,000	38,000	---	---	22400	M
22450 Repatriation	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---	22450	M
22500 Subtotal, Welfare payments	39,000	39,000	39,000	---	---	22500	
22550 Child Support Enforcement:						22550	
22600 State and local administration	3,943,678	3,417,713	3,417,713	-525,965	---	22600	M
22650 Federal incentive payments	471,000	483,000	483,000	+12,000	---	22650	M
22750 Access and visitation	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---	22750	M
22800 Subtotal, Child Support Enforcement	4,424,678	3,910,713	3,910,713	-513,965	---	22800	
22850 Total, Family support payments program level	4,463,678	3,949,713	3,949,713	-513,965	---	22850	
22900 Less funds advanced in previous years	-1,200,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	+200,000	---	22900	M
22950 Total, Family support payments, current year	3,263,678	2,949,713	2,949,713	-313,965	---	22950	
23000 New advance, 1st quarter, FY 2009	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	23000	M
23020 LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (LIHEAP)						23020	
23050 Formula grants	1,980,000	1,500,000	1,980,000	---	+480,000	23050	
23055 Deficit Reduction Act (P.L. 109-171) (NA)	---	---	---	---	---	23055	M
23080 Subtotal, Formula grants	1,980,000	1,500,000	1,980,000	---	+480,000	23080	UA
23150 Contingency fund	181,170	282,000	682,000	+500,830	+400,000	23150	
23152 Deficit Reduction Act (P.L. 109-171) (NA)	---	---	---	---	---	23152	M
23153 Subtotal, Contingency fund	181,170	282,000	682,000	+500,830	+400,000	23153	
23160 Total, LIHEAP	2,161,170	1,782,000	2,662,000	+500,830	+880,000	23160	
23175 Total, LIHEAP, program level	2,161,170	1,782,000	2,662,000	+500,830	+880,000	23175	
23200 REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE						23200	
23250 Transitional and Medical Services	265,546	294,021	294,021	+28,475	---	23250	UA
23300 Victims of Trafficking	9,823	14,816	9,814	-9	-5,002	23300	UA
23350 Social Services	154,005	149,610	154,005	---	+4,395	23350	UA
23400 Preventive Health	4,748	4,700	4,748	---	+48	23400	UA
23450 Targeted Assistance	48,590	48,104	48,590	---	+486	23450	UA
23475 Unaccompanied minors	95,318	134,662	129,635	+34,317	-5,027	23475	
23500 Victims of Torture	9,817	9,717	9,817	---	+100	23500	UA
23540 Total, Refugee and entrant assistance	587,847	655,630	650,630	+62,783	-5,000	23540	
23550 Total, Refugee and entrant assistance	587,847	655,630	650,630	+62,783	-5,000	23550	
23650 CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT	2,062,081	2,062,081	2,137,081	+75,000	+75,000	23650	UA
23700 SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (TITLE XX)	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	---	---	23700	M
23750 CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS						23750	
23800 Programs for Children, Youth and Families:						23800	
23850 Head Start, current funded	5,499,771	5,399,771	5,574,771	+75,000	+175,000	23850	
23900 Advance from prior year	(1,388,800)	(1,388,800)	(1,388,800)	---	---	23900	
23950 FY 2009	1,388,800	1,388,800	1,388,800	---	---	23950	
24000 Subtotal, Head Start, program level	6,888,571	6,788,571	6,963,571	+75,000	+175,000	24000	UA
24050 Consolidated Runaway, Homeless Youth Program	87,837	87,837	97,837	+10,000	+10,000	24050	
24125 Prevention grants to reduce abuse of runaway youth	15,027	15,027	15,027	---	---	24125	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
24150	Child Abuse State Grants	27,007	27,007	27,007	---	---	24150	
24200	Child Abuse Discretionary Activities	25,780	36,138	36,833	+11,053	+695	24200	
24225	Community based child abuse prevention	42,430	42,430	42,430	---	---	24225	
24250	Abandoned Infants Assistance	11,835	11,835	11,835	---	---	24250	
24300	Child Welfare Services	286,754	286,754	286,754	---	---	24300	
24350	Child Welfare Training	7,335	7,335	7,335	---	---	24350	
24400	Adoption Opportunities	26,848	26,848	26,848	---	---	24400	
24500	Adoption Incentive	5,000	13,500	9,500	+4,500	-4,000	24500	
24550	Adoption Awareness	12,674	12,674	14,674	+2,000	+2,000	24550	UA
24575	Interstate Home Study for Adoption and Foster Care	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000	24575	
24600	Compassion Capital Fund	64,350	75,000	64,350	---	-10,650	24600	
24650	Social Services and Income Maintenance Research	5,868	---	8,635	+2,767	+8,635	24650	
24655	Evaluation tap funding	(6,000)	(5,880)	(6,000)	---	(+120)	24655	
24657	Subtotal, Program level	(11,868)	(5,880)	(14,635)	(+2,767)	(+8,755)	24657	
24750	Developmental Disabilities Programs:						24750	
24800	State Councils	71,771	71,771	76,771	+5,000	+5,000	24800	
24850	Protection and Advocacy	38,718	38,718	38,718	---	---	24850	
24875	Voting access for individuals with disabilities	15,720	15,720	15,720	---	---	24875	
24899	Developmental Disabilities Projects of National						24899	
24900	Significance	11,414	11,414	11,414	---	---	24900	
24949	University Centers for Excellence in Developmental						24949	
24950	Disabilities	33,212	33,213	33,213	+1	---	24950	
25000	Subtotal, Developmental disabilities programs	170,835	170,836	175,836	+5,001	+5,000	25000	UA
25050	Native American Programs	44,332	44,332	47,332	+3,000	+3,000	25050	UA
25100	Community Services:						25100	
25150	Grants to States for Community Services	630,425	---	660,425	+30,000	+660,425	25150	UA
25200	Community Initiative Program:						25200	
25250	Economic Development	27,022	---	32,700	+5,678	+32,700	25250	UA
25275	Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals	5,382	---	5,382	---	+5,382	25275	
25300	Individual Development Account Initiative	24,452	24,452	24,452	---	---	25300	UA
25350	Rural Community Facilities	7,293	---	8,000	+707	+8,000	25350	UA
25400	Subtotal, Community Initiative Program	64,149	24,452	70,534	+6,385	+46,082	25400	
25550	Subtotal, Community Services	694,574	24,452	730,959	+36,385	+706,507	25550	
25650	Domestic Violence Hotline	2,970	2,970	2,970	---	---	25650	
25700	Family Violence/Battered Women's Shelters	124,731	124,731	134,731	+10,000	+10,000	25700	
25900	Mentoring Children of Prisoners	49,493	50,000	49,493	---	-507	25900	
25950	Independent Living Training Vouchers	46,157	46,157	46,157	---	---	25950	
25980	Abstinence Education	108,900	136,664	136,664	+27,764	---	25980	
25990	Evaluation Tap Funding	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)	---	---	25990	
25995	Subtotal, Program level	(113,400)	(141,164)	(141,164)	(+27,764)	---	25995	
25997	Faith-Based Center	1,386	1,386	1,386	---	---	25997	
26000	Program Direction	187,776	197,225	187,776	---	-9,449	26000	
26050	Total, Children and Families Services Programs	8,938,470	8,239,709	9,125,940	+187,470	+886,231	26050	
26100	Current Year	(7,549,670)	(6,850,909)	(7,737,140)	(+187,470)	(+886,231)	26100	
26150	FY 2009	(1,388,800)	(1,388,800)	(1,388,800)	---	---	26150	
26160	Evaluation Tap funding	(10,500)	(10,380)	(10,500)	---	(+120)	26160	
26180	Total, Program level	8,948,970	8,250,089	9,136,440	+187,470	+886,351	26180	
26250	PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES 7/	345,000	345,000	345,000	---	---	26250	M
26300	Discretionary Funds	89,100	89,100	89,100	---	---	26300	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
26350	PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION						26350	
26400	Foster Care	4,475,000	4,593,000	4,593,000	+118,000	---	26400	M
26450	Adoption Assistance	2,027,000	2,159,000	2,159,000	+132,000	---	26450	M
26500	Independent living	140,000	140,000	140,000	---	---	26500	M
26550	Total, Payments to States	6,642,000	6,892,000	6,892,000	+250,000	---	26550	
26600	Less Advances from Prior Year	-1,730,000	-1,810,000	-1,810,000	-80,000	---	26600	M
26650	Total, payments, current year	4,912,000	5,082,000	5,082,000	+170,000	---	26650	
26700	New Advance, 1st quarter	1,810,000	1,776,000	1,776,000	-34,000	---	26700	M
26750	Total, Administration for Children & Families	26,869,346	25,681,233	27,517,464	+648,118	+1,836,231	26750	
26800	Current year	(22,670,546)	(21,516,433)	(23,352,664)	(+682,118)	(+1,836,231)	26800	
26850	FY 2009	(4,198,800)	(4,164,800)	(4,164,800)	(-34,000)	---	26850	
26875	Evaluation Tap funding	(10,500)	(10,380)	(10,500)	---	(+120)	26875	
26880	Total, Administration for Children & Families	26,879,846	25,691,613	27,527,964	+648,118	+1,836,351	26880	
26900	ADMINISTRATION ON AGING						26900	
26950	Grants to States:						26950	
27000	Supportive Services and Centers	350,595	350,595	357,595	+7,000	+7,000	27000	
27050	Preventive Health	21,400	---	21,400	---	+21,400	27050	
27100	Protection of Vulnerable Older Americans-Title VII	20,156	19,166	20,156	---	+990	27100	
27150	Family Caregivers	156,167	154,187	156,167	---	+1,980	27150	
27200	Native American Caregivers Support	6,241	6,241	6,428	+187	+187	27200	
27250	Subtotal, Caregivers	162,408	160,428	162,595	+187	+2,167	27250	
27300	Nutrition:						27300	
27350	Congregate Meals	398,919	383,401	411,692	+12,773	+28,291	27350	
27400	Home Delivered Meals	188,305	180,998	194,337	+6,032	+13,339	27400	
27425	Nutrition Services Incentive Program	147,846	147,110	152,570	+4,724	+5,460	27425	
27430	Subtotal, Nutrition	735,070	711,509	758,599	+23,529	+47,090	27430	
27440	Subtotal, Grants to States	1,289,629	1,241,698	1,320,345	+30,716	+78,647	27440	
27450	Grants for Native Americans	26,134	26,134	26,918	+784	+784	27450	
27500	Program Innovations	24,058	35,485	10,240	-13,818	-25,245	27500	
27550	Aging Network Support Activities	13,133	13,133	29,633	+16,500	+16,500	27550	
27600	Alzheimer's Disease Demonstrations	11,668	---	11,668	---	+11,668	27600	UA
27650	Program Administration	18,385	18,696	18,385	---	-311	27650	
27700	Total, Administration on Aging	1,383,007	1,335,146	1,417,189	+34,182	+82,043	27700	
27750	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						27750	
27800	GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT:						27800	
27850	Federal Funds	179,175	225,442	195,021	+15,846	-30,421	27850	
27855	Rescission (P.L. 110-28)	-500	---	---	+500	---	27855	
27950	Trust Funds	5,792	5,851	5,851	+59	---	27950	
28050	Subtotal	184,467	231,293	200,872	+16,405	-30,421	28050	
28100	Adolescent Family Life (Title XX)	30,307	30,307	30,307	---	---	28100	UA
28200	Minority health	53,455	43,775	49,284	-4,171	+5,509	28200	
28250	Office of women's health	28,246	27,369	28,800	+554	+1,431	28250	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request	
28500 Minority HIV/AIDS	51,891	51,891	51,891	---	---	28500
28530 Afghanistan	5,892	5,941	5,941	+49	---	28530
28540 Embryo adoption awareness campaign	1,980	1,980	1,980	---	---	28540
28560 Evaluation tap funding (ASPE) (NA)	(39,552)	(46,756)	(46,756)	(+7,204)	---	28560
28600 Total, General Departmental Management	356,238	392,556	369,075	+12,837	-23,481	28600
28650 Federal Funds	(350,946)	(386,705)	(363,224)	(+12,278)	(-23,481)	28650
28655 Rescissions	(-500)	---	---	(+500)	---	28655
28700 Trust Funds	5,792	5,851	5,851	+59	---	28700
28775 Evaluation tap funding	(39,552)	(46,756)	(46,756)	(+7,204)	---	28775
28777 OFFICE OF MEDICARE HEARINGS AND APPEALS	59,727	70,000	65,000	+5,273	-5,000	28777
28779 OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL COORDINATOR FOR HEALTH						28779
28780 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY 8/	42,402	89,872	13,302	-29,100	-76,570	28780
28782 Evaluation tap funding	(18,900)	(28,000)	(48,000)	(+29,100)	(+20,000)	28782
28783 Total, Health Information Tech. program level	(61,302)	(117,872)	(61,302)	---	(-56,570)	28783
28850 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL:						28850
28900 Federal Funds	39,808	44,687	44,687	+4,879	---	28900
28950 HIPAA funding (NA)	(175,570)	(196,418)	(196,418)	(+20,848)	---	28950
28975 Medicaid integrity program						28975
28976 Deficit Reduction Act (P.L. 109-171) (NA)	---	(25,000)	(25,000)	(+25,000)	---	28976
29050 Total, Inspector General program level	(215,378)	(266,105)	(266,105)	(+50,727)	---	29050
29100 OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS:						29100
29150 Federal Funds	31,628	33,748	33,748	+2,120	---	29150
29200 Trust Funds	3,281	3,314	3,314	+33	---	29200
29250 Total, Office for Civil Rights	34,909	37,062	37,062	+2,153	---	29250
29450 MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS						29450
29500 Retirement payments	292,249	317,967	317,967	+25,718	---	29500 M
29550 Survivors benefits	17,338	18,026	18,026	+688	---	29550 M
29600 Dependents' medical care	61,111	66,549	66,549	+5,438	---	29600 M
29605 Total,Medical benefits for Commissioned Officers	370,698	402,542	402,542	+31,844	---	29605
29750 PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICE EMERGENCY FUND						29750
29790 Office of the Secretary activities	717,320	780,646	757,291	+39,971	-23,355	29790
29800 Other PHSSEF activities	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000	29800
29806 Pandemic influenza preparedness	---	948,091	948,091	+948,091	---	29806
29850 Total, PHSSEF	717,320	1,753,737	1,705,382	+988,062	-48,355	29850
29860 Covered countermeasure process fund	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000	29860
29900 Total, Office of the Secretary	1,621,102	2,790,456	2,642,050	+1,020,948	-148,406	29900
29950 Federal Funds	1,552,302	2,711,291	2,567,885	+1,015,583	-143,406	29950
30000 Trust Funds	68,800	79,165	74,165	+5,365	-5,000	30000
30100 Total, Title II, Dept of Health & Human Services	424,997,636	474,056,690	479,407,349	+54,409,713	+5,350,659	30100
30150 Federal Funds	421,787,729	470,520,499	475,720,021	+53,932,292	+5,199,522	30150
30200 Current year	(352,331,312)	(399,063,030)	(404,262,552)	(+51,931,240)	(+5,199,522)	30200
30210 Emergency appropriations	(459,000)	---	---	(-459,000)	---	30210
30250 FY 2009	(69,456,417)	(71,457,469)	(71,457,469)	(+2,001,052)	---	30250
30300 Trust Funds	3,209,907	3,536,191	3,687,328	+477,421	+151,137	30300

30305 Title II Footnotes: 30305
30308 1/In FY 2006, the Delta Health initiative funded 30308
30309 through the Rural hospital flexibility grant program 30309
30310 2/ Depart. of Health & Human Services reorganization 30310
30311 (7/12/06) of the Office of Rural Health Policy 30311
30312 3/ Funds provided for biodefense activities are 30312
30313 reflected within CDC and NIH respectively. 30313
30315 4/ Includes Mine Safety and Health. 30315
30318 5/ The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 provided $74M 30318
30321 for CMS Program Management. 30321
30324 6/ FY 2006 Appropriations Act included a $60M program 30324
30325 administrative reduction. 30325
30327 7/ The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 provided $20M for 30327
30328 the Promoting Safe and Stable Entitlement Program. 30328
30330 8/ An additional $50 million for Health IT within AHRQ 30330
30331 in FY 2007; an additional $45 million in FY 2008. 30331

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
30350 TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						30350	
30400 EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED						30400	
30450 Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)						30450	
30500 Basic Grants:						30500	
30550 Advance from prior year	(1,478,584)	(1,353,584)	(1,353,584)	(-125,000)	---	30550	
30600 Forward funded	5,451,387	5,325,824	5,451,387	---	+125,563	30600	FF
30650 Current funded	3,437	4,000	4,000	+563	---	30650	
30700 Subtotal, Basic grants current year approp.	5,454,824	5,329,824	5,455,387	+563	+125,563	30700	
30750 Subtotal, Basic grants total funds available	(6,933,408)	(6,683,408)	(6,808,971)	(-124,437)	(+125,563)	30750	
30800 Basic Grants FY 2009 Advance	1,353,584	1,478,584	1,353,584	---	-125,000	30800	
30850 Subtotal, Basic grants, program level	6,808,408	6,808,408	6,808,971	+563	+563	30850	
30900 Concentration Grants:						30900	
30950 Advance from prior year	(1,365,031)	(1,365,031)	(1,365,031)	---	---	30950	
31000 FY 2009 Advance	1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	---	---	31000	
31050 Subtotal, Concentration Grants program level	1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	---	---	31050	
31100 Targeted Grants:						31100	
31120 Forward funded	---	1,196,775	771,219	+771,219	-425,556	31120	FF
31150 Advance from prior year	(2,269,843)	(2,332,343)	(2,332,343)	(+62,500)	---	31150	
31200 FY 2009 Advance	2,332,343	2,269,843	2,323,343	-9,000	+53,500	31200	
31250 Subtotal, Targeted Grants program level	2,332,343	3,466,618	3,094,562	+762,219	-372,056	31250	
31300 Education Finance Incentive Grants:						31300	
31350 Advance from prior year	(2,269,843)	(2,332,343)	(2,332,343)	(+62,500)	---	31350	
31400 FY 2009 Advance	2,332,343	2,269,843	3,094,260	+761,917	+824,417	31400	
31450 Subtotal, Education Finance Incentive Grants	2,332,343	2,269,843	3,094,260	+761,917	+824,417	31450	
31500 Subtotal, Grants to LEAs, program level	12,838,125	13,909,900	14,362,824	+1,524,699	+452,924	31500	
31550 Even Start	82,283	---	99,000	+16,717	+99,000	31550	FF
31560 School improvement grants	125,000	500,000	500,000	+375,000	---	31560	FF
31600 Reading First:						31600	
31655 State Grants (forward funded)	1,029,234	1,018,692	400,000	-629,234	-618,692	31655	FF
31850 Subtotal, Reading First State Grants	1,029,234	1,018,692	400,000	-629,234	-618,692	31850	
31890 Early Reading First	117,666	117,666	114,550	-3,116	-3,116	31890	
31895 Striving readers 1/	31,870	100,000	31,870	---	-68,130	31895	FF
31897 Math Now for elementary school students	---	125,000	---	---	-125,000	31897	
31899 Math Now for middle school students	---	125,000	---	---	-125,000	31899	
31900 Literacy through School Libraries	19,485	19,486	19,486	+1	---	31900	
31915 Promise scholarships	---	250,000	---	---	-250,000	31915	
31920 America's opportunity scholarships for kids	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000	31920	
31950 State Agency Programs:						31950	
32000 Migrant	386,524	380,295	393,900	+7,376	+13,605	32000	FF
32050 Neglected and Delinquent/High Risk Youth	49,797	49,797	49,797	---	---	32050	FF
32060 Subtotal, State Agency programs	436,321	430,092	443,697	+7,376	+13,605	32060	
32100 Evaluation	9,330	9,327	9,330	---	+3	32100	
32150 Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration	2,352	---	1,634	-718	+1,634	32150	FF
32400 Migrant Education:						32400	
32450 High School Equivalency Program	18,550	18,550	18,550	---	---	32450	
32500 College Assistance Migrant Program	15,377	15,377	15,377	---	---	32500	
32550 Subtotal, Migrant Education	33,927	33,927	33,927	---	---	32550	UA
32600 Total, Education for the disadvantaged	14,725,593	16,689,090	16,016,318	+1,290,725	-672,772	32600	
32650 Current Year	(7,342,292)	(9,305,789)	(7,880,100)	(+537,808)	(-1,425,689)	32650	
32700 FY 2009	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(8,136,218)	(+752,917)	(+752,917)	32700	
32750 Subtotal, forward funded	(7,158,447)	(8,571,383)	(7,698,807)	(+540,360)	(-872,576)	32750	
32800 IMPACT AID						32800	
32850 Basic Support Payments	1,091,867	1,091,867	1,140,517	+48,650	+48,650	32850	
32900 Payments for Children with Disabilities	49,466	49,466	49,466	---	---	32900	
32950 Facilities Maintenance (Sec. 8008)	4,950	4,597	4,950	---	+353	32950	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
33000 Construction (Sec. 8007)	17,820	17,820	17,820	---	---	33000	
33050 Payments for Federal Property (Sec. 8002)	64,350	64,350	65,700	+1,350	+1,350	33050	
33100 Total, Impact aid	1,228,453	1,228,100	1,278,453	+50,000	+50,353	33100	
33150 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS						33150	
33200 State Grants for Improving Teacher Quality	1,452,439	1,352,488	1,752,439	+300,000	+399,951	33200	FF
33250 Advance from prior year	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	---	---	33250	
33300 FY 2009	1,435,000	1,435,000	1,435,000	---	---	33300	
33350 Subtotal, State Grants for Improving Teacher						33350	
33400 Quality, program level	2,887,439	2,787,488	3,187,439	+300,000	+399,951	33400	
33600 Early Childhood Educator Professional Development	14,550	---	---	-14,550	---	33600	
33700 Mathematics and Science Partnerships	182,160	182,124	182,160	---	+36	33700	FF
33890 State Grants for Innovative Education (Education Block						33890	
33900 Grant)	99,000	---	99,000	---	+99,000	33900	FF
34150 Educational Technology State Grants	272,250	---	272,250	---	+272,250	34150	FF
34200 Supplemental Education Grants	18,001	18,001	18,001	---	---	34200	
34325 21st Century Community Learning Centers	981,166	981,180	1,106,166	+125,000	+124,986	34325	FF
35050 State Assessments/Enhanced Assessment Instruments	407,563	411,630	411,630	+4,067	---	35050	FF
35060 Javits gifted and talented education	7,596	---	7,596	---	+7,596	35060	
35070 Foreign language assistance	23,780	23,755	26,780	+3,000	+3,025	35070	
35100 Education for Homeless Children and Youth	61,871	61,878	66,878	+5,007	+5,000	35100	FF
35150 Training and Advisory Services (Civil Rights)	7,113	7,113	7,113	---	---	35150	
35200 Education for Native Hawaiians	33,907	---	33,907	---	+33,907	35200	
35250 Alaska Native Education Equity	33,907	---	33,907	---	+33,907	35250	
35300 Rural Education	168,918	168,851	168,918	---	+67	35300	FF
35400 Comprehensive Centers	56,257	56,256	56,257	---	+1	35400	
35900 Total, School improvement programs	5,255,478	4,698,276	5,678,002	+422,524	+979,726	35900	
35950 Current Year	(3,820,478)	(3,263,276)	(4,243,002)	(+422,524)	(+979,726)	35950	
36000 FY 2009	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	---	---	36000	
36050 Subtotal, forward funded	(3,625,367)	(3,158,151)	(4,059,441)	(+434,074)	(+901,290)	36050	
36100 INDIAN EDUCATION						36100	
36110 Grants to Local Educational Agencies	95,331	95,331	100,057	+4,726	+4,726	36110	
36120 Federal Programs:						36120	
36130 Special Programs for Indian Children	19,399	19,399	19,884	+485	+485	36130	
36140 National Activities	3,960	3,953	4,059	+99	+106	36140	
36150 Subtotal, Federal Programs	23,359	23,352	23,943	+584	+591	36150	
36170 Total, Indian Education	118,690	118,683	124,000	+5,310	+5,317	36170	
36300 INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT						36300	
36310 Troops-to-Teachers	14,645	14,645	14,645	---	---	36310	
36320 Transition to Teaching	44,484	44,482	44,484	---	+2	36320	
36330 Writing instruction	21,533	---	23,533	+2,000	+23,533	36330	
36340 Teaching of Traditional American History	119,790	50,000	119,790	---	+69,790	36340	
36350 School Leadership	14,731	---	14,731	---	+14,731	36350	
36360 Advanced Credentialing	16,695	---	10,695	-6,000	+10,695	36360	
36365 Adjunct Teacher Corps	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000	36365	
36370 Charter Schools Grants	214,783	214,782	251,394	+36,611	+36,612	36370	
36380 Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities	36,611	36,611	---	-36,611	-36,611	36380	UA
36390 Voluntary Public School Choice	26,278	26,275	26,278	---	+3	36390	
36400 Magnet Schools Assistance	106,693	106,685	106,693	---	+8	36400	
36425 Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE)	158,508	58,108	205,402	+46,894	+147,294	36425	
36433 Teacher Incentive Fund, Current funded	200	199,000	99,000	+98,800	-100,000	36433	
36440 Ready-to-Learn television	24,255	24,255	24,255	---	---	36440	
36460 Congressional Fellowships	1,454	---	1,454	---	+1,454	36460	
36470 Advanced Placement	37,026	122,175	50,000	+12,974	-72,175	36470	
36480 Total, Innovation and Improvement	837,686	922,018	992,354	+154,668	+70,336	36480	
36500 SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION						36500	
36510 Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities:						36510	
36520 State Grants, forward funded	346,500	100,000	300,000	-46,500	+200,000	36520	FF
36570 National Programs	141,112	200,000	141,112	---	-58,888	36570	
36575 Supplemental (P.L. 110-28) (emergency)	8,594	---	---	-8,594	---	36575	
36590 Alcohol Abuse Reduction	32,409	---	32,409	---	+32,409	36590	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
36600 Mentoring Programs	48,814	---	48,814	---	+48,814	36600	
36610 Character education	24,248	24,248	24,248	---	---	36610	
36620 Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	34,650	---	61,500	+26,850	+61,500	36620	
36630 Carol M. White Physical Education Program	72,674	---	72,674	---	+72,674	36630	
36640 Civic Education	29,111	---	33,318	+4,207	+33,318	36640	
36670 Total, Safe Schools and Citizenship Education	738,112	324,248	714,075	-24,037	+389,827	36670	
36681 Current Year	(738,112)	(324,248)	(714,075)	(-24,037)	(+389,827)	36681	
36695 Subtotal, Forward funded	(346,500)	(100,000)	(300,000)	(-46,500)	(+200,000)	36695	
36700 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION						36700	
36710 Current funded	43,485	43,603	50,350	+6,865	+6,747	36710	
36750 Forward funded	625,522	627,216	724,264	+98,742	+97,048	36750	FF
36800 Total, English Language Acquisition	669,007	670,819	774,614	+105,607	+103,795	36800	
36850 SPECIAL EDUCATION						36850	
36900 State Grants:						36900	
36950 Grants to States Part B current year	5,358,761	4,276,741	4,650,443	-708,318	+373,702	36950	FF
37000 Part B advance from prior year	(5,424,200)	(5,424,200)	(5,424,200)	---	---	37000	
37050 Grants to States Part B (FY 2009)	5,424,200	6,215,200	6,641,982	+1,217,782	+426,782	37050	
37100 Subtotal, Grants to States, program level	10,782,961	10,491,941	11,292,425	+509,464	+800,484	37100	
37150 Preschool Grants	380,751	380,751	380,751	---	---	37150	FF
37200 Grants for Infants and Families	436,400	423,067	436,400	---	+13,333	37200	FF
37250 Subtotal, State grants, program level	11,600,112	11,295,759	12,109,576	+509,464	+813,817	37250	
37300 IDEA National Activities (current funded):						37300	
37450 Technical Assistance and Dissemination	48,903	48,902	48,903	---	+1	37450	
37500 Personnel Preparation	89,720	89,719	89,720	---	+1	37500	
37550 Parent Information Centers	25,704	25,704	25,704	---	---	37550	
37600 Technology and Media Services	38,428	25,063	36,928	-1,500	+11,865	37600	
37700 Subtotal, IDEA special programs	202,755	189,388	201,255	-1,500	+11,867	37700	
37750 Total, Special education	11,802,867	11,485,147	12,310,831	+507,964	+825,684	37750	
37800 Current Year	(6,378,667)	(5,269,947)	(5,668,849)	(-709,818)	(+398,902)	37800	
37850 FY 2009	(5,424,200)	(6,215,200)	(6,641,982)	(+1,217,782)	(+426,782)	37850	
37900 Subtotal, Forward funded	(6,175,912)	(5,080,559)	(5,467,594)	(-708,318)	(+387,035)	37900	
37950 REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH						37950	
38000 Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants	2,837,160	2,874,043	2,874,043	+36,883	---	38000	M
38100 Client Assistance State grants	11,782	11,782	11,782	---	---	38100	
38150 Training	38,438	38,438	38,438	---	---	38150	
38200 Demonstration and training programs	6,511	6,840	7,061	+550	+221	38200	
38250 Migrant and seasonal farmworkers	2,279	---	2,279	---	+2,279	38250	
38300 Recreational programs	2,518	---	2,518	---	+2,518	38300	
38350 Protection and advocacy of individual rights (PAIR)	16,489	16,489	16,489	---	---	38350	
38400 Projects with industry	19,538	---	19,538	---	+19,538	38400	
38450 Supported employment State grants	29,700	---	29,700	---	+29,700	38450	
38500 Independent living:						38500	
38550 State grants	22,588	22,588	22,588	---	---	38550	
38600 Centers	74,638	74,638	74,638	---	---	38600	
38650 Services for older blind individuals	32,895	32,895	32,895	---	---	38650	
38700 Subtotal, Independent living	130,121	130,121	130,121	---	---	38700	
38750 Program Improvement	835	633	633	-202	---	38750	
38800 Evaluation	1,473	1,973	1,473	---	-500	38800	
38849 Helen Keller National Center for Deaf/Blind Youth and						38849	
38850 Adults	8,511	8,011	8,511	---	+500	38850	
38900 National Inst. Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)	106,705	106,705	106,705	---	---	38900	
38950 Assistive Technology	30,452	26,111	30,452	---	+4,341	38950	
39050 Subtotal, Discretionary programs	405,352	347,103	405,700	+348	+58,597	39050	
39100 Total, Rehabilitation services	3,242,512	3,221,146	3,279,743	+37,231	+58,597	39100	UA
39150 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES						39150	
39200 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND	17,573	17,573	17,573	---	---	39200	
39250 NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF (NTID):						39250	
39300 Operations	56,141	55,349	59,052	+2,911	+3,703	39300	
39400 Construction	---	913	1,705	+1,705	+792	39400	
39450 Total, NTID	56,141	56,262	60,757	+4,616	+4,495	39450	UA
39550 GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY:						39550	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
39555	Operations	106,998	106,398	109,952	+2,954	+3,554	39555	UA
39560	Evaluation	---	600	---	---	-600	39560	
39570	Total, Gallaudet	106,998	106,998	109,952	+2,954	+2,954	39570	
39699	Total, Special Institutions for Persons with						39699	
39700	Disabilities	180,712	180,833	188,282	+7,570	+7,449	39700	
39750	CAREER AND ADULT EDUCATION						39750	
39800	Career Education:						39800	
39850	Basic State Grants/Secondary & Technical Education						39850	
39875	State Grants, current funded	390,553	600,000	415,553	+25,000	-184,447	39875	FF
39900	Advance from prior year	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	---	---	39900	
39950	FY 2009	791,000	---	791,000	---	+791,000	39950	
40000	Subtotal, Basic State Grants, program level	1,181,553	600,000	1,206,553	+25,000	+606,553	40000	
40050	Tech-Prep Education State Grants	104,753	---	104,753	---	+104,753	40050	FF
40150	National Programs	10,000	10,000	8,000	-2,000	-2,000	40150	FF
40299	Tribally Controlled Postsec Voc/Tech Institutions	7,366	7,366	8,000	+634	+634	40299	UA
40300	Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,303,672	617,366	1,327,306	+23,634	+709,940	40300	
40350	Adult Education:						40350	
40375	State Grants/Adult basic and literacy education:						40375	
40400	State Grants, current funded	563,975	564,074	588,975	+25,000	+24,901	40400	FF
40450	National Programs:						40450	
40500	National Leadership Activities	9,005	9,096	7,000	-2,005	-2,096	40500	FF
40550	National Institute for Literacy	6,583	6,638	6,638	+55	---	40550	FF
40600	Subtotal, National programs	15,588	15,734	13,638	-1,950	-2,096	40600	
40650	Subtotal, Adult education	579,563	579,808	602,613	+23,050	+22,805	40650	
40710	Smaller Learning Communities, current funded	4,677	---	---	-4,677	---	40710	
40720	Smaller Learning Communities, forward funded	88,854	---	93,531	+4,677	+93,531	40720	FF
40725	State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders 2/	22,770	---	22,770	---	+22,770	40725	UA FF
40750	Total, Career and adult education	1,999,536	1,197,174	2,046,220	+46,684	+849,046	40750	UA
40800	Current Year	(1,208,536)	(1,197,174)	(1,255,220)	(+46,684)	(+58,046)	40800	
40850	FY 2009	(791,000)	---	(791,000)	---	(+791,000)	40850	
40900	Subtotal, forward funded	(1,196,493)	(1,189,808)	(1,247,220)	(+50,727)	(+57,412)	40900	
40950	STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE						40950	
41000	Pell Grants -- maximum grant (NA)	(4,310)	(4,050)	(4,700)	(+390)	(+650)	41000	
41050	Pell Grants	13,660,711	13,414,000	15,583,000	+1,922,289	+2,169,000	41050	
41100	Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	770,933	---	770,933	---	+770,933	41100	
41150	Federal Work Study	980,354	980,492	980,492	+138	---	41150	
41200	Federal Perkins loan cancellations	65,471	---	65,471	---	+65,471	41200	
41400	LEAP program	64,987	---	64,987	---	+64,987	41400	
41490	Subtotal, discretionary programs	15,542,456	14,394,492	17,464,883	+1,922,427	+3,070,391	41490	
41500	Total, Student Financial Assistance	15,542,456	14,394,492	17,464,883	+1,922,427	+3,070,391	41500	UA
41610	STUDENT AID ADMINISTRATION 3/	718,450	708,216	708,216	-10,234	---	41610	UA
41612	Rescission (P.L. 110-28)	-500	---	---	+500	---	41612	
41615	Total, Student aid administration	717,950	708,216	708,216	-9,734	---	41615	UA
41650	HIGHER EDUCATION						41650	
41700	Aid for Institutional Development:						41700	
41750	Strengthening Institutions	79,535	79,535	79,535	---	---	41750	
41800	Hispanic Serving Institutions	94,914	94,911	99,500	+4,586	+4,589	41800	
41850	Strengthening Historically Black Colleges (HBCUs)	238,095	238,095	249,500	+11,405	+11,405	41850	
41898	Strengthening Historically Black Graduate						41898	
41900	Institutions	57,915	57,915	57,915	---	---	41900	
41949	Strengthening Alaska Native and						41949	
41950	Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions	11,785	---	11,785	---	+11,785	41950	
42000	Strengthening Tribal Colleges	23,570	18,570	24,475	+905	+5,905	42000	
42050	Subtotal, Aid for Institutional development	505,814	489,026	522,710	+16,896	+33,684	42050	UA

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
42100	International Education and Foreign Language:						42100	
42150	Domestic Programs	91,541	91,541	100,341	+8,800	+8,800	42150	UA
42200	Overseas Programs	12,610	12,610	13,610	+1,000	+1,000	42200	
42250	Institute for International Public Policy	1,600	1,600	1,700	+100	+100	42250	UA
42300	Subtotal, International Education & Foreign Lang	105,751	105,751	115,651	+9,900	+9,900	42300	
42375	Fund for the Improvement of Postsec. Ed. (FIPSE)	21,989	21,988	63,264	+41,275	+41,276	42375	UA
42400	Minority Science and Engineering Improvement	8,730	8,730	8,730	---	---	42400	UA
42500	Federal TRIO Programs	828,178	828,178	868,178	+40,000	+40,000	42500	UA
42550	GEAR UP	303,423	303,423	323,423	+20,000	+20,000	42550	UA
42600	Byrd Honors Scholarships	40,590	---	40,590	---	+40,590	42600	UA
42650	Javits Fellowships	9,699	9,797	9,699	---	-98	42650	UA
42700	Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need	30,067	30,064	30,067	---	+3	42700	UA
42750	Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants	59,895	---	40,000	-19,895	+40,000	42750	UA
42800	Child Care Access Means Parents in School	15,810	15,810	17,810	+2,000	+2,000	42800	UA
42825	Advancing America thru foreign language partnerships	---	24,000	---	---	-24,000	42825	
42850	Demonstration in Disabilities / Higher Education	6,875	---	6,875	---	+6,875	42850	UA
42900	Underground Railroad Program	1,980	---	---	-1,980	---	42900	UA
42950	GPRA data/HEA program evaluation	970	970	620	-350	-350	42950	UA
43050	B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships	970	---	970	---	+970	43050	UA
43075	Thurgood Marshall Legal education opportunities	2,946	---	2,946	---	+2,946	43075	
43100	Total, Higher education	1,943,687	1,837,737	2,051,533	+107,846	+213,796	43100	
43150	HOWARD UNIVERSITY						43150	
43200	Academic Program	204,405	204,405	204,405	---	---	43200	
43250	Endowment Program	3,526	---	3,526	---	+3,526	43250	UA
43300	Howard University Hospital	29,461	29,461	29,461	---	---	43300	
43350	Total, Howard University	237,392	233,866	237,392	---	+3,526	43350	
43400	COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES LOANS(CHAFL)	571	481	481	-90	---	43400	
43450	HBCU CAPITAL FINANCING PROGRAM -- Federal Admin	209	188	188	-21	---	43450	
43500	INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES						43500	
43600	Research, development and dissemination	162,552	162,535	157,552	-5,000	-4,983	43600	
43620	Statistics	90,022	119,022	96,022	+6,000	-23,000	43620	
43650	Regional Educational Laboratories	65,470	65,464	65,470	---	+6	43650	
43720	Research in special education	71,840	71,829	71,840	---	+11	43720	
43725	Special education studies and evaluations	9,900	9,628	9,900	---	+272	43725	
43730	Statewide data systems	24,552	49,152	37,508	+12,956	-11,644	43730	
43750	Assessment:						43750	
43800	National Assessment	88,095	110,595	91,095	+3,000	-19,500	43800	
43850	National Assessment Governing Board	5,054	6,037	5,716	+662	-321	43850	
43900	Subtotal, Assessment	93,149	116,632	96,811	+3,662	-19,821	43900	
44050	Total, IES	517,485	594,262	535,103	+17,618	-59,159	44050	
44100	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT						44100	
44150	PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION						44150	
44160	Salaries and Expenses	416,487	429,631	391,487	-25,000	-38,144	44160	
44170	Building Modernization	2,100	17,303	3,000	+900	-14,303	44170	
44181	Total, Program administration	418,587	446,934	394,487	-24,100	-52,447	44181	
44200	OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS	91,205	93,771	93,771	+2,566	---	44200	
44250	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	50,266	53,239	53,239	+2,973	---	44250	
44300	Total, Departmental management	560,058	593,944	541,497	-18,561	-52,447	44300	
44303	HURRICANE EDUCATION RECOVERY						44303	
44304	Aid for Elementary and Secondary Education,						44304	
44305	Supplemental (P.L. 110-28) (emergency):						44305	
44307	Recruitment, retention, and compensation						44307	
44308	of personnel	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---	44308	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request	
44316 Aid for Institutions of Higher Education, Supplemental						44316
44317 (P.L. 110-28) (emergency)	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---	44317
44319						44319
44321 Total, Hurricane Education Recovery	60,000	---	---	-60,000	---	44321
44500 Total, Title III, Department of Education	60,378,454	59,098,720	64,942,185	+4,563,731	+5,843,465	44500
44550 Current Year	(45,344,953)	(44,065,219)	(47,937,985)	(+2,593,032)	(+3,872,766)	44550
44555 Emergency appropriations	(68,594)	---	---	(-68,594)	---	44555
44560 FY 2009	(15,033,501)	(15,033,501)	(17,004,200)	(+1,970,699)	(+1,970,699)	44560
44599 Title III Footnotes:						44599
44600 1/ Funding for Striving readers was first forward						44600
44601 funded in the FY 2006 conference agreement.						44601
44602 2/ Previously funded under Office of Safe and						44602
44603 Drug Free Schools.						44603
44604 3/ In prior years, $600M was included as mandatory.						44604
44650 TITLE IV - RELATED AGENCIES						44650
44885 COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR						44885
44890 SEVERELY DISABLED	4,652	4,994	4,994	+342	---	44890
44900 CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE						44900
44905 OPERATING EXPENSES						44905
44910 Domestic Volunteer Service Programs:						44910
44950 Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA)	95,468	89,734	95,468	---	+5,734	44950
44955 VISTA cost-share revolving fund	3,500	---	---	-3,500	---	44955
45050 National Senior Volunteer Corps:						45050
45100 Foster Grandparents Program	110,937	97,550	110,937	---	+13,387	45100
45150 Senior Companion Program	46,964	41,299	46,964	---	+5,665	45150
45200 Retired Senior Volunteer Program	59,685	65,643	59,685	---	-5,958	45200
45300 Subtotal, Senior Volunteers	217,586	204,492	217,586	---	+13,094	45300
45400 Subtotal, Domestic Volunteer Service Programs	316,554	294,226	313,054	-3,500	+18,828	45400
45415 National and Community Service Programs:						45415
45425 National service trust	117,720	122,521	122,521	+4,801	---	45425
45430 AmeriCorps grants	264,825	255,625	255,625	-9,200	---	45430
45435 Innovation, assistance, and other activities	29,771	12,697	13,000	-16,771	+303	45435
45440 Evaluation	3,960	3,960	3,960	---	---	45440
45445 National Civilian Community Corps	26,789	11,620	11,620	-15,169	---	45445
45450 Learn and Serve America: K-12 and Higher Ed	37,125	32,099	37,125	---	+5,026	45450
45455 State Commission Administrative Grants	12,516	12,000	12,000	-516	---	45455
45460 Points of Light Foundation	---	8,900	---	---	-8,900	45460
45470 Subtotal, National & Community Service Programs	492,706	459,422	455,851	-36,855	-3,571	45470
45474 Total, Operating expenses	809,260	753,648	768,905	-40,355	+15,257	45474
45475 National and Community Service, Salaries & expenses	70,324	69,520	68,964	-1,360	-556	45475
45480 Office of the Inspector General	4,963	5,512	5,512	+549	---	45480
45490 Total, Corp. for National and Community Service	884,547	828,680	843,381	-41,166	+14,701	45490 UA
45500 CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING:						45500
45550 FY 2010 (current) with FY 2009 comparable	400,000	---	420,000	+20,000	+420,000	45550
45600 FY 2009 advance with FY 2008 comparable (NA)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	---	---	45600
45620 Subtotal, FY 2009 program level	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---	45620
45650 FY 2008 advance with FY 2007 comparable (NA)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	---	---	45650
45675 Rescission of FY 2008 funds (NA)	---	(-50,000)	---	---	(+50,000)	45675
45680 Subtotal, FY 2008 program level	400,000	350,000	400,000	---	+50,000	45680
45700 Digitalization program, current funded	29,700	---	29,700	---	+29,700	45700
45710 Previous appropriated funds (NA)	---	(30,600)	---	---	(-30,600)	45710
45725 Interconnection, current funded	34,650	---	26,750	-7,900	+26,750	45725
45730 Previous appropriated funds (NA)	---	(26,750)	---	---	(-26,750)	45730
45750 Subtotal, FY 2008 appropriation	64,350	---	56,450	-7,900	+56,450	45750 UA
45850 FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE	42,849	43,800	44,450	+1,601	+650	45850
45900 FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION	7,778	8,096	8,096	+318	---	45900
45950 INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES	247,205	271,246	264,812	+17,607	-6,434	45950
46000 MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION	12,066	10,748	10,748	-1,318	---	46000
46050 NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFO SCIENCE	989	---	---	-989	---	46050

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
46100 NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY	3,426	3,113	3,113	-313	---	46100	UA
46200 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD	251,507	256,238	256,988	+5,481	+750	46200	
46250 NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD	11,596	12,242	12,992	+1,396	+750	46250	
46300 OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION	10,471	10,696	10,696	+225	---	46300	
46350 RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD						46350	
46400 Dual Benefits Payments Account	88,000	79,000	79,000	-9,000	---	46400	
46450 Less Income Tax Receipts on Dual Benefits	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000	---	---	46450	
46500 Subtotal, Dual Benefits	82,000	73,000	73,000	-9,000	---	46500	
46550 Federal Payment to the RR Retirement Account	150	150	150	---	---	46550	M
46600 Limitation on Administration	103,694	103,518	103,694	---	+176	46600	
46650 Inspector General	7,173	7,606	7,606	+433	---	46650	
46700 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION						46700	
46750 Payments to Social Security Trust Funds	20,470	28,140	28,140	+7,670	---	46750	M
47150 SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME						47150	
47200 Federal benefit payments	37,204,000	40,675,000	40,675,000	+3,471,000	---	47200	M
47250 Beneficiary services	---	36,000	36,000	+36,000	---	47250	M
47300 Research and demonstration	27,000	27,000	27,000	---	---	47300	M
47350 Administration	2,950,169	2,983,000	3,020,525	+70,356	+37,525	47350	
47400 Subtotal, SSI program level	40,181,169	43,721,000	43,758,525	+3,577,356	+37,525	47400	
47450 Less funds advanced in prior year	-11,110,000	-16,810,000	-16,810,000	-5,700,000	---	47450	M
47500 Subtotal, regular SSI current year	29,071,169	26,911,000	26,948,525	-2,122,644	+37,525	47500	
47650 Total, SSI, current request	29,071,169	26,911,000	26,948,525	-2,122,644	+37,525	47650	
47700 New advance, 1st quarter, FY 2008	16,810,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	-2,010,000	---	47700	M
47710 Total, SSI program	45,881,169	41,711,000	41,748,525	-4,132,644	+37,525	47710	
47750 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES						47750	
47800 OASDI Trust Funds	4,598,834	4,698,292	4,760,767	+161,933	+62,475	47800	
47850 HI/SMI Trust Funds	1,626,570	1,679,661	1,679,661	+53,091	---	47850	
47900 Social Security Advisory Board	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---	47900	
47950 SSI	2,950,169	2,868,000	2,905,525	-44,644	+37,525	47950	
48000 Subtotal, regular LAE	9,177,573	9,247,953	9,347,953	+170,380	+100,000	48000	
48002 Additional CDR Funding:						48002	
48003 OASDI Trust Funds	---	98,000	98,000	+98,000	---	48003	
48004 SSI	---	115,000	115,000	+115,000	---	48004	
48005 Subtotal, additional CDR funding	---	213,000	213,000	+213,000	---	48005	
48020 User Fees:						48020	
48040 SSI User Fee activities	117,000	135,000	135,000	+18,000	---	48040	
48050 SSPA User Fee Activities	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---	48050	
48060 Subtotal, User fees	118,000	136,000	136,000	+18,000	---	48060	
48100 Total, Limitation on Administrative Expenses	9,295,573	9,596,953	9,696,953	+401,380	+100,000	48100	
48450 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL						48450	
48500 Federal Funds	25,902	27,000	27,000	+1,098	---	48500	
48550 Trust Funds	66,149	68,047	68,047	+1,898	---	48550	
48600 Total, Office of the Inspector General	92,051	95,047	95,047	+2,996	---	48600	
48750 Adjustment: Trust fund transfers from general revenues	-2,950,169	-2,983,000	-3,020,525	-70,356	-37,525	48750	
48800 Total, Social Security Administration	52,339,094	48,448,140	48,548,140	-3,790,954	+100,000	48800	
48850 Federal funds	46,045,541	41,902,140	41,939,665	-4,105,876	+37,525	48850	
48900 Current year	(29,235,541)	(27,102,140)	(27,139,665)	(-2,095,876)	(+37,525)	48900	
48950 New advances, 1st quarter	(16,810,000)	(14,800,000)	(14,800,000)	(-2,010,000)	---	48950	
49000 Trust funds	6,293,553	6,546,000	6,608,475	+314,922	+62,475	49000	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	----- Recommended vs. ----- Comparable	Request	
49100	Total, Title IV, Related Agencies	54,473,547	50,082,267	50,669,310	-3,804,237	+587,043	49100
49150	Federal Funds	48,057,061	43,414,395	43,938,787	-4,118,274	+524,392	49150
49200	Current Year	(30,847,061)	(28,614,395)	(28,718,787)	(-2,128,274)	(+104,392)	49200
49250	FY 2009 Advance	(16,810,000)	(14,800,000)	(14,800,000)	(-2,010,000)	---	49250
49300	FY 2010 Advance	(400,000)	---	(420,000)	(+20,000)	(+420,000)	49300
49350	Trust Funds	6,416,486	6,667,872	6,730,523	+314,037	+62,651	49350
49355	Title IV Footnotes:						49355
49371	1/ Carryover funding available from PL 108-173						49371
49640	RECAP						49640
49760	Mandatory, total in bill	409,271,907	455,463,526	455,665,526	+46,393,619	+202,000	49760
49780	Less advances for subsequent years	-84,945,617	-84,930,669	-84,930,669	+14,948	---	49780
49800	Plus advances provided in prior years	76,897,825	84,945,617	84,945,617	+8,047,792	---	49800
49820	Total, mandatory, current year	401,224,115	455,478,474	455,680,474	+54,456,359	+202,000	49820
49860	Discretionary, total in bill	145,262,591	141,710,017	154,238,378	+8,975,787	+12,528,361	49860
49880	Less advances for subsequent years	-19,285,301	-18,885,301	-21,276,000	-1,990,699	-2,390,699	49880
49900	Plus advances provided in prior years	19,285,301	19,285,301	19,285,301	---	---	49900
49920	Subtotal, Discretionary, current year	145,262,591	142,110,017	152,247,679	+6,985,088	+10,137,662	49920
49960	Scorekeeping adjustments:						49960
50100	SSI User Fee Collection	-117,000	-135,000	-135,000	-18,000	---	50100
50125	Adjustment to balance to CBO (technical)	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---	50125
50126	Adjustment to balance to CBO's ATB pay (technical)	6,401	---	---	-6,401	---	50126
50135	Vaccines for children amendment	---	---	2,000	+2,000	+2,000	50135
50136	Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (AWIU) Conting	---	45,000	---	---	-45,000	50136
50194	Health professions student loan (rescission)	---	-100,000	---	---	+100,000	50194
50198	Health Center Loan Guarantee Program (rescission)	---	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	50198
50200	Social services block grant reduction (rescission)	---	-500,000	---	---	+500,000	50200
50205	Voc rehabilitation reduction (rescission)	---	-36,883	---	---	+36,883	50205
50210	Excess H-1B Fee Revenue (rescission)	---	-50,000	-70,000	-70,000	-20,000	50210
50215	National skills standards board (rescission)	---	-44	-44	-44	---	50215
50220	TES prior year balances (rescission)	---	-335,000	-335,000	-335,000	---	50220
50237	Department of Labor (P.L. 110-28)						50237
50238	(Rescission of emergency funds)	-8,594	---	---	+8,594	---	50238
50239	EFAST2 filing system (DOL) (P.L. 110-28)	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---	50239
50241	2006 Bulk monovalent annual flu vaccine purchase						50241
50242	(rescission)	-29,680	-29,680	---	+29,680	+29,680	50242
50243	Medicare eligible accruals (permanent,indefinite)	36,288	37,365	37,365	+1,077	---	50243
50244	CMS Survey and Certification User Fee	---	-35,000	---	---	+35,000	50244
50245	CPB (FY 2008 Rescission)	---	-50,000	---	---	+50,000	50245
50249	Reallocation of FY02 carryover from PL107-117(HHS)	-16,120	---	---	+16,120	---	50249
50252	Training and employment services (leg. proposal)	---	745,000	---	---	-745,000	50252
50253	State unemployment insurance and employment						50253
50254	service operations (leg. proposal)	---	-61,000	---	---	+61,000	50254
50255	Unemployment trust fund (leg. proposal)	---	-685,000	---	---	+685,000	50255
50260	Less emergency appropriations	-519,000	---	---	+519,000	---	50260
50280	Total, discretionary	144,616,886	140,915,775	151,748,000	+7,131,114	+10,832,225	50280
50285	Adjustment to balance with 2007 enacted	-92,138	---	---	+92,138	---	50285
50291	Total, discretionary (FY 2007 enacted)	144,524,748	140,915,775	151,748,000	+7,223,252	+10,832,225	50291
50320	Grand total, current year (incl FY 2007 comparable)	545,841,001	596,394,249	607,428,474	+61,587,473	+11,034,225	50320
50325	Grand total, current year (incl FY 2007 enacted)	545,748,863	596,394,249	607,428,474	+61,679,611	+11,034,225	50325

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd like to begin my remarks by thanking Chairman OBEY for his willingness to accommodate many of the programmatic requests that we made. I appreciate his attention to the concerns important to my constituents and to my State.

As you know, this is a very complex and demanding bill, and Chairman OBEY's staff has done a fine job supporting him in this task. I also would like to recognize Steve Crane and Anne Marie Goldsmith from the minority office for their attention to detail in this legislation.

Let's make no mistake. This bill spends a great deal of money, approximately $6.5 billion more than last year in discretionary funding. But this bill addresses many of the most critical issues confronting our Nation—our families' health care, our children's education, our retirement security and our own workplace protection and job training needs.

If I were chairman, and I had this allocation, I'm not sure I would have written the bill a whole lot differently.

Specifically, this bill provides needed increases for community health centers. It advances my long-time efforts to advance funding for graduate medical education, of which my State, New York, trains 20 percent of the doctors in the Nation. So it is of critical importance to our teaching hospitals. And also the need for our Nation's poison control centers.

It funds important biomedical research, telemedicine and electronic medical records, which in the long run will dramatically reduce the cost of medical expenses.

□ 1615

It recognizes the need to provide seniors and those on fixed incomes with assistance paying high utility bills through the LIHEAP program. It continues Republican-led efforts to boost Federal funding for elementary and secondary education in support of the No Child Left Behind bill and also supporting programs for youth at risk. And thanks to my committee colleagues' support, the bill includes my amendment to boost funding for special education.

As most of you know, when the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act passed in 1977, Congress authorized annual Federal expenditures of 40 percent to help cover the cost of education for children with special needs. But in 1995 the Federal Government paid only 7.8 percent of those costs for our children with disabilities. That puts an additional burden on our local school districts. If we are only paying about 8 percent of the cost, that means they are forced to cover the other 92 percent instead of the 60 percent that we had told them they would have to cover. With this increase, we will provide just under 18 percent of the cost in 2008, or about half of our commitment. At least it is progress in the right direction.

This increased Federal support is important. Back in my home State of New York, the instructional expense for regular education for a student in 2003 and 2004 was $8,177 per student. For a special education student that cost was about double, $17,600. This bill boosts the maximum Pell Grant award to make a college education more attainable for more Americans, and it supports initiatives for senior health and wellness.

I am grateful to Chairman OBEY for including funds to take care of the health needs of those who responded heroically, and in many cases putting their own health and lives at risk, to the September 11 terrorist attacks in New York City.

And I thank the chairman for responding to my request and attending to an issue of growing importance to more and more young American families: the emerging threat of food allergies. Food allergies more and more are affecting families across the country, and nobody really understands what is going on, why these allergies are occurring, but they do put these young people's lives at risk. This bill provides a new line of funding for research and outreach to parents of children with food allergies. While it is only a small amount of money that is necessary for the effort this year, the impact it will have is dramatic.

In addition, I have some concerns with the additional $2 billion in advance funding that was provided by the Budget Committee. My concern is that advance funding can cause serious problems if future allocations for this bill are not as robust.

With that said, again I would like to congratulate Chairman OBEY and his staff for what I think on the whole is a well-written bill. I want to reiterate my appreciation for his willingness to work with us.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would also like to take this time to thank all of the staff people who worked on this bill, most especially Rob Nabors, Christina Hamilton, John Daniel, Lesley Turner, Kirstin Brost, Cheryl Smith, Sue Quantius, Nicole Kunko, Muftiah McCartin, Teri Bergman, Andria Oliver, Beth Chaney, Steve Crane, Anne Marie Goldsmith, Ron Anderson, and the associate staff as well. We certainly could not have put together the bill without them, and without them we would be making a whole lot more mistakes than we are likely to make today.

Madam Chairman, I reserve balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished leader on the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to both Chairman OBEY and my ranking member, the gentleman from New York, for the cooperative spirit in which they worked to produce this bill, a very difficult bill in the final analysis. With that, I would like to say to Mr. OBEY I very much appreciate his ongoing cooperation as we try to work on all the bills in the appropriations process this year to make some sense out of a very difficult year. I would also like to express my deep appreciation for the fabulous work done by the staff of this committee.

And having gone that far, Madam Chairman, let me say that the fiscal year 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies bill, Labor-HHS, reflects a fundamental difference in opinion on the level of funding necessary to support the Federal Government's role in education, health and workforce programs. Regardless of that disagreement, House Republicans agree that many of the programs funded in this bill are vitally important. The majority party would have the public believe otherwise.

In fact, House Republicans have shown the American people over the past 12 years that we recognize the importance of these programs. With history as our witness, we have demonstrated our commitment not in words but in action.

It should not be forgotten that it was House Republicans who demonstrated a commitment to fundamental research by doubling the budget of National Institutes for Health. It was House Republicans who bolstered the discretionary budget for the Department of Education by 72 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars.

Even with our unquestionable dedication to the programs in this bill over the last 12 years, Republicans stand accused by the Democratic majority of shortchanging fundamental research, shortchanging education, and according to the rhetoric of the day, shortchanging our very future. This rhetoric diminishes all that we do as elected officials, and it does not serve the Congress or our country well.

The primary difference is that Republicans believe that we must balance the benefits of these worthwhile programs with the fact that the American taxpayer must pay for them.

I know that Chairman OBEY feels very strongly about the Labor-H bill. He is now working two full-time jobs as chairman of the full committee and chairman of this subcommittee. He has also devoted one-half of the $20 billion or so increase over the President's budget request in the fiscal year 2008 302(b) allocation to the priorities contained in this bill.

The fiscal year 2008 Labor-H bill is $10.2 billion over the President's budget request and $6.6 billion over the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. Chairman OBEY has said repeatedly that it is necessary

to increase the subcommittee allocation dramatically to make up for the past funding shortfalls. But I remind the chairman that these programs have grown by $85 billion over the last 13 years.

When Labor-HHS Chairman Neil Smith, a Democrat, presented his bill in 1994, total discretionary budget authority totaled $65 billion. If he had predicted in 1994 that this very same bill, which largely covers the same agencies today as it did then, would increase by $85 billion over the next 13 years, the chairman of the full committee, who happened to be DAVID OBEY, probably would not have believed it.

By any objective standard, whether you are JERRY LEWIS or DAVID OBEY, $85 billion is a healthy increase, and today the committee is poised to spend an additional $10.2 billion under the mistaken notion that throwing money at our Nation's problems will cause them to fade away.

While many of these programs are popular on both sides of the aisle, a $10.2 billion increase is not without consequence, particularly when this bill contains what can rightly be considered lower priority and duplicative programs. For example, the committee-reported bill provides $420 million in 2-year advance appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Most objective observers will agree that providing these resources may be nice to do, but it hardly measures up to providing health care services to the poorest of Americans in terms of its priority.

Furthermore, there are a host of programs in the bill that duplicate activities that are funded elsewhere, not just in this bill but in other appropriations bills as well. For example, this legislation continues three programs that deal with violence prevention; one in the Labor Department, another in the Department of Health and Human Services, the third in the Department of Education. There are additional programs within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice that serve exactly the same purpose. Little real oversight was conducted to ferret out unnecessary and wasteful spending on these duplicative programs.

Yet another example is the funding the bill provides within the Administration for Children and Families for community economic development. According to this very committee report, these funds are intended to support employment, training, and business development opportunities for low-income residents in poor communities. Services that are already provided by the Department of Labor, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Economic Development Administration.

Surely the majority party could have met the very highest priority needs in this bill such as community health care centers or programs providing funding to educate youngsters living in poverty by eliminating duplicative programs or curtailing spending on lower priorities. Instead of making the tough choices between high- and low-priority programs or eliminating the duplication, this bill takes the easy way out: just spend more money.

The budget resolution adopted by the Democrat majority earlier this year and the appropriations bills that we are now considering spend some $23 billion more than the President requested. As we move forward with consideration of the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bills, Members of Congress ought to be aware that the average additional burden on the individual taxpayer to finance the spending spree outlined in the majority's budget will amount to roughly $3,000 to the individual taxpayer, $3,000.

I know it is difficult for many Members to oppose substantial increases in these popular programs; however, I remind Chairman OBEY and our colleagues that these increases are not without consequence.

Make no mistake about it. Excessive spending will force the American taxpayer to shoulder the burden of this extra spending. And if past is prologue, we will continue to pass this debt along to future generations.

As we complete consideration of our work this week, the House will have approved an additional $20.4 billion in spending above the President's budget request for the next year. This level is $36.4 billion above the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

So where is the Appropriations Committee in terms of getting its work done this year? It is July 17 and the House has five bills left to complete. The Senate has yet to take any of its bills to the floor and likely will not this month. Based on the present pace in both bodies, I have grave concern about our ability to complete our work this year through the regular order process.

Chairman OBEY is fond of pointing out that the process in the House this year has been delayed by having to complete action on the fiscal year 2007 bills. It is no surprise that he often fails to mention the role that the Senate played in this equation. The Senate failed to complete its work last year, and today history is repeating itself.

It is ironically unfortunate that the same type of legislative train wreck is likely to occur again this year. The scenario is becoming more and more apparent with each passing day. While it is only July, if past experience is any guide, a warning is in order. Once again the Senate is showing absolutely no inclination or ability towards moving appropriations bills, setting up the inevitable end-of-the-year omnibus strategy.

My colleagues, it has not yet been stated in so many words, but this is, or soon will become, the strategy to complete our work this year. And mark my words, not only will most of our appropriations bills end up in an omnibus, it will be a well-adorned Christmas tree filled with plenty of legislative goodies, perfectly timed to coincide with the holidays.

□ 1630

I want to be very clear about this, an omnibus is absolutely the wrong and fiscally reckless approach to completing this year's work. It would inflate the budget deficit, reward bad behavior, and negate any semblance of fiscal discipline demonstrated by this body in recent years.

Short of passing our conference reports individually, the best alternative would be to once again pass a clean year-long continuing resolution at the current rate of fiscal year 2007 levels, and without Member projects. That is, of course, an undesirable option. But if at the end of the process the House and the Senate cannot complete their work in a responsible fashion, passing a clean CR will be the best option remaining to complete this year's work.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you to Chairman OBEY, Ranking Member WALSH, and their staff for their hard work in crafting this bill.

At the start of the year, Chairman OBEY asked us to consider not only the challenges of today, but those of the year ahead, and I believe the bill does just that. The bill addresses the appalling reality that 46 million people in this country lack health insurance by providing a $200 million increase for community health centers, $75 million for grants for States to develop plans to cover their uninsured, $75 million for States to create insurance pools for high-risk individuals. Furthermore, recognizing that one of the best ways to keep women healthy is to provide them with access to high-quality family planning services and other preventative health care, the bill provides a $27 million increase to the Title X family program for low-income women.

The bill acknowledges that millions of students are shut out of college for financial reasons or lack of preparation in the early years and increases the maximum Pell Grant award by $200, restores proposed cuts to supplemental education grants, and increases both GEAR UP and TRIO.

The bill provides desperately needed relief to after-school programs by increasing 21st Century Community Learning Centers by $125 million. As a result of the Republican-controlled Congress level funding this program for more than 5 years in a row, thousands of children, including more than 34,000 in New York could lose these programs if this increase isn't approved quickly.

At a time when we're on the cusp of finding cures for some of the world's most devastating diseases, this bill increases our investment in biomedical research, and the bill provides a $700

million increase for NIH which would allow for hundreds of new research grants.

However, I would be remiss if I didn't express my disappointment that the mark also includes an increase by the same amount for abstinence-only programs when there is mounting evidence questioning the accuracy of some of the curriculum taught in those programs.

We all agree that we must teach our children that abstinence is the best way to prevent pregnancy and STDs. We should all also agree that abstinence-until-marriage programs must provide children with the most medically accurate information available. Unfortunately, study after study has found that many of these programs teach inaccurate and even harmful information to our young people.

I also hope to work with Chairman OBEY as the bill moves through the legislative process to reverse the potential damage of the large Workforce Investment Act reduction that was passed during Committee markup. If these cuts are enacted, New York could lose approximately $28 million in worker training funds.

Despite these two concerns, this bill—for the first time in a number of years—takes big steps towards addressing some of our nation's most pressing challenges. I am proud to support it, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), former chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

As you know, I chaired the subcommittee responsible for providing the funding in this bill for the previous 6 years, and I am pleased to provide my support today. The bill provides Federal funds that touch every American. And it's important in serving as the backbone for our medical research, job training, and key education programs at all levels of learning.

I do want to compliment Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH on the excellent job they did in crafting this legislation. Within the bill's allocation, they have targeted increased dollars in key areas that I strongly support.

First, as we continue to ask for more in the performance of our teachers and students under the No Child Left Behind Act, we continue to maintain the vital role the classroom teacher plays in student achievement. I am extremely pleased that the bill funds the Teacher Incentive Fund, a program that awards teachers for student achievement at $99 million.

Next, our Nation's future economic success depends on an educated population. An education that ends at high school no longer suffices in our globally competitive world. Therefore, I strongly support the increase in the Pell Grant for students, which reaches a new high of $4,700 in this bill.

Our Nation's biomedical research effort has made great strides since we doubled the funding for the National Institutes of Health during my tenure and led by our previous speaker in years past.

I am pleased that the bill will build on NIH funding in our continued attempts as a Nation to seek treatments and cures for the debilitating diseases that strike us, our family and friends.

Next, I talked about our competitive global economy, and I support funding to assist our current workers in improving their skills through the Department of Labor's employment and job training programs that are passed through to our local communities for use directly in these communities and for Jobs Corps, which gives our young people a second chance to participate in the workforce in society.

I could go on highlighting the numerous programs in the bill that impact Americans. But let me close by expressing my support for the increase in funding for the administrative costs for the Social Security Administration.

While the benefits Americans receive for Social Security or disability support are provided through mandatory spending, without good people and a sufficient staff to process these claims, the program would not run. Therefore, I support the $400 million increase in funding for the SSA administrative cost. Americans deserve effective and efficient responses to their claim requests. And with that funding, I'm hopeful the SSA will continue to improve and shorten its response times.

Again, this is a very good bill. I congratulate my colleagues on the subcommittee for their work in bringing it before us today. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this bill.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 10 minutes; the gentleman from Wisconsin has 17 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I want to thank the Chair for the time.

Madam Chairman, I rise to voice my strong support for H.R. 4033, the Labor-HHS bill. There is no bill that Congress produces on an annual basis that has such a profound impact on everyday people's lives like this bill.

I want to congratulate Chairman OBEY and the subcommittee staff on the product that is before us today. I also want to thank Ranking Member WALSH and the minority subcommittee staff working with us to produce this bill.

I think former Labor-HHS Chairman RALPH REGULA said it best when he described this bill as the ''people's bill.'' And I want to commend the gentleman for his statement in support of this product.

This might seem obvious, but your view depends on where you stand. From where I stand, I see an America today where the overall unemployment rate is 4.5 percent. For African Americans it's 8.5 percent. The average life expectancy is 77.6 years. For African Americans it is 69.2. Sixty-three percent of white students graduate from college. For African Americans, it's 43 percent. These numbers represent real problems for real people that need real solutions, not tax cuts and amendments to cut 1 percent and .5 percent across the board. This bill is a solution that illustrates how Congress can solve real problems.

We've heard from the other side already language like ''wrong,'' ''fiscally and recklessly irresponsible.'' The entire debate about earmarks is to divert our attention away from these very real problems that this bill seeks to solve.

Specifically, this bill includes a $43 million nominal increase for Job Corps, projecting the administration's proposal to cut 4,310 student training slots. The administration's request for CDC would have reduced funding for our primary health activities by $159.4 million, cutting childhood immunizations, State and local public health emergency preparedness, and efforts to combat chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease and emerging infection.

Madam Chairman, I encourage Members to look at the facts around this bill and to be supportive.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, a member of the subcommittee, Dr. WELDON.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to speak about an amendment that was introduced by me in the committee, and overwhelmingly adopted by the committee by voice vote. And I rise mainly to address the concerns being raised by members of the American Academy of Pediatrics and other members sending letters to the Congress from the public health community.

Let me state from the outset, as a physician, I strongly support vaccinating children and adults. Indeed, I gave a lot of vaccines. Immunizing kids against the flu is a particularly good idea. It prevents the kids from getting the flu, but it also, because children have bad personal hygiene and they tend to spread the flu around if they get it, by vaccinating kids and preventing them from getting the flu you actually prevent adults from getting the flu.

Certainly I believe the American Academy of Pediatrics is a great organization, as are the public health officials who do the work in administering these vaccines, even though they are complaining about my amendment.

Let me just state from the outset, my amendment simply implements the policy that the American Academy of Pediatrics established in 1999, when they stated, The Public Health Service, the American Academy of Pediatrics and vaccine manufacturers agree that thimerosal-containing vaccines should be removed as soon as possible. My amendment does nothing more than implement that policy.

Thimerosal is a mercury-containing preservative that is toxic. If I brought some thimerosal to this Chamber, spilled it on that table, we would have to evacuate the Chamber. That is how toxic it is.

Now, in 1999, the manufacturers, in coordination with the AAP, the CDC and the drug industry, removed all of the mercury from all of the childhood vaccines in 18 months. They removed it from the DPT and the hepatitis B. Eighteen months after adopting that policy in 1999, all of the pediatric vaccines had been produced and manufactured without any mercury in them. And then in 2004, a decision was made to add flu vaccine to the vaccine scheduled for children. And since that time it has been very difficult for me to get the American Academy of Pediatrics and the CDC and the manufacturers to take this issue seriously and get the mercury out of the childhood vaccines.

And let me just also add, this is a bipartisan issue. I have a bill that I've introduced with Representative CAROLYN MALONEY from New York to get all this mercury out. There are many Democrats and many Republicans on this bill.

Now, some of the people who are opposing my amendment are actually claiming that children who were not vaccinated last year who got the flu died, and if there's not enough flu vaccine available, that more children may not get vaccinated and there may be more deaths. I would like to just simply point out that one of the issues here is public confidence in the vaccine program, and that many of these parents who didn't get their kids vaccinated maybe didn't get their kids vaccinated because they were concerned about the mercury in the flu vaccine. And, indeed, you might ask the question of the deaths that occurred last year, might some of them not have occurred if we had a mercury-free vaccine on the market?

Now, I want to refer to this chart briefly because I think this basically says it all.

In 2004, we were producing a little bit over 80 million doses of flu vaccine, and today we're producing over 130 million doses. But yet, officials have made no attempt to increase the amount of mercury-free vaccine that is being produced in this country. Mind you, the Europeans are producing more than enough mercury-free to vaccinate their kids. They have figured out how to do it. Mind you, I said earlier 18 months was all it took to get the mercury out of all of the other childhood vaccines. And why, after all these years, year after year, they say they want to get the mercury out of the childhood vaccines and they're not doing it. They're got getting it out of the flu vaccine. And they can do it and they will do it.

What this really boils down to, my colleagues, is an issue of leadership. CDC, AAP, the public health community has not exercised proper leadership on this issue, and it falls to us to do the right thing.

The language that I put in this bill is not covering this flu season, it's covering next flu season. They have more than a year to address this issue. I think they can. And that's why I put that language in the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and I commend Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH for their strong leadership in crafting this bipartisan legislation.

Our commitment to expand access to health care and other essential human services is reaffirmed in this bill by restoring funding to programs that put health care within the reach of an additional 2 million Americans.

For example, under the provisions of this bill, community health centers can provide an additional one million medically underserved Americans with primary and preventive care.

□ 1645

Education funding levels in this bill also demonstrate our deep-seated commitment to investing in educational opportunity for all America's children. For example, this bill helps level the playing field for disadvantaged minority students by beginning, finally, to provide adequate resources for title I. The bill reinvests in the American workforce by restoring funding to critical education and job training programs that have been neglected in recent years. In particular, the bill provides a much needed increase to America's migrant and seasonal farmworkers who are the backbone of the agricultural industry.

Finally, on the issue I have worked on for many years, I am particularly gratified that the committee has provided funds for the STOP Underage Drinking programs. This recently enacted initiative will go a long way toward reducing the crises of underage drinking in our country and the tragic consequences it has on our youth and society as a whole.

I look forward to continuing to work with our Democratic leadership and my colleagues in the House to move our Nation closer to the goal of ensuring every American has access to quality health care, every student has a real chance to succeed, and every worker is given the tools to prosper.

Madam Chairman, in closing, I thank Chairman OBEY for his hard work and for his commitment to improving the lives of Americans. I extend my gratitude to Cheryl Smith and the rest of the subcommittee staff for their dedication and commitment as well.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the former Governor.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I would just like to make two brief points, perhaps to Chairman OBEY, about this bill that concern me, although I think the bill is well done. I am basically supportive of it.

The first is something which the President has vetoed, the stem cell research legislation. Back in August of 2001, he signed an order which allowed 21 different stem cell lines to be developed. There was a lot of discussion that in this particular bill that we could have actually updated that date from 2001 until 2007.

There have been 400 private lines developed since that time; that is, without any Federal dollars whatsoever. They could have been used for research by anybody if indeed we could have had it approved in this legislation. As a result of that, I drafted an amendment to do just that. But I have been informed that it will not be in order if I were to present it, so I will not present it.

I think this is a missed opportunity. I say to the chairman, because he was supportive of the stem cell research, that my judgment is we should do everything in our power to be able to enhance and to further that research in America. This was an opportunity which is unfortunately lost.

The other point I would like to make also deals with health, which is a matter of great concern to all of us, obviously, and that is the increase in NIH research. Basically, when you boil it all down, the increase here is 1.9 percent. It has been widely discussed that it's 2.6 percent. But this includes $900 million to the global HIV/AIDS fund that will be transferred immediately to the Department of State. It will not go directly into research.

The amount which is left is 1.9 percent, which would be almost the smallest increase for NIH in 38 years. We will lose length and quality of life to disease and disability. New research opportunities will go unfunded. The number of new therapies will continue to decline. Flat funding may discourage, along with the embryonic stem cell research going by the boards, the best and brightest young scientists remaining in the United States. Another year of failure to provide sustained, strong growth and Federal support for medical research is a problem.

Madam Chairman, I would hope before it is all said and done that we can address these two issues.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I want to rise and congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin, Chairman OBEY, as well as Ranking Member WALSH for their good work on this bill.

This bill, Madam Chairman, does a great deal in rejecting the President's cuts that would have provided $7.6 billion below last year's level in programs vital to protecting our Nation's health and education system.

This bill today, instead, provides a 3 percent increase over last year in areas such as family intervention, early learning, education and health care access. Let me tell you what that means. That means that we can help make a difference in averting the kinds of problems that will come later on, because now we will invest in prevention. Programs such as the SAMHSA, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration program, and Starting Early Starting Smart, which invests in family intervention, are so crucial. We know from the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study that the Kaiser Foundation did that families that are in crisis produce children that are at higher risk for not only delinquency but for drug abuse, for HIV, and for greater health care problems.

In this bill, we provide funds to go towards those families so that we can reach those parents. If we reach those parents, we reach those children. That, my friends, is what real family values are all about; it is reaching out to the families in this country in order to reach the children of this country. If we reach these children, they will be able to grow and prosper, and we as a Nation will be even stronger for it.

Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for the work that he has done in helping to build a stronger safety net for the children of this country. It will make our country an even stronger place for all of us to live.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, let me thank the chairman and our ranking member and our staff for their very diligent and brilliant work, really, in crafting this bipartisan bill. As a new member of the committee and the subcommittee, it has been a true honor to work with the chairman and our staff and our ranking member on this bill.

I must tell you, we had our work cut out for us because of the deep draconian cuts that the President proposed and because of the President's priorities of tax cuts for the rich and the invasion and occupation of Iraq. I am pleased that this bill rejects most of those cuts and makes the kinds of investments that recognize that an educated and skilled workforce and a healthy population are the backbone of our national security.

Let me highlight a few of these investments.

First, in the area of education, this bill invests in strengthening our minority-serving institutions by providing a $249.5 million for our Historically Black Colleges and Universities, which is an $11.4 million increase over FY 2007 levels, and also we increased by $4.5 million above FY 2007 the President's request for our Hispanic-serving institutions.

With regard to helping our low-income students go to college, we have increased TRIO and GEAR UP, which really do provide first generation college students the resources to enter and complete college.

With several universities in my district, we have increased the maximum Pell Grant, which will benefit millions of students which I know my district truly will benefit from.

On the issue of economic opportunity and a trained, skilled workforce, this bill reverses deep cuts in workforce training and requires the Secretary of Labor to provide a plan to address the huge dramatic disparities in unemployment in the African American and other communities of color.

We have increased, actually, by $100 million the Ryan White CARE Act, which, of course, is our HIV and AIDS funding.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), who is really not celebrating her birthday on the same day as the Baltimore Orioles.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, which makes needed investments in our family security and therefore our national security. I want to congratulate Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH for bringing forward a good bill, a bill that makes critical investments in America's families and in our country's future. This is my first year on the Appropriations Committee, and I am honored to have an opportunity to be part of this subcommittee.

The investments in this bill will affect every family in America. Today, we ensure our children have an opportunity for quality education, help families and students afford college, and increase access to community health clinics.

As Mr. OBEY says, this bill is about the country we want to be, and that is the country we deserve to be.

For too long the Bush administration has been negligent in its underfunding of education and health care, putting enormous strains on local governments, on schools and on local taxpayers. Today we move in a new direction by investing in families, prioritizing what matters: the education of our students, health care research in diabetes, cancer and heart disease, job training for those who are affected by our changing economy and for our returning veterans, energy assistance for our elderly, and early childhood education.

When we make responsible and necessary investments in our children and in our communities, we strengthen our families and we strengthen our Nation by ensuring our global competitiveness.

Once again, I thank Chairman OBEY for his leadership on the committee, for his commitment to strengthening America and bettering the lives of Americans.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I thank Mr. WALSH, the ranking member, for putting such a terrific bill together that is going to allow our Nation to compete in the global economy of the 21st century.

This bill makes investments in our kids, this bill makes investments in our workers, and this bill makes investments in American families. If our kids and our workers are healthy and educated, then we will be able to compete in the global economy.

I think it is important, just with this bill, if we look at what is going to happen next year when these investments hit, when students and workers are going to get a Pell Grant and it is $500 or $600 or $700 more for them. Tack that on to the education bill last week, where interest rates will be cut in half. Tack that on to the Energy and Water appropriations bill, where we are investing in our scientists and alternative energy research and we are creating new sectors of the economy so that we can compete in a global economy.

The anxiety that has been felt across this country over the last couple of years has been profound, and this bill helps address the challenges that American families have had. By reducing the cost of education, by making sure that we have community health clinics for people to go and take their kids, with the SCHIP program, this bill will have more to do with us being a competitive country in the next couple of decades, I think, than anything else we could possibly do.

So I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member and say that this is a bipartisan bill. This came out of the committee with the unanimous support of Democrats and Republicans, who agree that these investments needed to be made.

Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman again and thank the Republicans for their support.

□ 1700

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 2008 Labor, HHS and Education appropriations bill that is before us today.

I would like to express my admiration and gratitude to Chairman OBEY and the members of the committee for bringing forward a bill that reflects our values and our commitment to investing in education.

As the chairman of the Higher Education Lifelong Learning and Competitiveness Subcommittee, I am pleased to see the significant increases for student financial aid, for GEAR UP and TRIO programs. These investments make a real difference, and they have not come a moment too soon.

Recent reports estimate that by the year 2025, just to keep pace with our international competitors, the United States would need to produce an additional 15.6 million college graduates. That translates to another 781,000 degrees per year. GEAR UP and TRIO help close the college awareness and readiness gap.

Pell Grants and campus-based student aid programs close the affordability gap. This legislation coupled with the recently passed budget reconciliation bill signal that we are serious about ensuring that our students have the education and the skills they need to compete.

As chairman of the Education Task Force for the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I am particularly heartened to see the commitment in this bill to increase educational opportunities for Hispanic students. This legislation reverses the trend of the past of eliminating, cutting or at best flat-lining the key programs that provide the pillars of educational support to the Hispanic community. They include migrant education programs for English language learners, developing Hispanic-serving institutions, Even Start Family Literacy, GEAR UP, TRIO and adult education. Together, we call them the Hispanic education action plan.

In 2006, every single program in the Hispanic education action plan was reduced. Elections do make a difference.

For 2008, on top of the $1.5 billion increase to the core title I program in No Child Left Behind, we have over $212 million increases to the other programs, including a long overdue investment program for English language learners.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. And in particular, I want to sincerely and deeply thank Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH on behalf of all New Yorkers and this Nation for providing the leadership to include for the first time much-needed money for the health care needs of the heroes and heroines of 9/11.

These rescue, recovery and cleanup workers selflessly rushed into the flames of 9/11 to save the lives of others. We lost 3,000 people on 9/11, but many thousands more lost their health. This bill includes $50 million for their treatment. This is the first time it has been part of an appropriations bill, and I deeply thank Chairman OBEY for working so hard to make this happen. In the past it has been tacked onto emergency spending and to the Iraq spending bill, but it is the least we can do to provide health care to these men and women.

Very importantly, the bill includes detailed language requiring the administration to develop and submit a long-term comprehensive plan to address these critical health needs. This is a tremendous step forward. I thank Chairman OBEY.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee. I have no further comments other than to say I enjoyed working with the chairman on this bill and his staff. I think we have a good work product here.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Frankly, Madam Chairman, I was filibustering in hopes that the majority leader would arrive, but he is in the middle of a meeting and can't make it. So let me simply second the comments of the gentleman from New York. I think this is a good bipartisan product. I think we can work with the Senate to produce a bill which people on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol can support with pride.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I write today in opposition to the Weldon amendment to the Labor/HHS appropriations bill. This amendment would prohibit appropriated funds from being used to administer thimerosal-containing flu vaccine in the 2008–2009 flu season to children under 3.

This legislation is strongly opposed by a number of public health groups including the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Public Health Association, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). According to public health officials, this language would pose real risks to public health, particularly to the youngest children who are most susceptible to the serious complications from flu, including death.

The American Academy of Pediatrics, in their letter opposing this amendment, assures us that there is scientific evidence that "the thimerosal in influenza vaccine is not a danger to health." The Institute of Medicine examined all of the available evidence on the association between thimerosal-containing vaccines and autism. In 2004 the IOM issued a report that concluded that the evidence was sufficient to say that thimerosal-containing vaccines do not cause autism.

Since that time there has been no new compelling evidence that would change the IOM's conclusion. In fact, because thimerosal has been removed from all other pediatric vaccines, children in the last 5 years have received much less thimerosal than they had in the 1990s, and yet autism rates continue to go up, not down.

The practical impact of the bill would be that the demand for thimerosal-free vaccine would exceed current production capacity. While technically the bill would prohibit only the youngest children who get Vaccines for Children vaccine from getting thimerosal-containing vaccine, the reality is that the message Congress would be sending to all parents is that the thimerosal-containing vaccine is less safe than the thimerosal-free vaccine. It is likely that most, if not all, parents would demand thimerosal-free vaccine for all of their children.

There are simply not enough doses of thimerosal-free vaccine to meet that kind of demand and it is unlikely that there would be for at least several years. Vaccine companies are moving to increase the production of thimerosal-free vaccines, but doing so requires building new facilities, or expanding existing facilities, and then going through a new FDA approval process.

Furthermore, there is currently only one company with a licensed thimerosal-free product for children under 3. If that company experienced production problems or delays in its thimerosal-free product, this would leave us without any vaccine for this population.

Even if there were sufficient vaccine to immunize all children under 3 with thimerosal-free vaccine, we have a private vaccine distribution system and there would be no way to ensure that each dose of thimerosal-free vaccine would be matched up with a child under 3. In recent years there have been shortages of flu vaccine. In order to make sure that those most susceptible to the flu get vaccinated, CDC has asked that vaccine be given first to priority groups, including very young children, the elderly, health care workers, and people with certain illnesses. Unfortunately, we have seen that this has not worked very well. There is no reason to believe that the system would work any better to make sure that the thimerosal-free vaccine goes first to children under 3.

In fact, there is nothing that would prevent one state from buying up all of the thimerosal-free vaccine for its population leaving the rest of the country without vaccine for the youngest children. That could cost lives. These are the children who are most susceptible to the serious complications from flu.

I urge Members to consider that this language could harm those very children the authors are trying to help. By restricting their access to flu vaccine, they will not prevent a single child from getting autism, but they may expose children to the very serious risks posed by influenza.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Labor, Health, Human Services and Education Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2008. Overall, this is a very good bill, and I will vote for it. In this difficult fiscal environment, it provides funding for critical programs that have been starved by the Administration and the Republican Congress.

This bill provides significant increases for Education programs including resources for

teacher quality, early education and after school programs, and it provides more for Low Income Home Energy Assistance. It also provides important resources for preventive health care, for the title IIV and title IIIV Health professions training programs, and for the Ryan White program.

While I will support the bill, I am very disappointed that we were not able to provide more funding for the critical work conducted at the National Institutes of Health. The NIH embodies our country's hope for treating or curing debilitating diseases like heart disease, Alzheimer's, cystic fibrosis, diabetes, cancer and so many other illnesses that American families battle every day. But scientific advances don't just occur by accident. They are the result of sustained investments in research. Unfortunately, since 2003, Republicans flat-lined the NIH budget, and NIH has lost 13 percent of its research funding when adjusted for inflation.

I was hopeful that this year we would be able to end that devastating trend and get the NIH budget back on track by providing the NIH with significant increases over the rate of inflation.

Although I am disappointed that we were not able to provide more for NIH this year, I look forward to working with the distinguished chair and the members of the Appropriations committee in the future to ensure that we provide our country's premier medical research institution with the funding it needs to find treatments and cures to our country's most devastating diseases.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, in accordance with House earmark reforms, I would like to place into the record a listing of Congressionally-directed projects in my home state of Idaho that are contained within the report to the FY08 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations bill.

I'd like to take just a few minutes to describe why I supported these projects and why they are valuable to the nation and its taxpayers.

The report contains $300,000 for the Literacy Matters! Program administered by the Lee Pesky Learning Center in Boise. The Literacy Matters! Program is aimed at educating new mothers on the importance of early childhood literacy and math skills and providing them with resources for educating their children. The funding is used to provide every mother of a newborn in Idaho with a book created by the Lee Pesky Learning Center that helps them with teaching early literacy and math skills. The books are distributed through Idaho hospitals and the program has been highly successful. This is the second year of federal funding for the program.

This project was requested by the Lee Pesky Learning Center in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $300,000 for the Idaho Caring Foundation's program to provide dental services to low-income, uninsured children who would otherwise have no access to such services. The program will provide access to needed dental care for 600 low-income, uninsured children throughout Idaho. Eligible children will be identified by working in partnership with Idaho schools, health departments, Head Start programs, and YMCA programs. Dental services will be provided by over 90 dentists who are Caring Foundation providers, providing oral health services for reduced fees. Federal funding is only a portion of the total costs of the program. As a dentist, I understand the importance of proper dental hygiene at a very young age. Serious health and self esteem problems can quickly evolve if dental hygiene is neglected early in a child's development. This is an outstanding program that enjoys my complete support. This is the second year of federal funding for the program.

This project was requested by the Idaho Caring Foundation in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $250,000 for the Discovery Center of Idaho's new facility. The funding will assist with efforts initiated by the Discovery Center and the J.R. Simplot Foundation to build a new model of a ''hands-on'' science center to captivate the attention of and inspire tomorrow's leaders and innovators. The 70,000 square foot Center will be founded on three core strengths, inspiring stories of innovation including Mr. Simplot's story, iconic collection of working steam tractors and DCI's expertise in igniting curiosity, through interactive science exhibits and programs. The center will be a resource for the region, with particular interest in serving rural areas to help break the myth that innovation is a new urban phenomenon—that ingenuity is found wherever and whenever an observant creative human being has a problem to solve. This is a tremendous opportunity to create a new approach to bridging the gap in science and technology education. The $250,000 federal investment is a very small portion of what is expected to be a $40,000,000 project.

This project was requested by the Discovery Center of Idaho in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for the College of Southern Idaho's Pro-Tech Training Program which partners with local agencies and companies to identify training needs in the community and provide for those needs by training talented Idaho students. The College partners with other agencies to identify training needs and to identify potential candidates for employment. The most recent of these ventures are the training programs that were established for Dell Computers and its call center in Twin Falls. In addition, data provided by Region IV of the Idaho Economic Development Agency indicate that manufacturing will be a leading employment area in the Magic Valley with over 250 new jobs expected over the next two years.

This project was requested by the College of Southern Idaho in Twin Falls, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for St. Luke's Hospital's Children's Health Services Expansion. The Children's Health Services Expansion project provides essential growth in capacity for Pediatric Medical/Surgical, Pediatric Intensive Care, Neonatal Intensive Care, Pediatric Oncology, and Pediatric Surgical Suites and support areas, to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population in the hospital's service area. The hospital is spending millions on the expansion and federal funds will represent only a small portion of the project's total costs. This is the fourth year of federal funding for this program.

The project was requested by St. Luke's Regional Medical Center in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for Teton Valley Hospital and Surgicenter's Revitalization Project. Teton Valley Hospital & Surgicenter, a 13-bed Critical Access Hospital, provides an emergency room and a full scope of primary care services to the residents in and around Teton Valley, a rural community of just over 7,000 residents, nestled against the Teton Mountains in Southeast Idaho and Western Wyoming. Its population has grown by more than 99% over the past 15 years, ranking it in the top two fastest growing counties in Idaho for the last six years. This population growth has seriously strained the resources of the hospital and necessitated the revitalization project. Federal funds represent only a portion of the project's total costs.

This project was requested by Teton Valley Hospital & Surgicenter in Driggs, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for Madison County Memorial Hospital. Madison County Memorial Hospital services a growing area encompassing five counties and quite simply has outgrown its facilities. Increased capacity for obstetrics (Madison County Memorial Hospital has more births than any other hospital of its size in the State of Idaho and possibly the nation) and inpatient and outpatient surgeries are needed. The size of this project is 70,000 sq. feet of new construction and 85,000 sq. feet of remodeling, with an overall budget of $49 million and an equipment budget of over $7 million. Federal funding will be used for necessary medical equipment for the expanded and remodeled facility and represents a very small portion of the overall funding for this project.

This project was requested by Madison County Memorial Hospital in Rexburg, Idaho.

The report contains $400,000 for a Community Detox Center in Boise, Idaho. The need for a detox facility is both pressing and longstanding. According to a 2002 study by Boise State University's Center for Health Policy, rates of drug and alcohol abuse are worse in the Treasure Valley than in the rest of Idaho. Over 17,000 individuals in Ada and Canyon Counties were deemed at-risk for substance dependence in 2000, and the region severely lacks beds for detox patients, particularly those on limited incomes. To fill this void, hospital emergency rooms are acting as de facto drug and/ or alcohol detox centers which adds to rising health care costs. The proposed facility is a 24-hour medically monitored alcohol and drug sobering station and 36-bed detox center for indigent patients treated by a professional, qualified staff. Typical stays for sobering will be 12 hours and typical stays for detoxification will be 5-6 days; following sobering and/or detoxification, patients will be referred to appropriate education and treatment programs.

This project was requested by the United Way of Treasure Valley in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for the Advanced Clinical Simulation Laboratory at Idaho State University. This funding will be used to develop an Advanced Clinical Simulation Laboratory (ACSL) to strengthen nursing education, practice and research in Idaho. The ACLS will enable students, faculty, and practice partners to become actively involved in clinical simulation learning and conducting research related to student learning, effectiveness of clinical education models and improving patient care outcomes. The ACSL will also provide a research and practice laboratory for nurse faculty and clinical educators to learn and update knowledge about clinical educational models and teaching with technology.

This project was requested by Idaho State University in Pocatello, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for Idaho SySTEMic Solution: Plant Early for STEM

Learning (science, technology, engineering, and math) at Boise State University. Idaho SySTEMic Solution is a nationally relevant, hands-on, project-based STEM learning system (science, technology, engineering, and math) designed to spur achievement and confidence among elementary-age learners and their teachers. Key project components will include: (1) a comprehensive teacher training model that includes a one-week summer institute and ongoing site-based follow-up training to boost the ability and confidence of elementary teachers; (2) implementation into demographically diverse schools (grades 1–5/6, urban to suburban to rural, multicultural) of curriculum-aligned learning lab systems that have been shown to improve student scores in math, science, and technology; and (3) research and evaluation of results in accordance with Idaho and national assessment standards to maximize the effectiveness of transplanting this solution to other U.S. states.

This project was requested by Boise State University in Boise, Idaho.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally-directed projects in my region and an explanation of my support for them: (1) $300,000 for Early Literacy Matters, Lee Pesky Learning Center; (2) $300,000 for Idaho Caring Foundation Dental Project; (3) $200,000 for Children's Health Services Expansion; St. Luke's Regional Medical Center; (4) $400,000 for Community Detox Center, United Way of Treasure Valley; (5) $200,000 for Advanced Clinical Simulation Laboratory, Idaho State University; (6) $200,000 for Idaho SySTEMic Solution, Boise State University; (7) $200,000 for Madison County Memorial Hospital Revitalization Project; (8) $200,000 for College of Southern Idaho Pro-Tech Program, College of Southern Idaho; (9) $200,000 for Teton Valley Hospital Revitalization Project, Teton Valley Hospital; (10) $250,000 for the Discovery Center of Idaho Expansion, Discovery Center of Idaho.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I strongly support this bill to fund the departments of Labor, Health & Human Services, and Education.

I commend Chairman Obey and his staff on their hard work and dedication in putting together a bill that addresses the most pressing needs of American families, including their health and safety and the education of their children. I especially thank the Chairman for his efforts to increase funding for school counselors. This bill provides over $61 million for school counseling programs, a 77% increase over last year's funding. This historic investment will expand counseling in middle and high schools across the nation.

School counseling is a profession often treated as an afterthought in school improvement efforts. But counselors play a critical role, especially in high schools. High school is a transition period into adulthood and the world of work. As students make this transition, many lose their way and drop out. But a good counselor can help a student find the right path. No matter how many credits a student is behind or how many personal challenges she might face, counselors can help students at risk develop a plan, access the right help, and graduate on time.

Individual attention and follow-up from a counselor can help turn around students' lives. Additional counselors, particularly at the middle and high school levels, will be instrumental in helping schools improve their graduation rates and achieve other goals of No Child Left Behind.

Again, I thank the gentleman for his commitment to the education of our young people, and I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express my support for this bill and my deep appreciation for the leadership of Chairman OBEY in the crafting of this bill, the work of the committee staff, and the spirit of bi-partisanship that has marked our subcommittee and full committee proceedings on this bill.

Since being elected to Congress, I have worked hard to become a member of this committee and I find it especially gratifying to have had the opportunity to work on this bill. As Mr. OBEY is fond of saying, this is the people's bill. It funds the programs which are critical to the health and welfare of millions of my fellow Americans and I feel honored to be a part of taking this country in a new direction.

By rejecting the President's request that we cut critical labor, health, and education programs by $7.5 billion, and instead investing in targeted, carefully considered increases, this bill shows the American people Congress is serious about preserving and improving the social fabric of our nation.

Although I am disappointed that we were unable to more significantly increase the federal commitment to IDEA, I am glad that the committee protected the program from the President's proposed $291 million cut. I am particularly proud of the increases the bill makes to Title I—education for the disadvantaged, Title VII—health professions diversity programs, and CDC's Division of Viral Hepatitis.

The more than $4 billion increase in education funding contained in this bill is desperately needed if we are to continue to lead the world in the decades to come. Our students must have solid educational grounding to succeed in college but just as importantly, they must have the means to afford college. The $2 billion increase in Pell grants will go a long way toward making college a reality for many students.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been deeply involved in the effort to bring awareness to the problem of healthcare disparities. Communities of color suffer disproportionately from disparities in healthcare coverage, quality, and outcomes. The investments being made by this bill in Title VII Health Professions programs, particularly the increase in the diversity programs, are vital to increasing the pipeline of minority health professionals in underserved communities.

Finally, I would like to highlight the funding crisis that faces CDC's Division of Viral Hepatitis. The budget for this Division has remained almost flat since fiscal year 2002 and this has resulted in a serious curtailment of the Division's programs. There are an estimated 30 million people in the United States affected by a liver or liver related disease. Asian Americans face a near epidemic, with 1 out of 10 Asian American and Pacific Islanders infected with chronic hepatitis B. Included in the bill's 7.8 percent increase to the Centers for Disease control, is a $1 million increase for the Division of Viral Hepatitis. This appropriation begins a long overdue reversal of the inadequate budgets given to this Division since fiscal year 2002 and I would like to thank Chairman OBEY for acknowledging the need to rectify this situation.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman OBEY, Ranking Member WALSH, and all my other colleagues on the committee for their hard work and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3043

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 Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

For necessary expenses of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (''the Act''), and the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act of 1992, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Act, $3,579,530,000, plus reimbursements, is available. Of the amounts provided:

(1) For grants to States for adult employment and training activities, youth activities, and dislocated worker employment and training activities, $2,994,510,000 as follows:

(A) $864,199,000 for adult employment and training activities, of which $152,199,000 is available for the period July 1, 2008, to June 30, 2009, and of which $712,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(B) $940,500,000 for youth activities, which shall be available for the period April 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(C) $1,189,811,000 for dislocated worker employment and training activities, of which $341,811,000 is available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009, and of which $848,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the transfer limitation under section 133(b)(4) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2863(B)(4)), up to 30 percent of such funds may be transferred by a local board if approved by the Governor.

(2) For federally administered programs, $483,213,000 as follows:

(A) $282,092,000 for the dislocated workers assistance national reserve, of which $2,600,000 is available on October 1, 2007, of which $67,492,000 is available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009, and of which $212,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009: *Provided*, That up to $125,000,000 may be made available for Community-Based Job Training

grants: *Provided further*, That funds provided to carry out section 132(a)(2)(A) of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2862(A)(2)(a)) may be used to provide assistance to a State for State-wide or local use in order to address cases where there have been worker dislocations across multiple sectors or across multiple local areas and such workers remain dislocated; coordinate the State workforce development plan with emerging economic development needs; and train such eligible dislocated workers: *Provided further*, That funds provided to carry out section 171(d) of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2916 (d)) may be used for demonstration projects that provide assistance to new entrants in the workforce and incumbent workers: *Provided further*, That $2,600,000 shall be for a noncompetitive grant to the National Center on Education and the Economy, which shall be awarded not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) $56,381,000 for Native American programs, which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(C) $83,740,000 for migrant and seasonal farmworkers under section 167 of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2912), of which $78,740,000 is for formula grants (of which not less that 70 percent shall be for employment and training services) and $5,000,000 is for migrant and seasonal housing (of which not less than 70 percent shall be for permanent housing), which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(D) $60,000,000 for YouthBuild activities under section 173A of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2918a), which shall be available for the period April 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(E) $1,000,000 for carrying out the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act (29 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(3) For national activities, $101,807,000, which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through July 30, 2009, as follows:

(A) $68,746,000 for ex-offender activities, under the authority of section 171 of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2916), notwithstanding the requirements of sections 171(b)(2)(B) or 171(c)(4)(D) of such section, of which not less than $48,000,000 shall be for youthful offender activities.

(B) $28,140,000 for Pilots, Demonstrations, and Research (notwithstanding the requirements of sections 171(b)(2)(B) or 171(c)(4)(D) of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2916(b)(2)(B) or (c)(4)(D)), of which $10,000,000 shall be for grants to address the employment and training needs of young parents.

(C) $4,921,000 for Evaluation under the authority of section 172 of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2917).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEON:

Page 2, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $43,746,000)''.

Page 5, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $43,746,000)''.

Page 5, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $43,746,000)''.

Page 6, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $48,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $8,484,000)''.

Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 87, line 5, after the first dollar amount and after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $22,770,000)''.

Mr. McKEON (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, my amendment would restore much-needed funding to the highly successful Reading First program.

In 2001, Members of both parties committed to implementing scientifically based reading instruction, through Reading First, as the foundation of an effort to provide a high-quality education in every school. Six years later, it is clear that the program is working, but not without some internal challenges.

Indeed, Reading First has received a great deal of attention over the last several months, and for good reason. An investigation into the program by the Department of Education's Inspector General uncovered real problems in the agency's implementation and management of the program. And the Education and Labor Committee has followed with appropriate, thorough, and bipartisan oversight to ensure that those problems are addressed.

In spite of this, we have heard from the majority that it intends to cut some $600 million from this program, roughly 60 percent of its overall annual budget, until problems identified by the Inspector General have been addressed. That's particularly interesting since these problems have been and are being addressed both by the Department of Education itself and through proposed legislation.

Since last September, the Department has responded to the investigation of its Inspector General and to our committee's oversight of Reading First by making a number of significant changes to improve the administration of the program. In fact, at the committee's oversight hearing of this program, the Inspector General acknowledged that the Department has accepted his recommendations and begun implementing them to reform the program.

Among the steps taken by the Department in the wake of this investigation include: Replacing the internal Reading First program management; reconstituting a key peer review panel used in the program to ensure fairness and more openness in its review processes; and providing additional guidance to contractors and subcontractors to enhance the objectivity and effectiveness of their services.

In order to codify many of these recommendations made by the Inspector General and reform steps taken by the Department earlier this year, I joined my committee colleague, Mr. CASTLE, in introducing the Reading First Improvement Act. Instead of slashing funding for this highly successful program, I call on my friends on the other side of the aisle to enact this legislation to ensure permanent and longstanding reform to Reading First.

To date, the bill has seen no action, not in subcommittee, not in full committee, and not on the floor. To think that we are cutting this program's budget by more than 60 percent when a measure to reform it is sitting right before us demonstrates how truly politically driven the majority's actions are on Reading First and continue to be.

Nonetheless, it is clear to any fair-minded person that the management problems of Reading First are in the past. What is equally clear is that Reading First, despite past problems, has been an unqualified success for the students it is intended to serve. Indeed, my friend, the distinguish chairman of our committee said during our oversight hearing of Reading First earlier this year, ''The purpose of this hearing is not to evaluate the effectiveness or strengths or weaknesses of the Reading First program. I support the Reading First program, as do many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.''

Statistics bear out the chairman's and my own continued support for Reading First. For example, data released earlier this year shows that in Reading First schools, the percentage of first graders meeting or exceeding proficiency on fluency outcome measures increased by 14 percentage points, from 43 to 57 percent, from 2004 to 2006, with the percentage of third graders increasing by 7 percent during the same period of time.

And a 2006 Center on Education Policy survey found that 97 percent of school districts which reported increases in student achievement indicated that Reading First was a key reason for this progress.

Madam Chairman, rather than taking into consideration this data and the improvements that the Department has made in its implementation of Reading First, the majority has decided it is better to make a political statement against the administration than to provide the critical resources needed to continue to address the needs of our most disadvantaged young students.

By finding some $75 million in savings through reducing administrative costs at the Department of Health and Human Services and implementing programs for prisoners that the President did not request funding for, while keeping intact his faith-based prisoner reentry initiative, my amendment restores some of these resources.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman who just offered the amendment, but I have to say this is exactly the wrong thing for the Congress to do at this time.

The gentleman's amendment tries to restore $75 million to probably the most troubled program in this bill. As the gentleman has indicated, we have had six different audits by the Office of Inspector General. He has discovered that the Department of Education

tried to steer billions of dollars in Reading First funds for the purchase of certain reading textbooks and assessments in order to benefit favored publishers and individuals. I don't think the Congress ought to stand for that.

I would also point out that the OIG found out that the Department of Education administrators improperly promoted commercial reading programs in potential violation of Federal law. And this did not just occur in my own State, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, it occurred in Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey. States in districts with programs that were not on the Department's preferential list were either rejected for grants or pressured to change their methods, even though some argued, as did my own State, that their programs met the law's standard.

What is most ironic is this is supposed to be a peer reviewed program, and yet the programs that have demonstrably shown the best performance levels were frozen out of the program, including Bob Slaven's program at Johns Hopkins that has generally been reviewed as one of the best in the country. Yet, they were virtually invited out the door by the DOE.

In addition to the fact that we certainly should not be rewarding the administration for the way they have handled this program, the gentleman seeks to finance this program by taking $43 million out of job training for ex-offenders. We cannot afford to have criminals reentering society with inadequate job training that provides them with incentives to renew their lives of crime.

□ 1715

We need to provide as much training as possible, and the gentleman scales that back dramatically.

And, lastly, I must confess I'm a bit confused. In the full committee, I accepted an amendment from Mr. PETERSON, a valued member of our subcommittee, who wanted to add $25 million for vocational education above my mark. I accepted it because I thought he made a good case. Now we're being asked to take out $23 million of the money that Mr. PETERSON successfully added in the subcommittee. I don't think that's a wise thing to do.

There will be plenty of time in conference to restore funding for Reading First, provided that the administration and provided that the agency demonstrates that it's shaped up and it's no longer following the same habits. But at this point, you have the same contractors still in place, you have the same conflicts still at large, and I don't think under these circumstances that this Congress wants to support the kind of shenanigans that we've seen in that Reading First program. And, on behalf of the integrity of the taxpayers' dollar, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 107–116 to carry out the activities of the National Skill Standards Board, $44,000 is rescinded.

Of the unexpended balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Labor under this heading for fiscal years 2006 and prior years, $335,000,000 is rescinded.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

To carry out title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, $530,900,000, which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all your efforts in bringing this bill forward and thank you for your continued support of the Nation's chartered schools, which increase the academic achievement of our Nation's most low-income students. I wanted to clarify the committee's intent to fund the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program, which received $36.6 million last year. This year, the committee chose to increase funding to the Charter School Grant program and folded the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program into this larger program.

Charter schools are public schools created by teachers, parents and other community stakeholders to educate students of all backgrounds and educational abilities. In exchange for greater accountability for student achievement, these schools are free from many local and State regulations. This flexibility and accountability has allowed individuals with nontraditional backgrounds to create cultures that have made charter schools top academic performers, often in some of the Nation's largest urban centers. Because of this unique approach to education, demand for these schools has been remarkable over the last decade.

Unlike other local school districts, however, public charter schools cannot levy property or other taxes for building and infrastructure. Thus, public charter schools must pay for their facilities from their operating budgets, which are smaller than those received by their conventional K–12 peers. In fact, locating suitability facilities remains the greatest challenge faced by charter schools.

The Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program provides vital assistance to help charter schools meet their local facility needs. Under this program, funds are provided on a competitive basis to public and nonprofit entities, and consortia of those entities, to leverage other funds and help charter schools obtain school facilities through such means as purchase, lease and donation. Grantees may also use grants to leverage funds to help charter schools construct and renovate school facilities.

Was it the intent of the chairman to continue funding for the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program, as part of the Charter School programs and at their fiscal year 2007 levels?

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKEON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his question.

Yes, it was our intent to fund both the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program within the larger Charter School Grant program at their fiscal year 2007 levels, not to eliminate the credit enhancement program. We consolidated the programs for administrative efficiency and fully expect the Secretary of Education to continue funding for existing charter school programs from this single line item.

Mr. MCKEON. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his clarification and again appreciate his continued support for charter schools.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments during fiscal year 2008 of trade adjustment benefit payments and allowances under part I of subchapter B of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, and section 246 of that Act; and for training, allowances for job search and relocation, and related State administrative expenses under Part II of subchapter B of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, $888,700,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent appropriation for payments for any period subsequent to September 15, 2008.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For authorized administrative expenses, $85,945,000, together with not to exceed $3,256,669,000 which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund (''the Trust Fund''), of which—

(1) $2,510,723,000 from the Trust Fund is for grants to States for the administration of State unemployment insurance laws as authorized under title III of the Social Security Act (including $10,000,000 to conduct in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments in one-stop career centers of claimants of unemployment insurance), the administration of unemployment insurance for Federal employees and for ex-service members as authorized under sections 8501–8525 of title 5, United States Code, and the administration of trade readjustment allowances and alternative trade adjustment assistance under the Trade Act of 1974, and shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 2008, except that funds used for automation acquisitions shall be available for obligation by the States through September 30, 2010, and funds used for unemployment insurance workloads experienced by the States through September

30, 2008, shall be available for Federal obligation through December 31, 2008;

(2) $10,500,000 from the Trust Fund is for national activities necessary to support the administration of the Federal-State unemployment insurance system;

(3) $23,203,000, together with $702,680,000 from the Trust Fund, is for grants to States in accordance with section 6 of the Wagner-Peyser Act, and shall be available for Federal obligation for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009;

(4) $32,766,000 from the Trust Fund is for national activities of the Employment Service, including administration of the work opportunity tax credit under section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the administration of activities, including foreign labor certifications, under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the provision of technical assistance and staff training under the Wagner-Peyser Act, including not to exceed $1,228,000 that may be used for amortization payments to States which had independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1980;

(5) $52,985,000 is to provide workforce information, national electronic tools, and one-stop system building under the Wagner-Peyser Act and shall be available for Federal obligation for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009; and

(6) $9,757,000 is to provide for work incentive grants to the States and shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009:

Provided, That to the extent that the Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (''AWIU'') for fiscal year 2008 is projected by the Department of Labor to exceed 2,786,000, an additional $28,600,000 from the Trust Fund shall be available for obligation for every 100,000 increase in the AWIU level (including a pro rata amount for any increment less than 100,000) to carry out title III of the Social Security Act: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this Act that are allotted to a State to carry out activities under title III of the Social Security Act may be used by such State to assist other States in carrying out activities under such title III if the other States include areas that have suffered a major disaster declared by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this Act which are used to establish a national one-stop career center system, or which are used to support the national activities of the Federal-State unemployment insurance or immigration programs, may be obligated in contracts, grants, or agreements with non-State entities: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this Act for activities authorized under title III of the Social Security Act and the Wagner-Peyser Act may be used by States to fund integrated unemployment insurance and Employment Service automation efforts, notwithstanding cost allocation principles prescribed under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–87.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with both the chairman and ranking member on a recent CMS proposed national coverage decision on ESAs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chairman, I'd like to thank the chairman and ranking member for this opportunity.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, has proposed a national coverage decision memorandum for the use of erythropoiesis stimulating agents, ESAs, in cancer and related neoplastic conditions. Recent concerns have been raised by both CMS and the Food and Drug Administration about the use of ESAs in treating anemia that results from chemotherapy.

The FDA is currently conducting its own scientific review of the issues. These concerns may be valid for many patients treated with ESAs, but as the FDA noted, they do not apply to all individuals treated for chemotherapy-induced anemia or bone marrow failure diseases.

I would ask the chairman to work with me during conference to preserve the Senate language requesting that CMS delay finalizing the proposed decision memo for ESAs for non-renal disease indications until after the FDA has completed its current scientific review.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HONDA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concern, and I'm surprised that CMS would consider issuing a final decision when the FDA has not completed its scientific review. I would certainly be happy to work with the gentleman during conference on the issue.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HONDA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I'm also concerned about the matter raised by the gentleman from California. I understand that the Senate Appropriations Committee has included some language dealing with this issue in its committee report. I can assure the gentleman that we'll continue to work on this matter as we conference the bill.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you. I thank the chairman and ranking member.

Madam Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, $40,000,000 from the employment security administration account of the Unemployment Trust Fund shall be available to conduct in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments in one-stop career centers of claimants of unemployment insurance: *Provided*, That not later than 180 days following the end of the fiscal year 2008, the Secretary shall submit an interim report to the Congress that includes available information on expenditures, number of claimants assessed, and outcomes from the assessments: *Provided further*, That not later than 18 months following the end of the fiscal year, the Secretary of Labor shall submit to the Congress a final report containing comprehensive information on the estimated savings that result from the assessments of claimants and identification of best practices.

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For repayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by sections 905(d) and 1203 of the Social Security Act, and to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund as authorized by section 9501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and for nonrepayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by section 8509 of title 5, United States Code, and to the ''Federal unemployment benefits and allowances'' account, to remain available until September 30, 2009, $437,000,000.

In addition, for making repayable advances to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year after September 15, 2008, for costs incurred by the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For expenses of administering employment and training programs, $88,451,000, together with not to exceed $82,049,000, which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Employee Benefits Security Administration, $142,925,000.

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION FUND

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, including financial assistance authorized by subtitle E of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.), within limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program, including associated administrative expenses, through September 30, 2008, for such Corporation: *Provided*, That none of the funds available to the Corporation for fiscal year 2008 shall be available for obligations for administrative expenses in excess of $411,151,000: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the number of new plan participants in plans terminated by the Corporation exceeds 100,000 in fiscal year 2008, an amount not to exceed an additional $9,200,000 shall be available for obligation for administrative expenses for every 20,000 additional terminated participants: *Provided further*, That an additional $50,000 shall be made available for obligation for investment management fees for every $25,000,000 in assets received by the Corporation as a result of new plan terminations, after approval by the Office of Management and Budget and notification of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For necessary expenses for the Employment Standards Administration, including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, $434,397,000, together with $2,111,000 which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39(c), 44(d) and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish and, in accordance with section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, collect and deposit in the Treasury fees for processing applications and issuing certificates under sections 11(d) and 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 211(d)

and 214) and for processing applications and issuing registrations under title I of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLINE of Minnesota:

Page 13, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,016,000)''.

Page 25, line 22, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, my amendment is very simple.

The committee bill cuts the Office of Labor Management Standards, known as OLMS, down to fiscal 2006 levels. My amendment would restore just over $2 million to get this enforcement agency back to its fiscal 2007 level. To offset the increase for OLMS, we have reduced the International Labor Organization earmark from the International Labor Affairs Bureau by the requisite amount.

What is OLMS and why I am taking to the floor of the House to make a $2 million adjustment in this small agency? That's a fair question.

Without this amendment, the OLMS will have to cut staff. OLMS is the agency within the Department of Labor's Employment Standards Administration that enforces the Labor Management Reporting Disclosure Act of 1959. This Federal statute was championed by then-Senator John F. Kennedy and enacted as an outcome of the McCollum hearing on labor racketeering.

Then-Senator Kennedy knew, as we affirm today, that rank-and-file union members deserve the right to know how their unions were spending and investing their members' dues money; that their unions' books were clean; and that elections for union officers would be fair and free of intimidation or scandal.

Do labor unions need a government watchdog? Apparently so. Since 2001, OLMS has helped obtain 750 convictions and restitution of over $70 million for union members in criminal cases of embezzlement and election irregularities.

Some of my colleagues may dismiss these monetary results as just small change compared to the billions of assets held by labor unions, but they miss the point. Stealing from your fellow union members is against the law, regardless of whether the theft is $10,000 or $100,000. And anywhere in the country but Washington, D.C., $10,000 is a lot of money.

OLMS functions like the Securities and Exchange Commission for labor unions. Why should rank-and-file union members not be protected in the same way as individual shareholders of corporations? Senator Paul Sarbanes agreed. During the debate on the Sarbanes-Oxley legislation in 2002, he argued that if union financial disclosure and accountability was already required by law and wasn't being funded, he suggested that the Department of Labor request the money from Congress.

Madam Chairman, DOL is not only being denied the increase it asked for; it is being cut to the bone. Federal law requires financial transparency and disclosure from corporations, pension plans, lobbyists and Members of Congress. Why would we not enforce the one law on the books that enables rank-and-file union members to review the financial expenditures of their unions?

I find it ironic, Madam Chairman, that the House Financial Services Appropriations Subcommittee provided $3.1 million over the administration's budget request for the SEC, while OLMS was being cut below fiscal year 2007 levels. Clearly, we put a high priority on corporate accountability. We need to put the same high priority on union accountability.

Although this is a modest amendment, it will enable this enforcement agency within the Department of Labor to maintain its audit program and other activities under the Labor Management Reporting Disclosure Act. I cannot believe that this House would say to union members throughout America that we do not support your right to know and your right to union integrity.

I urge all Members to vote for this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Let me say simply say, Madam Chairman, that the fund that the gentleman seeks to increase has been increased by 33 percent in terms of resources just over the last 4 years, and staffing for that same agency has been increased by over 25 percent. That is hardly starving an agency.

I would also point out that at the same time you've had those large increases, the wage and hour division, which is supposed to enforce protection for workers on minimum wage, overtime and child labor laws, will have seen its staffing drop by over 12 percent since 2001, and the staff level at the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, which protects workers from unfair employment practices by Federal contractors, will have dropped by 23 percent.

So it seems to me that what the gentleman's amendment does is to enrich the one portion of the Labor Department which has been doing very well, thank you, and they have been doing very well while other portions of the Labor Department that are supposed to focus on protecting workers have, in fact, been starved.

The Department's own budget justifications for the large increase that they've requested states that the acceptability rate for unions in meeting labor management reporting and disclosure reporting requirements is at 96 percent.

□ 1730

The goal for fiscal 2008 is to raise this to 97 percent. I'd say if you are getting 96 percent, that's an A. At least it was when I went to school. Things may have changed since then.

Let me also say that the place that this funding was taken from, in order to finance this increase is especially pernicious. The administration itself has asked for an 81 percent reduction in the International Labor Account. That is the program that is used in order to protect workers from having to compete against slave labor and child labor.

I don't think that you help workers by weakening that program. We are simply trying to restore funding in that program that the President cut, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. KLINE's amendment to restore funding for the Labor Department's Office of Labor Management Standards to its fiscal year 2007 level.

A column published in Wall Street Journal's Opinion Journal noted today that Congress has added $935 million to President Bush's fiscal year 2008 budget request for the Department of Labor. Within that budget increase are individual funding increases for every single enforcement agency within the agency; that is, except for one.

The appropriations measure before us cuts the Office of Labor Management Standards' budget $2 million below its fiscal 2007 funding level and more than $10 million below the President's budget request for the office this year.

Identifying OLMS as the only enforcement office at the Department of Labor to have its budget cut is significant. In fact, it was clearly singled out by design.

Why? Perhaps it's because the office has had such great success in protecting rank-and-file union members. Consider this, since 2001, OLMS has helped obtain over 750 convictions and restitution of over $70 million in criminal cases of embezzlement, election irregularities and violations of union members' rights.

Last week, for example, a union financial secretary in Michigan pleaded guilty to falsifying union reports. Earlier this year, a former union president in Texas was sentenced to 6½ years in prison for embezzling dues paid by hard-working union members. These are the types of results Congress expected when it passed the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

This law makes clear that a union member must have access to union financial records and has the right to recover misappropriated union assets on

behalf of the union when the union fails to do so itself.

Nearly 50 years later, and with more than 15 million American workers contributing a portion of every paycheck they earn to labor organizations, we should demand nothing less than what we demanded in 1959. Indeed, Congress expects the Securities and Exchange Commission to protect the interests of shareholders, and so too must we expect the OLMS to protect the interests of rank-and-file union members.

The amendment before us would restore $2 million to the OLMS budget, bringing it back to the fiscal year 2007 level and ensuring it has the resources its needs to safeguard union transparency and accountability. Indeed, if my colleagues believe, as I do, that transparency is the key protection against financial misconduct, then we should take OLMS off the political chopping block by restoring its funds.

I thank my Education and Labor Committee colleague, Mr. KLINE, for offering the amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I find it very ironic from the other side that they are so outraged about these cuts. This is an account within the Department of Labor that has seen a 33 percent increase over the last several Congresses, a 33 percent increase within this specific account of the Department of Labor.

Now let's put that in perspective to what the Republicans put into other accounts within the Department of Labor. I seem to recall the International Child Labor Inspection in the last several Congresses was cut repeatedly over the last several Congresses, up to 87 percent.

This is the International Labor Organization's duty to oversee child labor standards to ensure that our competitors are not using children in the conduct of labor when competing with us and our manufacturing process. Yet it was good enough for us to cut 87 percent of the inspection for child labor, but good enough for us to increase the 33 percent.

Now we hear a complaint that somehow it's not good enough for us to just, since the account has done very well, to just keep it as it's going. Now there is a big outrage about this.

I might add, where was the outrage when the 12 percent cut was for the wage and hour department? Where was that? I didn't hear any outrage. Where was the outrage for the compliance for the contractors? I didn't hear any outrage for that.

It's just interesting, when we hear these complaints about where the cuts are, let's find out where the priorities really are. I think we are hearing them. They are not with the children and child labor. They are not with the workers and the wage and hour inspections, and they are not with the contractors and making sure that they are protected on the job.

They are here going after, once again, people who are trying to earn a living. I think that's a very clear set of priorities in this Department of Labor account.

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Chairman, I think the gentleman from Rhode Island must have misspoken when he said we were here to ''go after the workers.''

I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for sponsoring this amendment which, to the contrary, seeks to protect American union dues-paying workers.

We live in an era of instant information, almost universal access to information. We are in a period, a legislative period on the heels of Sarbanes-Oxley, which brought unprecedented new auditing requirements and penalties for noncompliance for publicly traded companies.

We live in a legislative era of McCain-Feingold, which brought unprecedented penalties, accountability, auditing to public office holders who accept campaign contributions to seek elective office, but then have to disclose to a greater detail than ever before, and subject to greater limits than ever before, for the sole purpose of having the public understand who was supporting that particular campaign.

So in this era, in this trend of greater openness, greater accountability, easier access for the public to be able to understand how their money is being spent, and who is the money behind individuals, behind candidates, behind corporations, enter the Democratic appropriations bill which guts the ability for America to understand who is behind the money in big labor and how are individual hard-working chemical workers', steelworkers', teachers', manufacturers' dues being spent by those public unions and private unions?

Here is an amendment that takes the level of this agency's funding. It doesn't freeze it, it doesn't cut it by single digits. It takes it all the way back to the 2006 level and is a 20 percent cut.

My friend and colleague from Minnesota seeks to correct that situation by replacing the money that otherwise would be going to a United Nations organization and puts it to help American workers. American taxpayers understand how American union dues are being spent.

This agency has a proven track record. It gets results. This amendment allows it to continue on that path of auditing and getting results so that they can do better than the 4½ percent audit rate, which was all they were able to muster under the existing funding levels that they had been enjoying.

Union members have a right to know how their dollars are being spent. Union Members have a right to know how their dollars are being spent, and clearly the curiosity is there. There is a proven track record of them seeking to know how their dollars are being spent.

In fact, there were over 760,000 hits on the OLMS Web site just for that purpose, an average of over 2,100 hits per day for people seeking the information that will not be available at the desired rate and at the desired accuracy if this amendment is not adopted. It is critical that we adopt the Kline amendment so that hard-working men and women across America can see how their hard-earned dollars are being spent.

Why, in this era of greater openness, for political candidates, for executives, for publicly traded companies, why in this era of ever more complicated regulations, ever more detailed tax returns, are we letting unions off the hook? There is a trend here.

It began on this House floor over great resistance on this side of the aisle, rolled back fundamental privacy, the fundamental right to a secret ballot that hard-working union members had been enjoying, that hard-working Americans had been enjoying when they decided they want to unionize. Here we find ourselves today taking an additional step, and it's wrong.

Adopt the Kline amendment.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me just say to the gentleman from Florida, I find it curious that he says he is standing up for workers, because he must not recall his party gutting workers' overtime pay. I don't know whether he recalls that his party was for flex time.

Make sure every worker out there understands the Republican Party passed flex time. That means that your overtime pay, America, is gone. They passed it. They are not for working people. They said, if you work overtime, that it wasn't counting as overtime pay, and that that overtime pay towards your pension didn't get calculated to your overtime pension. So don't say you are on the side of workers.

I suppose that when you were for OSHA reform, that you are for workers, right? Reform in your view meant inspection was voluntary. That's really standing up for workers, making it so that the employer, all they had to do is, you know, check their own book to say whether they were protecting workers' heads or not from scaffolding or for those chemical plants that you mentioned, whether they were safe or not.

They didn't have to worry about covering their tracks. They didn't have any tracks to cover any more under

your bill for OSHA reform. As far as other bills, NLRB, forget it. You guys threw that out the window with the TEAM Act. There is no negotiating for unions.

So don't stand up here and talk about how you guys like to protect workers under this phony premise that you want to see more transparency and compliance. That's just a lot of hogwash.

In terms of international labor standards, if you don't understand the connection between slave labor abroad and workers here at home, I am sorry, you don't understand globalization.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind Members to direct all comments to the Chair, please.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the gentleman doesn't understand, through the Chairman, doesn't understand the comparison between children working overseas, fighting, working to try to manufacture products that are going to compete against our unionized workers here at home or our manufacturer workers, whether they are unionized or not, if he doesn't understand that they are competing against one another, I can't explain it to them.

If he can't understand and grasp that it's in our interest to make sure that our competitors don't use children that are being paid pennies on the dollar while our moms and pops are having to compete against them with minimum wage standards, I can't explain it to him. If he doesn't understand that, it's hard for me to give him an economics lesson that they are competing in a global economy that has transparency of products thanks to these trade agreements.

□ 1745

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island. And I also find it a bit peculiar that our friend from Florida, being from Ohio, we disagree on our favorite college basketball team, we disagree on our favorite college football team, so it is not a real surprise that we are going to disagree here. But I find it peculiar that he was saying that he was trying to support the workers. And I wish he would remember the vote on the minimum wage when he and the leadership of his party were consistently trying to prevent us from passing the minimum wage to help the American worker.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend from Minnesota for bringing this issue forward. Madam Chairman, this is an extremely important issue, and I think it is important that we bring the debate back to the actual amendment.

The amendment addresses the issue of funding for the Office of Labor Management Statistics, and that agency is the only agency of the government that is devoted to protecting the interests of dues-paying union members, the only one.

The funding in last year, fiscal year 2007, was about $47 million. Funding proposed for this year is about $45 million. It is a cut of about $2 million. That is a cut. Not the cut that we have heard explained in other bills that were reductions in the increase; it is a cut. The President felt so strongly about this and felt so strongly about the success of this agency that he recommended an increase to $56 million. So this proposal by the majority party is a decrease of $11.1 million from the President's request.

Now, it is curious the arguments that we are hearing on the other side. They have increased spending virtually across the board for every single agency except for this one, and this is the one that provides the enforcement for the Department of Labor. I have supported many appropriate reductions, there is no doubt about it, as we have moved through these appropriations bills, but I believe strongly that there is a message that is being sent in this cut that is being proposed by the majority party, and that message is that it is imperative that the debt that they owe to union bosses be paid.

And why do I say that? This is an agency that has significant results. Since 2001, the indictments resulting from investigations by this agency have increased by 20 percent. Now, why would we want to decrease funding to an agency that is showing success in protecting dues-paying workers? Convictions have increased by 26 percent and the courts have ordered restitution of over $70 million in union members' dues that were stolen, stolen by union officials. That sounds like a project that would merit support by the majority party, but, as my good friend from Florida just said, it is clear that this is a trend that we are seeing by this new majority party, and that is that the protection of the rank-and-file worker is not what they have an interest in. And that was demonstrated clearly with the card check issue which, as he mentioned, took away the sacrosanct right of a secret ballot in union formation in this Nation. The majority party said, no, that wasn't important, that individuals ought to be exposed to the kind of intimidation that we see on both sides, both the employer and the union side.

So, Madam Chairman, I guess it ought not be surprising that we see this included in the current bill, but it is disappointing. There is no doubt that it is disappointing. Because, again, we have an agency of the Federal Government, the Office of Labor Management Statistics, which is getting results, which is fulfilling its mission, which is fulfilling its charge, which is fulfilling its responsibility to the American people and to this Federal Government, and this new majority proposes to significantly cut the amount of funding to the agency. I think it exposes a flaw in the thinking of the majority party and, hence, this general statement that we are the only individuals for working people. In fact, tax cuts are for working people. In fact, decreasing spending at the level of the Federal Government is for working people. In fact, not passing the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation is for working people.

So we stand proudly and honorably before the American people and say that the party that stands in favor of working people is the party that is most responsible with Federal spending. It is the party that holds to account Federal agencies. This Federal agency, this office is accomplishing its goal, it is accomplishing its mission, and so it ought not be one that we cut. There are certainly others that are available to be decreased. I urge support of the Kline amendment and ask all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are a couple of points I would like to address. It has been an interesting debate, as these things often turn in to be. We have heard the gentleman from Rhode Island say that this base bill just keeps it going presumably at the current level. And, as we have already heard established, this is in fact a $2 million cut, $11 million below the President's request.

The gentleman from Rhode Island is right, though, when he talked about this being about people checking their own books and covering their tracks. That is exactly what this is about. He was talking about perhaps corporations, and we have already talked about increasing the money to provide oversight and law enforcement for corporations. But this is about unions. This is about American workers.

We have looked at the money percentage cut/percentage increase. We have already confirmed that this is a $2 million cut, as my colleague from Georgia says. And I just find it interesting, looking at the figures here, we have added $935 million to President Bush's fiscal year 2008 budget request for the Department of Labor, and within that budget increase are individual funding increases for every single enforcement office within the agency except this one, this one whose job it is to make sure that union leaders who are misbehaving are not able to just check their own books and cover their tracks. Somebody else has got to hold them accountable.

And this embezzlement is not restricted to one or two people in one or two States. We have examples over the last 3 or 4 years of misconduct by union leaders in 48, at least, of the 50

States. A couple of examples here might be relevant.

Looking at the neighboring State of Wisconsin, on September 21, 2006, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Felix A. Robinson, former president of the Industrial Division of the Communication Workers of America, Local 84101, pled guilty to one count of embezzling union funds. The guilty plea followed investigation by the OLMS Milwaukee district office.

Sad to say it happens in my own State. On February 22 of this year, 2007, in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, Catherine Bronson, former business representative for Hotel and Restaurant Employees Local 21 in Rochester, Minnesota, was sentenced to 180 days of home confinement.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCHANT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Could the gentleman tell me, have there been any more labor leaders indicted lately than Members of Congress?

Mr. MARCHANT. Reclaiming my time, Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. We have pages and pages of examples. Let me just give another one so that my colleagues and the workers of America understand that we are talking about misbehavior, illegal behavior on the part of people who have the responsibility for taking care of their union dues.

November 7, 2006, in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, Timothy J. Pulvermacher, former financial secretary for USWA Local 9444 pled guilty to embezzling union funds.

January 8, 2007, Kathryn Stark, former office manager for IBEW Local 31 was sentenced to a 6-month confinement.

Why? Because they are abusing their union members. They are stealing from them. And this is the only office that has the responsibility and authority for holding them accountable.

So we can debate for all day, I suppose, who is for the worker and who is not for the worker and whether the tax cuts are good for the worker. We certainly believe they are on this side of the aisle. But that is not what my amendment is about. My amendment is about making sure that the office who has the responsibility for holding union leaders accountable for their workers' funds has the staff it needs to do the job.

The base bill, cutting $2 million would force that office to cut staff members, the very people who conduct the investigations and bring these people to justice.

Again, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this amendment which supports the union workers of America and holds those who misbehave accountable. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment introduced by my friend Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, a dedicated U.S. Marine veteran, which restores much needed funding to the Office of Labor Management Standards (OLMS). I applaud Representative KLINE's continued efforts to draw attention and support to this very important issue, and I appreciate his dedicated leadership in this area.

This straightforward amendment would add $2 million to the current legislation and restore funding for OLMS to its fiscal year 2007 levels. This addition would also enable the agency to hire 13 full-time employees.

The Office of Labor Management Standards plays a vital role in administering and enforcing provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, LMRDA. This bipartisan law was enacted by Congress to ensure standards of democracy and fiscal responsibility in labor organizations representing employees in private industry.

When enacting the LMRDA, Congress expressed that union members and the general public would benefit by having access to information about labor unions. As a result, each union subject to LMRDA is required to submit annual financial reports to OLMS. This public accountability is achieved through the filing of LM–2 forms. Millions of working Americans have a portion of their paychecks given to labor organizations, and they deserve to know where their hard-earned money is going.

According to a September 2006 Wall Street Journal article, up to 60 percent of labor organizations' budgets are going to PAC contributions and lobbying activities. In one instance, only 36 percent of the funds actually went to representing union members in labor negotiations.

There is a high level of demand for this information. In fact, between May 2006 and May 2007, there were 767,908 hits on OLMS's website. That's an average of about 64,000 per month and over 2,100 per day.

Again, I am pleased to recognize the important work of the Office of Labor Management Standards, and I urge members to support this amendment.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. 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 Minnesota will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of the unobligated funds collected pursuant to section 286(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, $70,000,000 is rescinded.

SPECIAL BENEFITS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses (except administrative expenses) accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year authorized by chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code; continuation of benefits as provided for under the heading ''Civilian War Benefits'' in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944; sections 4(c) and 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2012); and 50 percent of the additional compensation and benefits required by section 10(h) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, $203,000,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation and other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided*, That amounts appropriated may be used under section 8104 of title 5, United States Code, by the Secretary of Labor to reimburse an employer, who is not the employer at the time of injury, for portions of the salary of a reemployed, disabled beneficiary: *Provided further*, That balances of reimbursements unobligated on September 30, 2007, shall remain available until expended for the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses: *Provided further*, That in addition there shall be transferred to this appropriation from the Postal Service and from any other corporation or instrumentality required under section 8147(c) of title 5, United States Code, to pay an amount for its fair share of the cost of administration, such sums as the Secretary determines to be the cost of administration for employees of such fair share entities through September 30, 2008: *Provided further*, That of those funds transferred to this account from the fair share entities to pay the cost of administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, $52,280,000 shall be made available to the Secretary as follows:

(1) For enhancement and maintenance of automated data processing systems and telecommunications systems, $21,855,000.

(2) For automated workload processing operations, including document imaging, centralized mail intake and medical bill processing, $16,109,000.

(3) For periodic roll management and medical review, $14,316,000.

(4) The remaining funds shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts:

Provided further, That the Secretary may require that any person filing a notice of injury or a claim for benefits under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, or the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, provide as part of such notice and claim, such identifying information (including Social Security account number) as such regulations may prescribe.

SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS

For carrying out title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, as amended by Public Law 107–275, $208,221,000, to remain available until expended.

For making after July 31 of the current fiscal year, benefit payments to individuals under title IV of such Act, for costs incurred in the current fiscal year, such amounts as may be necessary.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairman, during the full committee markup of this bill, an amendment was added that would prohibit the use of Federal funds for administering thimerosal-containing influenza vaccines to children under 3 years of age. While

I respect the good intentions of the author of this amendment and my colleagues who supported it, this provision creates significant public health concerns for the protection of our youngest children from both seasonal and pandemic influenza.

This past week, I have heard from numerous public health and scientific groups with expertise in immunizations. They all agree that there is no credible scientific or medical evidence that vaccination of young children with vaccines containing the preservative thimerosal causes autism or other neurodevelopmental disorders.

Madam Chairman, our national immunization policies must be based on science. I strongly believe that the United States Congress should not substitute its judgment about which vaccines are safe for our children for that of the major vaccine and public health experts.

Perhaps the most convincing statements against the amendment are in a communication from Dr. Julie Gerberding, the Director of the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, dated July 16, 2007. Her opposition to the thimerosal amendment is as follows:

''There is no scientific basis to support a prohibition of use of thimerosal-containing vaccine. In particular, science does not support a causal association between thimerosal and autism. In fact, the Institute of Medicine concluded that, 'the evidence favors rejection of a causal relationship between thimerosal-containing vaccines and autism.'

□ 1800

''CDC respects this IOM conclusion.''

The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, a diverse group of expert advisers on vaccine use, has made its position explicitly clear. ''The benefits of influenza vaccination for all recommended groups including pregnant women and young children, outweigh the unproven risk from thimerosal exposure through vaccination.''

Instead, ACIP recommends that children and adults who need vaccination may receive any available vaccine preparation licensed for use in the person's age and risk factor group with or without thimerosal.

The supply of thimerosal-free vaccine is increasing, but we do not know precisely how many doses of vaccine licensed for use in children 6–35 months of age will be available in 2008–2009. Based on information from the manufacturers, the supply is not likely to be large enough to vaccinate all the children whose parents want this protection for them.

Even if the supply increases more than we expect, the realities of vaccine distribution make it impossible to precisely align supplies with vaccine demand in every practice or community.

Passage of the proposed amendment would mean that some children would not have access to influenza vaccine because the supply would be reduced. Tragically, some of these unvaccinated children would suffer the more severe consequences of influenza, even though vaccination would otherwise have helped protect them. For this reason, CDC strongly opposes the proposed amendment.

Madam Chairman, these are Dr. Gerberding's compelling arguments against this provision. I will not be offering an amendment today to strike it from the bill. However, considering the overwhelming outcry from the public health community against this amendment, I hope we will continue this discussion, and I look forward for a way to address these concerns in conference.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For making benefit payments under title IV for the first quarter of fiscal year 2009, $62,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to administer the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act, $104,745,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to transfer to any executive agency with authority under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act, including within the Department of Labor, such sums as may be necessary in fiscal year 2008 to carry out those authorities: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may require that any person filing a claim for benefits under such Act provide as part of such claim, such identifying information (including Social Security account number) as may be prescribed. *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, in addition to other sums transferred by the Secretary to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) for the administration of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program (EEOICPA), the Secretary shall transfer $4,500,000 to NIOSH from the funds appropriated to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Fund (42 U.S.C. 7384e), for use by or in support of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (the Board) to carry out its statutory responsibilities under EEOICPA (42 U.S.C. 7384n–q), including obtaining audits, technical assistance and other support from the Board's audit contractor with regard to radiation dose estimation and reconstruction efforts, site profiles, procedures, and review of Special Exposure Cohort petitions and evaluation reports.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In fiscal year 2008 and thereafter, such sums as may be necessary from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended, for payment of all benefits authorized by section 9501(d) (1), (2), (4), and (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and interest on advances, as authorized by section 9501(c)(2) of such Act. In addition, the following amounts shall be available from the Fund for fiscal year 2008 for expenses of operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program, as authorized by section 9501(d)(5) of such Act: $32,761,000 for transfer to the Employment Standards Administration ''Salaries and Expenses''; $24,785,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, ''Salaries and Expenses''; $335,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, ''Office of Inspector General''; and $356,000 for payments into miscellaneous receipts for the expenses of the Department of the Treasury.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, $503,516,000, including not to exceed $91,093,000 which shall be the maximum amount available for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act (''the Act''), which grants shall be no less than 50 percent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under plans approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 18 of the Act; and, in addition, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may retain up to $750,000 per fiscal year of training institute course tuition fees, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, and may utilize such sums for occupational safety and health training and education: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary is authorized, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, to collect and retain fees for services provided to Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratories, and may utilize such sums, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of April 13, 1934 (29 U.S.C. 9a), to administer national and international laboratory recognition programs that ensure the safety of equipment and products used by workers in the workplace: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Act which is applicable to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs 10 or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to administer or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Act with respect to any employer of 10 or fewer employees who is included within a category having a Days Away, Restricted, or Transferred (DART) occupational injury and illness rate, at the most precise industrial classification code for which such data are published, less than the national average rate as such rates are most recently published by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in accordance with section 24 of the Act (29 U.S.C. 673), except—

(1) to provide, as authorized by the Act, consultation, technical assistance, educational and training services, and to conduct surveys and studies;

(2) to conduct an inspection or investigation in response to an employee complaint, to issue a citation for violations found during such inspection, and to assess a penalty for violations which are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period and for any willful violations found;

(3) to take any action authorized by the Act with respect to imminent dangers;

(4) to take any action authorized by the Act with respect to health hazards;

(5) to take any action authorized by the Act with respect to a report of an employment accident which is fatal to one or more employees or which results in hospitalization of two or more employees, and to take

any action pursuant to such investigation authorized by the Act; and

(6) to take any action authorized by the Act with respect to complaints of discrimination against employees for exercising rights under the Act:

Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs 10 or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That $10,116,000 shall be available for Susan Harwood training grants, of which $3,200,000 shall be used for the Institutional Competency Building training grants which commenced in September 2000, for program activities for the period of October 1, 2007, to September 30, 2008, provided that a grantee has demonstrated satisfactory performance: *Provided further*, That such grants shall be awarded no less than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate with timetables for the development and issuance of occupational safety and health standards on beryllium, silica, cranes and derricks, confined space entry in construction, and hazard communication global harmonization; such timetables shall include actual or estimated dates for: the publication of an advance notice of proposed rulemaking, the commencement and completion of a Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act review (if required), the completion of any peer review (if required), the submission of the draft proposed rule to the Office of Management and Budget for review under Executive Order 12866 (if required), the publication of a proposed rule, the conduct of public hearings, the submission of a draft final rule to the Office and Management and Budget for review under Executive Order 12866 (if required), and the issuance of a final rule; and such report shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, with updates provided every 90 days thereafter that shall include an explanation of the reasons for any delays in meeting the projected timetables for action.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, $313,478,000 including purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles, including up to $2,000,000 for mine rescue and recovery activities; in addition, not to exceed $750,000 may be collected by the National Mine Health and Safety Academy for room, board, tuition, and the sale of training materials, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, to be available for mine safety and health education and training activities, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code; and, in addition, the Mine Safety and Health Administration may retain up to $1,000,000 from fees collected for the approval and certification of equipment, materials, and explosives for use in mines, and may utilize such sums for such activities; the Secretary of Labor is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private; the Mine Safety and Health Administration is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative programs with States, industry, and safety associations; the Secretary is authorized to recognize the Joseph A. Holmes Safety Association as a principal safety association and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may provide funds and, with or without reimbursement, personnel, including service of Mine Safety and Health Administration officials as officers in local chapters or in the national organization; and any funds available to the Department may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to provide for the costs of mine rescue and survival operations in the event of a major disaster.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, $497,854,000, together with not to exceed $78,264,000, which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, of which $5,000,000 may be used to fund the mass layoff statistics program under section 15 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491–2): *Provided*, That the Current Employment Survey shall maintain the content of the survey issued prior to June 2005 with respect to the collection of data for the women worker series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PLATTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLATTS:

Page 24, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $27,995,000)''.

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,163,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,942,000)''.

Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $900,000)''.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Chairman, before I address my amendment I certainly want to commend Chairman OBEY and the ranking member, Mr. WALSH, and their staffs for their dedicated work on this very important appropriations bill. I sincerely appreciate their efforts.

Madam Chairman, literacy skills are the cornerstone of our education system. I think that we can all agree that students who struggle with reading face challenges in all subject areas in school.

Unfortunately, children of parents who themselves have difficulty reading English are even more likely to perform at low literacy levels. For this reason, my predecessor, the Honorable Bill Goodling, former Republican chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, established the Even Start Family Literacy Program.

Even Start is the only Federal education program that teaches literacy skills to both parents and their children. Through this program parents receive the necessary skills to become a teacher to their children and to improve their lives.

Even Start serves the most economically and educationally disadvantaged population in the country. According to a Department of Education report, 84 percent of Even Start's families are at or below the Federal poverty level. Nearly half of Even Start families have an annual household income of under $6,000, and 84 percent of Even Start adults do not have a high school diploma or GED.

Even Start is a program that provides disadvantaged families with an opportunity to provide a better life for their children. Parents enroll in Even Start to become better parents, to further their education, and to improve their children's chance of success in school.

At the Even Start centers in my hometown of York, Pennsylvania, I've witnessed firsthand the positive and significant impact that this program is having on parents and children alike.

The Even Start program has yielded successful results. A 2005 Texas A&M study has found that, on average, employment rates rise from 17 percent to 51 percent after program completion. In addition, wages increased by more than 25 percent.

Despite these positive results, and even with the Appropriations Committee's approximately $17 million proposed increase over the fiscal year 2007 funding level, the underlying bill's proposed funding level for the Even Start program is 60 percent less than the amount provided in 2002. Even Start centers struggled this past year to keep their doors open, and many had to close their doors permanently because of this drastic funding cut.

For these reasons, I've introduced this amendment to H.R. 3043. My amendment would increase the appropriations for the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Program by $50 million, bringing its total appropriation to $149 million. While this increase may seem significant, it's important to put the proposed level of $149 million into perspective. Even with the increased proposed in this amendment, the total level of funding for Even Start will still be 40 percent less than the funding levels provided in fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 respectively. In fact, the underlying bill's funding level is less than what was provided even 13 fiscal years back, in 1995.

I certainly thank Chairman OBEY for his support and advocacy of the Even Start program throughout many years. The Even Start program helps our most disadvantaged parents better their lives for themselves and their children.

I hope all Members will join me in supporting the Even Start program. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Madam Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I don't really enjoy opposing this amendment because I think this is a good program

that the gentleman seeks to expand. But let me put his amendment in context.

The President of the United States tried to eliminate this program in his budget. The committee has provided $99 million for it, and for that the administration is criticizing us.

I would also point out that in the last year, when the other party controlled the House of Representatives, the committee cut Even Start by $29 million. We've done none of that. We've restored the funding, and I have a great deal of confidence in the program. But I cannot support the idea of adding the additional money the gentleman proposes because he takes it from a very damaging place.

Now, I know that there is no political constituency for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. No one is going to get excited if they hear that we are cutting back funding for that agency. But, in fact, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which produces the Consumer Price Index, puts together the numbers that determine the way hundreds of billions of dollars flow in this budget and flow in this economy.

We are operating on the basis of an ancient Consumer Price Index. The housing component of that index, which makes up almost 30 percent of it, is some 17 years out of date, and we know there's been a lot of change in housing stock over the last 17 years.

And it just seems to me that while the gentleman is citing a worthy program for adding funds, I would suggest that it would do tremendous long-term damage to this country in terms of equity if we do not update and modernize the data being produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Republicans can have their set of facts, Democrats can have their set of facts, but in the end we need to disregard both sets and we need to have statistics which underlie all of the economic decisions that we make. And it makes no sense to be proceeding on the basis of 17-year old statistics.

So, much as I regret having to oppose the gentleman's amendment and much as I regret having to call Bill Goodling, who is the original sponsor of the program, to tell Bill that I couldn't support the increase in this instance, I do think that the responsible thing to do in this instance is to vote ''no.''

I forgot to mention, and far be it for me to defend the administration's Cabinet appointees. But the gentleman, as I understand it, would take a significant amount of this funding from the Department of Labor administration accounts.

I would point out the administration is also complaining about the cuts we've made in the Labor Secretary's budget. Their Information and Technology Account has already been cut by 39 percent. The Office of the Secretary has already been cut by 17 percent. And we did not provide the requested funds for a core accounting system, and the administration specifically brings attention to their concerns about this. And I honestly do not think it's advisable to cut the agency even more deeply.

And let me assure the gentleman that I would actually prefer that he withdraw the amendment and I'd be happy to try to work, as I'm sure the gentleman from New York would, to try to improve the Even Start position in conference.

But if he has to rely on these kinds of offsets, I regret it, but I simply cannot see my way clear to support it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PLATTS. 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 Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT POLICY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Office of Disability Employment Policy to provide leadership, develop policy and initiatives, and award grants furthering the objective of eliminating barriers to the training and employment of people with disabilities, $27,712,000.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Departmental Management, including the hire of three sedans, and including the management or operation, through contracts, grants or other arrangements of Departmental activities conducted by or through the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, including bilateral and multilateral technical assistance and other international labor activities, $292,943,000, of which $72,516,000 is for the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (including $5,000,000 to implement model programs to address worker rights issues through technical assistance in countries with which the United States has trade preference programs), and of which $18,000,000 is for the acquisition of Departmental information technology, architecture, infrastructure, equipment, software and related needs, which will be allocated by the Department's Chief Information Officer in accordance with the Department's capital investment management process to assure a sound investment strategy; together with not to exceed $318,000, which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REICHERT:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 33, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. We don't have a copy of it.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Chairman, as the former sheriff of King County in Seattle, Washington, and the cochairman of the Congressional Children's Health Care Caucus, I am proud to offer this amendment supporting emergency medical services for children.

I am pleased to be joined in offering this amendment by Congressman MATHESON, and to have the support of Congressman KING from New York, both of whom have been outstanding leaders on this issue.

Our amendment will provide $2.5 million in additional resources for emergency medical services for children's programs offset from the Department of Labor's General Administrative Account. This vital program provides grants to States and medical institutions, to expand and improve emergency care for children who need treatment for life-threatening illnesses or injuries.

This modest funding increase will help a program that has been nearly level funded for the past 6 years. It will better serve those who provide emergency care for our children.

Children, as everyone knows, are not small adults. The illnesses and injuries that bring them into emergency rooms vary significantly, and they often need equipment that is smaller than what is used for adults, and medication in much more carefully calculated doses.

□ 1815

Although children account for 30 million annual visits to the emergency rooms, many hospitals and emergency management agencies are not well equipped to handle these patients. According to the Centers for Disease Control, only 6 percent of the United States emergency departments have all the supplies they need to handle pediatric emergencies.

Emergency Medical Services grants have been awarded to all 50 States, the District of Columbia and five territories. They have been used to train first responders to buy pediatric equipment for hospitals and to establish and improve standards for emergency care for children. Other grants have been used to create pediatric treatment guides for school nurses to test best practices and to incorporate pediatric care into State disaster plans.

Madam Chairman, this is a simple amendment with a significant impact on emergency care for our children. I urge all my colleagues to join in supporting this important measure.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. I withdraw the point of order and move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, let me simply point out that the administration has sent us a statement of administration policy, or SAP as it is known in the trade, and they indicate that the President intends to veto this bill. And one of the reasons they intend to veto the bill is because they say this bill spends too much money. I would simply point out that virtually every Republican amendment that has been offered so far is an amendment to increase funding for a specific program.

On this program the President zeroed out this very worthy program. The committee fully restored the funding at the previous year's level of $19.8 million, and now this amendment seeks to add a small amount in addition by taking it out of departmental management.

As the Chair of the committee, I think it is my obligation to the administration to try to be somewhat objective about the funding level that they need in order to fund their agency activities. But if we are going to continue to get amendments from the administration's own side of the aisle that further reduce Cabinet Secretaries' operating budgets, who am I to object? So if the administration can't save itself from its friends, far be it from me to intercede, and so I would simply say that on this I will accept the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I won't take the full 5 minutes. I would just like to say I am also prepared to accept the amendment. But I would make the note that this is not an increase in spending. There is an offset. We are moving money from one place to another. It does not increase overall spending. It is cost neutral.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARCHANT

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCHANT:

Page 25, line 22, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $58,419,000)''.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Chairman, my amendment would reduce funding in the bill for the International Labor Affairs Bureau to the President's requested level of $14 million. This would save $58.4 million in this category.

The underlying bill provides $72.5 million for this account. This amendment would reduce funding for the International Labor Affairs Bureau by $58.4 million to match the President's request.

The bureau was originally responsible for the Department of Labor's overseas research projects and international labor workers' rights, primarily research and advocacy. However, in recent years the bureau has taken on grant-making activities. The bureau's grant assistance is already provided for by the Department of State, and this amendment would restructure the bureau's activities to advocacy and research only.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It seeks to reinstate the President's 81-percent cut in the International Labor Organization appropriation in the bill.

Madam Chairman, I cannot walk into a union hall in my District, I cannot walk into a restaurant, I cannot walk into a barber shop without having someone say to me, OBEY, what are you guys going to do to protect workers from unfair competition? What are you going to do to protect us from slave labor in China? What are you going to do to protect us from countries that pretend that they are free market countries when, in fact, they are centrally directed Marxist countries? When are you going to protect us from goods being produced by child labor around the world?

The purpose of this International Labor Organization is to serve as the one agency that serves as a red flag when our workers' wages are being undercut unfairly.

So I think the issue is very simple, and I don't intend to take the full 5 minutes. If you really are comfortable with the idea of just letting the wonders of the world market determine what wages are for American workers, if you are really comfortable with the idea of letting substandard wages and substandard working conditions undercut legitimate American workers' interests, then by all means vote for the gentleman's amendment. If you think that the American worker deserves a square deal in the midst of this globalization rampage, then I would suggest you vote against the amendment. And, I do think that workers and the organizations who represent them will be watching.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I come to the floor tonight to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I come to the floor also to indicate my support for what we can do on this floor for labor here in America. And I think that is the optimum word, ''here'' in America.

This amendment will do just that. It will protect laborers in this country, and that should be the first priority of this U.S. Congress. We do that first and foremost by protecting the fruits of their labor. Their wages, their income, what they work for, 9 to 5 and longer, Monday through Friday or longer during the course of the week. We do that by ensuring that the money that we spend, their hard-earned tax dollars, is appropriately spent and appropriately prioritized. And I commend the gentleman for doing just that with this amendment.

There are many things that we would like to spend our dollars on. But when we are elected to public office, we are to come here and make sure that first and foremost the American citizen, and in this case, the American worker, is protected.

As I come to the floor tonight, as I have said in the past, we have now marked about 6 months into Democrat control of this U.S. Congress. And what has it wrought during those 6 months? The largest tax increase in U.S. history. The attempts to change historic rules of this House and in operations. And, finally, attempts to create slush funds in which dollars can be misspent on other inappropriate items, dollars that are earned from the backs and sweat of American labor. And that is why I come strongly to support this amendment by the gentleman from Texas, to make sure that their hard-earned dollars are not misspent.

How often have we gone back to our districts and heard the complaint of jobs in this country going overseas? Well, it is one thing to say the jobs are going overseas; it is another thing to ask the laborers in this country to support those jobs overseas. It is one thing to see our jobs flee from this country to go to foreign shores; it is another thing to ask the workers of this country, through their tax dollars, to in essence support the organizations' structure of those jobs overseas.

We are elected to public office to protect the workers of this country. This gentleman's proposal does just that, by making sure that their tax dollars are focused first and foremost on workers and their quality of life and their standards here in this country. We will protect American workers. We will protect American jobs. And with this amendment, we will protect the budget of the workers of America as well.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I am somewhat amused by the posture of the Appropriations Chair in the last two amendments, and I appreciate the difficult position he finds himself in. But on the one hand, the amendment before this one attempting to support the President's recommendation and then on this one lambasting the President's recommendation. So a case of whiplash, I understand, may be in order.

But it is important to talk about exactly what this amendment does. And I want to commend my good friend from Texas for proposing this amendment.

The Department of Labor proposes in the President's budget that $14 million go to the International Labor Affairs Bureau, which would move the agency closer to its core mission of research and policy analysis. Remember this is the Department of Labor, not the Department of State. In 2008 the International Labor Affairs Bureau will continue to focus on administering over $530 million, $530 million, in projects that were launched in previous years, including in the field of child labor, as the chairman mentioned.

The Department of Labor seeks to restore the International Labor Affairs Bureau to its original mission of research and advocacy by eliminating its grant-making activities. We have all sorts of duplication and redundancies in the Federal Government, and this certainly is one of them. As an example of that, between 1996 and 2001, the International Labor Affairs Bureau's funding rose by 1,500 percent over a 5-year period of time when the agency embarked on an expansive grant-making mission intended to combat international child labor, develop and disseminate AIDS prevention information in the international workplace, support core labor standards development, and provide bilateral technical assistance.

Madam Chairman, grant-making activities are appropriately funded through the Department of State and through the USAID, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and other agencies. For example, the 2008 budget includes $3 billion to continue international assistance activities in developing countries through the Millennium Challenge Account. The administration created the Millennium Challenge Account to provide targeted and accountable international development assistance to poor countries with a demonstrative commitment to ruling justly, investing in people, and encouraging economic growth. So there are more appropriate places to fund these kinds of grant activities.

I would suggest, Madam Chairman, that the gentleman from Texas has proposed an appropriate amendment to return the level of funding in this appropriations bill to a level that would allow the International Labor Affairs Bureau to return to its core mission, its core mission of research and policy analysis and I believe better serve this Congress and the American people.

□ 1830

So I commend the gentleman for his amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARCHANT. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL OF TEXAS

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCAUL of Texas:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 84, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 84, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000''.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment in support of teacher training for deaf and blind children.

Madam Chair, the Department of Education has provided funding from within its special education national activities account aimed at children who are both deaf and blind, commonly referred to as "deafblindness." This money trains teachers who have such children in their classes on how to educate and include them in daily classroom activities. This modest $12 million program has not received an increase in nearly two decades.

Today over 110,000 people rely on this important program. Expanding this program will allow us to identify more children in need and increase the number of on-site technical assistance personnel.

This amendment simply increases the Special Education National Activities Account to provide the DeafBlindness program with a modest but necessary increase.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would be willing to constrain his remarks, we would be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. That's an offer I would be remiss to refuse, and I will accept the offer.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. I thank the chairman.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 107, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, this amendment would increase the funding for the National Labor Relations Board by $500,000 and is offset by a decrease to the Department of Labor departmental management salaries and expenses. It is to allow the NLRB to start to reduce its cases. It's at 2 years now, and we're looking to reduce it. This is an amendment offered by MARK UDALL and myself and FRANK LOBIONDO.

The NLRB takes an extraordinary amount of time to review and render a decision on employment disputes.

According to the NLRB, the median mount of time it takes from the filing of a charge to the issuance of the NLRB'S decision is over 2 years.

The funding in the Shays-Udall-LoBiondo amendment will allow the NLRB to retain some of its full-time staff, which they otherwise would have to let go due to the pay increase for Government employees.

It will also be used to train supervisors and new employees to ensure they are handling the cases efficiently and effectively, without sacrificing quality.

Funding, however, is not the only answer to the NLRB's problems.

We need to create deadlines to ensure the NLRB renders decisions in an expedient manner.

MARK UDALL, FRANK LOBIONDO, and I have been working on legislation to require the NLRB to issue their decisions promptly.

The bill will require the NLRB to issue a decision not later than 9 months after the date on which the initial complaint was served.

Should the Board not reach a decision within 9 months, it must transmit a report to Congress provide the reason or reasons the deadline was not met and what steps it is taking to reach a decision.

One high-profile NLRB decision found the Smithfield Packing Company guilty of illegally assaulting, intimidating, and harassing its workers in Tar Heel, North Carolina, when they attempted to form a union in 1994 and 1997. However, the NLRB's decision that the employer used unfair labor practices did not come down until 2005.

Taking this amount of time is an absurdity.

Mr. OBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. Absolutely.

Mr. OBEY. Again, same deal; if the gentleman will constrain his remarks, we would be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. I would be happy to. Could I just recognize MARK UDALL?

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for his generous offer.

I rise in support of the amendment.

I'd like to thank Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH and the Appropriations Committee for their leadership on this vital legislation that will help to provide quality healthcare, enhance education opportunities, and increase worker safety.

This is a good bill, but I think this amendment would make it better.

The amendment will increase the funding for the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) by $500,000, and is offset by a decrease to the Department of Labor Departmental Management Salaries and expenses.

As we all know the NLRB plays a vital role in labor-management relations.

It hears appeals of unfair labor practices and resolves questions about the composition of bargaining units.

We need to maintain its ability to do its job.

But without the additional funding this amendment will provide, there is a danger that they will have to lay off some of their staff in order to pay for their required overhead, including salaries.

The amendment would prevent that, and would also enable the NLRB's staff to handle cases efficiently and effectively, without sacrificing quality.

Funding is not the only problem that faces the National Labor Relations Board but congress should make it easier not harder for the National Labor Relations Board to administer decisions.

I urge the House to adopt the Shays-Udall amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JINDAL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JINDAL:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 18, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Mr. JINDAL. Madam Chairman, the Labor-HHS Subcommittee has funded the Center for Disease Control's Division of Tuberculosis Elimination at $150 million in this bill. Over the past 15 years, funding for this program has been level. There has been no increase in funding for this program since 1993.

Madam Chairman, every State and most major cities have TB control programs. Approximately 75 percent of the funds appropriated for this program are used in the States.

Funding for this program is critically important because just last year, in 2006, more than 20 of the 50 States had increases in TB cases. My home State of Louisiana, as well as most other States, have a large number of workers who travel the globe to share their expertise. Unlike tourists who stay in hotels in environments where TB exposure does not normally occur, Louisiana's oil and gas workers spend months working and living in environments among the local population where exposure can and does occur. TB exposure in these communities can result in many fatalities.

Another key issue for States and cities is the huge number of foreign-born students attending universities in the United States. More than half of the TB cases in the United States stem from foreign-born students who come here on student visas and often return home for summers and holidays, risking exposure in their home country. While risk of exposure is high for these students, their return to universities in the United States with the possibility of a latent TB infection creates the same problem seen in oil and gas workers.

If the disease is activated, the number of people exposed is tremendous. The last such case at a Louisiana university exposed 120 contacts in classes as well as in the dorms.

At present, there is no mandatory screening of this group, and no vaccine to prevent disease. The Georgia man whose case recently made headlines was exposed while volunteering overseas. As in his case, volunteers or overseas workers can return to the United States with a latent TB infection and activate the spread of this disease in the United States, later exposing family, friends and coworkers. No routine screening is performed, and no effective vaccine is available to prevent the spread of this disease.

My amendment is supported by the American Lung Association, American Thoracic Society, National Coalition for the Elimination of Tuberculosis, and the National TB Controllers Association.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I don't like to have to oppose this amendment, but the fact is where some of the previous amendments were merely troublesome, this amendment is irresponsible.

Now, let us point out what's happened so far. What we have going on here is a ''let's pretend'' game. We have the administration telling us that this bill is runaway spending, and they threaten to veto the bill when in fact this bill in real terms is only a little over a 2 percent increase over last year. It is a large difference with the President's budget, but that's because he tried to cut $7.5 billion of it. In real terms, this bill goes up by less than $5 billion.

By now we have a number of people in this House who are trying to escape from the consequences of the President's budget. So we have pretended in one amendment that we can add money to AmeriCorps by taking money out of administrative management accounts for the Labor Department.

Then we are pretending that we can take out, yes, just a small amount, $500,000, out of that same account in order to deal with National Labor Relations Board. Then we are having another effort to escape the squeeze on behalf of another very worthy cause, deaf and blind children. And those have been accepted.

But now this amendment comes in, and it proposes to increase funding for a very worthy cause, Center for Disease Control TB Elimination Program. That is funded in the bill at $150.7 million, an increase of $13.7 million over fiscal 2007 and $13.9 million over the President's request. The funding included in this bill is a 10 percent increase over fiscal 2007.

Now, everybody knows that we would like to be providing more money for that program and a dozen others in this bill. But we are trying, evidently, to give some credence to the administration's complaints about dollar levels in spending.

So what does this amendment do? It savages the ability of the Secretary of Labor to run any programs at all, because what it does is to require a 25 percent cut in the ability of the Secretary of Labor to manage all of the programs within their jurisdiction. So that means that you have to chop the living guts out of the Secretary's own office; you have to chop the guts out of the Solicitor's office. And that is the office that deals with enforcement for mine safety, for OSHA, or even the OLMS union violations that were the subject of a previous amendment just a couple minutes ago.

And what this all is is a giant ''let's pretend'' operation. It's a game that pretends that we are doing something real by adding money for these accounts, when you know that if you're going to be responsible, when we go to conference we're going to have to restore most of these management accounts or else we will have a government agency, admittedly one run by a very conservative Republican, but still a government agency which will be crippled in its ability to provide its functions.

I have in my office two signs. And whenever anybody comes to me asking for money, I make them read those signs out loud. This is what one of them says: ''What do you want us to do for someone besides yourself that's more important than whatever it is you want us to do for you?'' And I think that's the basic question we always ought to be asking in a Judeo-Christian society.

My problem with this amendment is, while it seeks funds for a very worthy cause, in the process it takes away crucial funds for many other worthy causes. And sooner or later, even in the Congress of the United States, we need to think about the needs of the whole. We need to think about all of the needs that the government has to deal with, not just one concern of one Member or one concern of another.

So in the interest of responsibility, I would urge a, very regretfully, defeat of the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I couldn't agree more with my colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee. It's difficult to oppose an amendment that increases funding for treating and dealing with tuberculosis. It's a very serious disease all across the Third World. And there is the potential for it coming into our society and creating real problems.

Having said that, there is an increase in the budget, it's $14 million above

what the President requested, a pretty substantial increase, a 10 percent increase in the budget. And while I respect the gentleman's desire to strengthen our country against the disease, it's not proper to take that amount of the budget of the Department of Labor for this purpose. That would hamstring the Department of Labor. It would not cut the fat, it would cut the muscle, it would cut the arms out. It would cut the eyes out of the Department of Labor, and I don't think anybody wants that.

So, I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. JINDAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH of New York. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. JINDAL. I won't take a lot of time. I just want to make one point.

I do thank the gentleman and the chairman for recognizing the good intent behind the amendment. I do want to point out that the offset still leaves in that account more money than what the President requested in his budget. The rationale for offsetting from that account is that, according to the administration there is a duplication of effort between the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, the State Department, USAID, and other agencies. So, even with the offset, we still leave more money in those accounts than the administration itself requested.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, there have been a number of amendments that have cut into this salaries and expenses administrative account. I suspect there will be more. We need to be very careful about further deep cuts.

And this is an especially large cut, $50 million. So I would, again, urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I will be relatively brief on this.

I want to commend my friend from Louisiana for offering the amendment. As a physician in my former life, I appreciate the remarkable increase in the incidence of tuberculosis and the need for surveillance as well as detection and treatment. So I commend my friend from Louisiana for offering this amendment. We all watched with some curiosity and some significant concern within the last couple of months as we tracked the travels of one individual from my City of Atlanta around the world who was felt to have a case of tuberculosis that needed to be treated urgently. So I commend my good friend for the amendment.

I do want to say in the larger context, however, that I'm a little perplexed, for the Chair of the Appropriations Committee talks about ''pretending'' to support AmeriCorps in previous amendments dealing with this section of the bill, ''pretending'' to support NLRB, ''pretending'' to support deaf and blind children, and yet those are the amendments that he accepted.

□ 1845

So I am a little perplexed as to why this amendment isn't being given the same, at least the same pretending of, support from the Chair of the committee.

I would also point out that the appropriately decreased reductions in the proposal from the administration in this area of the budget aren't taken in isolation. They are part of the entire, larger budget, which gets to the issue of the entire, larger budget that this new majority has passed, and that, as you well know, Madam Chairman, includes the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation. So I understand that somehow you have to pay for all these things, but I believe strongly that it is not the American people who desire to have the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation.

So I rise to commend my good friend from Louisiana for proposing this sound amendment. I would encourage its adoption. I understand the concerns that others have regarding the underlying section in this area of the bill, but I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JINDAL. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,800,000)''.

Page 92, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,500,000)''.

Page 97, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $8,300,000)''.

Page 97, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $8,300,000)''.

Page 98, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, this amendment transfers $6.8 million from the Department of Labor Departmental Management Salaries and Expenses and $1.5 million from the Department of Education Departmental Management Account to fund a $6.8 million increase in the AmeriCorps State and National program. The additional $1.5 million is needed to fund corresponding increases to the National Service trust fund for reimbursement of student loans.

This amendment will provide adequate funding to ensure that AmeriCorps State and National program will maintain the 34,000 full-time volunteer positions. Based upon the funding level in the legislation, the corporation will have to reduce its full-time enrollment by 600 positions and replace them with reduced, part-time positions.

There is a great deal of support for increasing Pell Grants in this Congress, something with which I agree. It seems to me, however, that with Pell Grants, the government and our society get no direct return, whereas with AmeriCorps, recipients of this aid are required to perform service to their community and Nation. There is a stipend for education, but they have earned it through serving their country.

To me, national service is one of the smartest investments our government can make. Not only is it a smart financial investment, but national service energizes our youth, empowers our volunteers and helps citizens make a very real, tangible impact on our communities.

Madam Chairman, I concur that we are taking from an account that the chairman has some concern about. I would hope that where it is going would outweigh that.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF JOB CORPS

To carry out subtitle C of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2881 et seq.), including Federal administrative expenses, the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration and repairs of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Workforce Investment Act; $1,649,476,000, as follows:

(1) $1,507,684,000 for Job Corps operations, of which $916,684,000 is available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009, and of which $591,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009;

(2) $112,920,000 for construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers, of which $12,920,000 is available from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2011; and $100,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2011; and

(3) $28,872,000 for necessary expenses of the Office of Job Corps, which shall be available for the period October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008:

Provided, That the Office of Job Corps shall have contracting authority: *Provided further*, That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this title for the Job Corps shall be used to pay the salary of an individual, either as direct costs or any proration as an indirect cost, at a rate in excess of Executive Level I: *Provided further*, That a total student training slot level of not less than 44,791 shall be achieved by the end of program year 2008.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Not to exceed $197,143,000 may be derived from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of sections 4100–4113, 4211–4215, and 4321–4327 of title 38, United States Code, and Public Law 103–353, and which shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 2008, of which $1,967,000 is for the National Veterans' Employment and Training Services Institute. To carry out the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Programs under section 5(a)(1) of the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Assistance Act of 2001 (38 U.S.C. 2021) and the Veterans Workforce Investment Programs under section 168 of the Workforce Investment Act (29 U.S.C. 2913), $31,055,000, of which $7,435,000 shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $72,929,000, together with not to exceed $5,729,000, which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.)) which are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Labor in this Act may be transferred between a program, project, or activity, but no such program, project, or activity shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority granted by this section shall be available only to meet unanticipated needs and shall not be used to create any new program or to fund any project or activity for which no funds are provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer.

SEC. 102. In accordance with Executive Order No. 13126, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended for the procurement of goods mined, produced, manufactured, or harvested or services rendered, whole or in part, by forced or indentured child labor in industries and host countries already identified by the United States Department of Labor prior to enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. After September 30, 2007, the Secretary of Labor shall issue a monthly transit subsidy of not less than the full amount (of not less than $110) that each of its employees of the National Capital Region is eligible to receive.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this title for grants under section 171 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2916) may be obligated prior to the preparation and submission of a report by the Secretary of Labor to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the planned uses of such funds.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of Labor shall award the following grants on a competitive basis: (1) Community-Based Job Training Grants awarded from amounts provided for such purpose under this title; and (2) grants during fiscal or program year 2008 under section 414(c) of the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2916 note), as amended by section 428 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447).

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available to the Department of Labor for grants under section 414(c) of the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2916 note) may be used for any purpose other than training in the occupations and industries for which employers are using H–1B visas to hire foreign workers, and the related activities necessary to support such training: *Provided*, That the preceding limitation shall not apply to grants awarded under section 107 of this title and to multiyear grants awarded in response to competitive solicitations issued prior to April 15, 2007.

SEC. 107. Out of funds available to the Department of Labor under section 414(c) the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2916 note), as amended by section 428 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447), up to $20,000,000 is available (in addition to dislocated worker assistance national reserve funds) for the purposes of grants to States to address the gap in health care coverage faced by trade adjustment assistance (''TAA'') participants and dislocated workers awaiting TAA certification, to assure that these dislocated workers can benefit from the tax credit for health insurance costs authorized in section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 108. The Secretary of Labor shall take no action to amend, through regulatory or administration action, the definition established in 20 CFR 667.220 for functions and activities under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, or to modify, through regulatory or administrative action, the procedure for redesignation of local areas as specified in subtitle B of title I of the Act (including applying the standards specified in section 116(a)(3)(B) of such Act, but notwithstanding the time limits specified in section 116(a)(3)(B) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2831), until such time as legislation reauthorizing such Act is enacted.

SEC. 109. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act shall be available to finalize or implement any proposed regulation under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, or the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform Act of 2002 until such time as legislation reauthorizing the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform Act of 2002 is enacted.

SEC. 110. (a) On or before November 30, 2007, the Secretary of Labor shall, pursuant to section 6 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 655), promulgate a final occupational safety and health standard concerning employer payment for personal protective equipment. The final standard shall provide no less protection to employees and shall have no further exceptions from the employer payment requirement than the proposed rule published in the Federal Register on March 31, 1999 (64 FR 15402).

(b) In the event that such standard is not promulgated by the date required, the proposed standard on employer payment for personal protective equipment published in the Federal Register on March 31, 1999 (64 FR 15402) shall become effective as if such standard had been promulgated as a final standard by the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in this title may be used to carry out a public-private competition or direct conversion under OMB Circular A–76 or any successor administrative regulation, directive, or policy until 60 days after the Government Accountability Office provides a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the use of competitive sourcing at the Department of Labor.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. SESSIONS: Strike section 111.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, my amendment would strike section 111 of this legislation, which, as drafted, would have the same effect as language already included in a number of the Democrat majority's other appropriations bills which prevents funds from being spent to conduct public-private competitions.

While this policy may be good for increasing dues payments to private sector union bosses, it is unquestionably bad for taxpayers and for Federal agencies because agencies are left with less money to spend on their core missions when Congress takes the opportunity to use competition away from them.

In 2006, Federal agencies ''competed'' only 1.7 percent of their commercial workforce, which makes up less than one-half of 1 percent of the entire civilian workforce. This very small use of competition for services is expected to generate savings of $1.3 billion over 10 years by closing performance gaps and improving efficiencies.

Competitions competed since 2003 are expected to produce almost $7 billion in savings for taxpayers over the next 10 years. This means that taxpayers will receive a return of about $31 for every $1 spent on competition, with annualized expected savings of more than $1 billion.

Specifically at the Department of Labor, since May 2004, 27 public-private partnerships have competed, involving over 1,000 positions. And thanks to a 10 percent protection clause, 24 of these competitions have been won by the government. This overwhelming track record of government success in competing with private sector begs the question, why would the Democrat leadership insist upon preventing Federal agencies from running their operations in the most efficient manner when they have been successful in the past?

I think the answer is clear, Madam Chairman, that when this appropriations bill cuts the budget for the Office of Labor Management Standards, which monitors union compliance with Federal law, and prevents competitive sourcing from taking place, that the Democrat leadership is clearly hearing from labor bosses that this bill represents a good opportunity to increase the power of labor bosses at the expense of taxpayers and good government.

In this time of stretched budgets and bloated spending, Congress should be looking to use all of the tools it can to find taxpayer savings and reduce the cost of services that are already being provided by thousands of hardworking companies nationwide.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense taxpayer-first amendment to oppose the underlying provision to benefit private sector union bosses by keeping cost-saving competition available to the government.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, this bill contains a provision that freezes public-private competitions at the Department of Labor under OMB circular A–76. That process is used to compete out jobs now performed by Federal employees. Significant resources have been spent by the Department over the last several years on contracting out government jobs, and the committee believes it is time to take a step back and examine how the process is working.

Government-wide statistics cast doubt, frankly, on the overall effectiveness of this process. OMB reports in fiscal year 2006 that government employees won the competition in more than 85 percent of the cases where competitive sourcing was used. At DOL, the results have been similar. Since the process has begun, DOL employees have won 22 of the 25 competitions.

Now, aside from questions about the lack of compelling evidence of cost savings or increased efficiency, there is concern about the fact that the Department is not taking proper care to assure that functions that ought to be considered inherently governmental or are otherwise unsuitable for contracting performance are excluded from these competitions.

We have seen some competitions where regulatory and policy functions are included and believe that an independent look at the Department of Labor's use of this authority is warranted.

The gentleman says that it is labor bosses who are concerned about this. The last time I looked, this was having a disproportionate impact on women and on minority workers, and we are asking the GAO to assess the impact on them.

□ 1900

The bill language freezes the A–76 process at the Department of Labor until the committee has the benefit of a GAO review of that process. What is wrong with that?

The Comptroller General chaired a panel that submitted a report to Congress in 2002 and the request to GAO will be to ask for an assessment of the extent to which the sourcing principle adopted by the panel, including the recognition of inherently governmental functions, are being followed by the Department. This department is frankly not known to be a friend of the worker, certainly not under the present regime. It certainly is not known to be a friend to Federal workers, and it seems to me that we have seen in Iraq what happens when we contract out everything in sight. We have seen what happens in the Labor Department when 90 percent of one of their most important manpower programs, when 90 percent of the money in that program is farmed out on a noncompetitive basis. Frankly, we have sincere doubt about the balance with which the Department is approaching this issue.

Therefore, we asked the GAO to review the process. What on earth is wrong with that? I urge opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, the moratorium on A–76 public-private competition at the Department of Labor is the right provision, in the right bill at the right time.

The moratorium is included in this Appropriations bill because the Department of Labor has made indications that the agency is trying to reach numerical privatization targets—quotas—for its outsourcing.

The use of outsourcing quotas was first addressed by Congress when the Office of Management and Budget under the Bush Administration introduced its effort to outsource at least 15 percent of each agency to the private sector, with a goal of outsourcing up to half of the agency workforce.

The problem with outsourcing quotas is that they are a "one-size-fits-all" arbitrary privatization effort. Quotas never consider the unique needs of different Federal agencies, and they often lead to widespread cuts that harm the ability of Federal agencies to effectively carry out their mission.

I offered an amendment to the Transportation-Treasury Appropriations Act in 2003 that shed light onto the administration's effort, and outlawed the outsourcing quota.

Now it appears that the Department of Labor is taking the same approach.

In the next two years, over 2,000 jobs are expected to be competed, many of which appear to be both inherently governmental and even discriminatory.

These jobs include technical writers reviewing OSHA enforcement action, senior instructor for safety specialist responsibilities, and physical scientists that analyze toxic materials in working environments. It is vital that these positions provide sound, objective services that Federal employees can.

Furthermore, the majority of employees impacted by the recent round of A–76 competitions were older African-American women. The GAO report will analyze whether the scheduled outsourcings are discriminatory.

The DOL has won 21 out of 23 competitions conducted in the past 3 fiscal years. Millions of dollars have been spent over the last several years on these initiatives; 90 percent of the cases are won by Government.

The GAO report would give Congress an objective analysis of the outsourcing program at the Department of Labor from which to base further decisions.

Competitive sourcing is not inherently a bad thing if it can save money for the Federal Government, but arbitrary quotas, numerical targets, are a bad thing.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 Texas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 2008".

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For carrying out titles II, III, IV, VII, VIII, X, XII, XVI, XIX, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, section 427(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, title V and sections 1128E, 711, and 1820 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7e, 912, and 1395i–4), the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, the Native Hawaiian Health Care Act of 1988, the Cardiac Arrest Survival Act of 2000, construction and renovation (including equipment) of health care and other facilities, and section 712(c) of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 300b–1 note), $7,055,709,000, of which $63,538,000 from general revenues, notwithstanding subsection (j) of section 1820 of the Social Security Act, shall be available for carrying out the Medicare rural hospital flexibility grants program under such section: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $100,000 shall be available until expended for facilities renovations at the National Hansen's Disease Programs Center (as described in section 320 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247e)): *Provided further*, That in addition to fees authorized by section 427(b)(4) of the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11137(b)(4)), fees shall be collected for the full disclosure of information under the Act sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the National Practitioner Data Bank authorized under such Act, and shall remain available until expended to carry out such Act: *Provided further*, That fees authorized under subsection (d)(2) of section 1128E of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7e) to be collected for the full disclosure of information under the national health care fraud and abuse data collection program established under such section, shall be sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the program, and shall remain available until expended to carry out that program: *Provided further*, That $35,000,000 of the funding provided for community health centers shall be used for base grant adjustments for existing centers: *Provided further*, That no more than $40,000 is available until expended for carrying out the provisions of section 224(o)(6) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 233(o)(6)) including associated administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That $3,963,000 is available until expended for the National Cord Blood Stem Cell Program: *Provided further*, That no more than $45,000,000 is available until expended for carrying out the amendments to section 224 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 233) made by the Federally Supported Health Centers Assistance Act of 1995 and for expenses incurred by the Department of Health and Human Services pertaining to administrative claims made pursuant to such amendments: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $310,910,000 shall be for the program under

title X of the Public Health Service Act to provide for voluntary family planning projects: *Provided further*, That amounts provided to such projects under such title shall not be expended for abortions, that all pregnancy counseling shall be nondirective, and that such amounts shall not be expended for any activity (including the publication or distribution of literature) that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal or candidate for public office: *Provided further*, That of the funds available under this heading, $1,865,800,000 shall remain available to the Secretary of Health and Human Services through September 30, 2010, for parts A and B of title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided further*, That within the amounts provided for part A of title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff–11 et seq.), funds are included to ensure that the amount of any funding provided under such part to a metropolitan area for the program year beginning in 2007 is not reduced by an amount that is more than 8.4 percent, and the amount of any funding provided under subpart II of such part to a transitional area is not reduced by an amount that is more than 13.4 percent, relative to the amount of the total funding provided under such part to the metropolitan area or transitional area, respectively, for the program year beginning in fiscal year 2006: *Provided further*, That $830,593,000 shall be for State AIDS Drug Assistance Programs authorized under section 2616 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff–26): *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, $25,000,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 238j) to carry out parts A, B, C, and D of title XXVI of such Act to fund the special projects of national significance under section 2691 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff–101): *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 502(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 702(a)(1)), not to exceed $170,991,000 is available for carrying out special projects of regional and national significance pursuant to section 501(a)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 701(a)(2)).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS:

Page 33, line 25, after the aggregate dollar figure insert ''(increased by $12,500,000)''.

Page 90, line 7, after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $12,500,000)''.

Page 97, line 16, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Chairman, my amendment is very simple. My amendment transfers 10 percent or $25.5 million from AmeriCorp to the TRIO educational programs and the geriatric program. I have one of these programs in my congressional district, and I have a large university, two community colleges, so I thought it would be appropriate considering lots of time we talk about the loan process for the students, and particularly for low income, first generation college students, I thought it might be appropriate to take a very small portion of AmeriCorp and give it to these two programs.

I think we all know that AmeriCorp has done some good work. When we talk about volunteerism, we talk about people who go out and help people after natural disasters. We have a lot of that in Florida. We recently had a tornado in Lake County. A lot of the people in the district donated blood. They helped mentor schoolchildren. We teach English to new Americans, we teach illiterate adults how to read. We also have volunteers who go in and clean up rivers and forests.

AmeriCorp is a little bit different. It does have volunteers, but these volunteers, obviously, are paid. Remuneration in exchange for choosing to contribute one's time, energy and/or money clearly undermines the word ''volunteer.'' This is a different type of volunteerism. We have had a discussion whether it is necessary to pay volunteers. Paying people to volunteer sort of almost contradicts the spirit of the word, but we have sort of accepted that and the program has continued to flourish.

There has been some question that Members on both sides have sought to legislate whether AmeriCorp members could spend time with political activities, campaigns, faith-based initiatives or unions. That got us into some controversy and some rhetoric. If the Federal Government were not involved in what should be a personal preference in the first place, we wouldn't have to have these conversations discussing whether we should allow these AmeriCorp members be involved with political activities, campaigns, faith-based initiatives, or unions.

So I think when you look at the overall spectrum, I think the modest amount I am taking from AmeriCorp and putting into these two programs, I hope Members agree with me, it is worthwhile.

Take a little money, give to TRIO programs. They are aimed, as I mentioned, at low-income, first generation college students. Currently there are 2,700 TRIO programs serving nearly 900,000 low-income students across the United States. TRIO is critical to our Nation's commitment to advance educational opportunities at our colleges and universities and, as a result, obviously our Nation's economic future.

I have had the privilege of visiting several TRIO programs at schools in my district and had the privilege of hearing some of the wonderful success stories from these students. For that reason, I would like to give them a little more money.

Also across many districts like mine there are geriatric programs. So I am taking part of this money from AmeriCorp and putting it into geriatric programs, roughly $12 million. These programs are currently funded at the same level as the previous fiscal year. Included in these programs are educational centers which provide crucial physician, dental and mental health training programs for the care of our seniors. Current Federal funding will continue the support of about 50 geriatric education centers and the training of over 50,000 health care providers. This funding should be increased to provide more education and training for more health care professionals so we can meet our aging population's future health care demands. This is particularly true in Florida.

I ask my colleagues to consider putting part of the money from AmeriCorp into the geriatric educational centers. They have done a great job.

In my district we have three of these geriatric centers. At the University of Florida, where one center is located, it was established in 1987 to provide educational services for faculty and practitioners in the State of Florida. Their goal is to provide better care for older Americans.

I close, Madam Chairman, and urge support for my amendment so we can create better educational opportunities for underprivileged youth through the TRIO programs, and better ensure adequate and quality care for our seniors.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, once again we demonstrate the strangeness of the administration's statement of policy on this bill.

This amendment would add $40 million to TRIO. We have already added $40 million above the amount that the President asked for for that program. It is a worthy program.

The President also eliminated the funding for the other account that the gentleman wants to increase in this amendment. The President zeroed out the geriatrics program. The committee restored $32 million. So in both of these accounts, we are significantly above the President's budget; and yet we get another amendment from the other side of the aisle seeking to raise a worthy program.

Now he seeks to pay for it by cutting, among other sources, AmeriCorp. I am a little confused by that because just a few minutes ago the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut had an amendment to try to add money for AmeriCorp. The House turned that down. Frankly, had I realized that the gentleman's amendment was going to be offered, in this instance I probably would have accepted the gentleman's amendment from Connecticut because I don't think it makes sense to reduce AmeriCorp, which has already been cut $9.2 million below last year, although I admit they do have carryover funds of $8 million.

I guess what I am saying is I don't intend to stand in the way of this amendment, but it once again illustrates that when the administration claims that this bill is profligate, it is in fact far off the mark. Virtually every single amendment being offered today is being offered for the purpose of increasing funding for what is described as a worthy program.

Now, yes, in order to pretend that we are all equally focused on the same things, they say that they have an offset. But it is clear that the offset is a

secondary motivation and the primary motivation is to raise funding for these programs, and I think it indicates that the committee has been far from profligate when it has set the funding levels that we have set in this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. I rise to oppose this amendment not because of where the money is spent but where it is taken from. That is what I want to address.

I had an amendment to try to restore funds for AmeriCorp programs to bring it back to the level of 34,000 AmeriCorp workers. We can call them volunteers; we can call them workers.

I was a Peace Corps volunteer. Peace Corps volunteers are given whatever the minimum wage is in the countries where we serve. We are given a stipend when we return, a modest stipend. We are called a ''volunteer'' but we don't work for nothing. We have to have shelter provided as a Peace Corps volunteer, and we have to be paid something to buy food.

AmeriCorp workers, ''volunteers,'' are given a minimum wage in order for them to buy food and to pay their minimum expenses like rent. They may have a 1-year assignment or a 2-year assignment. Most of these people are young kids out of high school who may never have even had a job before, and now they have a job as an AmeriCorp volunteer with this wonderful hope that they can use the 2 years, the stipend that they receive of about $4,600 a year, for college expenses, for educational expenses.

Why would we increase a Pell Grant and not require anything of our young people, but we have an opportunity with AmeriCorp to have someone provide a service to their community, learn a skill and put aside money for education? They can't spend the stipend for anything other than educational needs.

So I just really would encourage my colleague to reconsider doing this. It is destructive, I think, to the program. It is, I think, foolish to think that we would not want these young people gainfully employed in society.

And I make this point particularly to my Republican colleagues. We helped write this bill. The Clinton administration was going to have a one-size-fits-all, and they said we will have a competitive model. We will run these programs State by State by State. We will have them be local programs so you have not the one-size-fits-all. The States then decide what programs competing on the State and local level should be funded. And the program really works well.

I think, if anything, we should be adding more money to AmeriCorp, not less.

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose my friend and colleague's amendment. I certainly support the intent to provide more money for TRIO, and I also championed additional funds for the geriatric programs in the 2007 continuing resolution. But I can't support this cut to AmeriCorp.

Like my colleague from Connecticut who just spoke, I was a Peace Corps volunteer. The point was made you are not a volunteer if you get paid. Well, nobody gets rich at these jobs. You have to have some money to live, to pay the rent, to buy your food, and to call home on occasion.

□ 1915

So you still can be a volunteer and receive a small portion of income to maintain your livelihood while you're providing this service, but this program gives young Americans the opportunity to express their idealism, to give something back and to learn and to round themselves out and to broaden their horizons.

In fact, since AmeriCorps was established back in 1993, it has demonstrated some pretty remarkable results. Eighty-one percent of former members have volunteered. Additionally, after leaving AmeriCorps service in other areas, 89 percent of former members became employed in the public sector, and Lord knows we need good people working in the public sector. Ninety percent of organizations said AmeriCorps members helped their involvement with other organizations in the community.

Young people are idealistic. They want to do something positive in their lives. This is one of the few programs that we have in the Federal Government that gives them that opportunity. So I would again reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I'm pleased to yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Madam Chairman, I am just going to briefly respond to my two distinguished Peace Corps representatives. I know both of them have had ample experience understanding what the Peace Corps is all about.

When they came to Congress, we didn't have the AmeriCorps. In fact, the AmeriCorps is only a recent program here in Congress, and it's been funded continually every year.

I think this is a question not of the Peace Corps merits, but this is a question of priorities. And I think both of them would realize that the TRIO, which helps low-income students in college, is probably just as deserving, as well as geriatric education programs that are part of the amendment here which would get more funding. So it's only in terms of priority, and I think when you look at the two programs, I think they trump the AmeriCorps.

I just would conclude by giving you an example, perhaps highlight two outstanding participants in the TRIO programs that are from my congressional district.

A sophomore at Loften High School in Gainesville, Florida, Juliun Kinsey was one of only 30 students nationwide selected as a Young Entrepreneur of 2007 by the National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship for his unique and high-quality business plan. As a result, he received an all-expense paid trip to an awards banquet in New York City and a cash award.

Another example is Brooke Bostic, a TRIO program participant and a sophomore at Buchholz High School, which is also in Gainesville. He was one of only six students from Florida whose paper on global issues was selected for entry in the United Nations Association Student Paper Competition in New York City this spring.

So both these students benefited from the TRIO program. I think it has ample accommodation for us to say it has a higher priority when we take just a small portion from the AmeriCorps to use for this TRIO program.

So with that, Madam Chairman, I yield back to my distinguished colleague and thank him for the opportunity.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend for his comments, and I would just like to underscore one point that he made, and that is, that all appropriations bills are bills that relate to priorities.

And we oftentimes hear from our good friends on the other side that we're quibbling or pretending or all sorts of descriptions about what's going on here tonight, but Madam Chairman, what's going on here tonight is the work of our democracy and the work of representatives in Congress to best represent their constituents.

And to scoff at ordering priorities for spending at the Federal level, I don't believe it's an appropriate message to send to the American people. This is important work. This is hard-earned taxpayer money, and it behooves us to spend as much time as any Member in this House so desires to determine the best way in which that money ought to be spent.

So I commend my friend for standing up for the priorities that he believes are most appropriate in this bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

Page 33, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $3,500,000)'' .

Page 38, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,500,000)''.

Page 39, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $3,500,000)''.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member on a very well-crafted and bipartisan bill. I'd like to particularly thank the chairman for including a nearly $100 million increase to the Ryan White CARE Act.

My amendment would add a $3.5 million increase to Ryan White title IV funding.

Title IV's unique model of coordinated, family-centered care has proven successful at promoting better health. HIV-positive children treated by title IV have reduced hospitalizations, fewer symptoms, and fewer opportunistic infections, resulting in overall improved health and longer life. Babies are more likely to be born HIV-free if their HIV-positive mothers receive prenatal care through a title IV program.

Nearly 90 percent of the people cared for by title IV live below the poverty level, and 88 percent are African American or Latino.

As HIV infections in women and young people continue to rise, disproportionately impacting low-income women and youth of color, title IV programs have needed additional resources in recent years.

A $3.5 million increase to title IV will prevent cuts to HIV services for women, children, youth and families living with HIV. Even this modest increase can help bring more pregnant women and young people into care and keep them in care.

Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member as well, and I want to acknowledge the advocacy and support of Congressman HANK JOHNSON from the State of Georgia as well.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JINDAL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JINDAL:

Page 33, line 25, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $37,200,000) (increased by $37,200,000)''.

Mr. JINDAL. Madam Chairman, the current bill provides $37.2 million for nurse education and retention at level funding from the last fiscal year.

Nursing is the Nation's largest health care profession, with an estimated 2.9 million active, licensed registered nurses. However, only 212,927 of these RNs received their licenses after 2000.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects there will be approximately 1 million new job openings for registered nurses by 2010.

In 1980, 26 percent of RNs were under the age of 30. Today, less than 9 percent of RNs are under the age of 30, with the average nurse being 46.8 years of age.

In 2004, the highest level of educational preparation for nurses was 17.5 with a diploma, 33.7 percent had an associate degree, 34 percent had a baccalaureate degree, and 13 percent with a master's or doctoral degree.

The number of full-time nursing faculty required to fill this nursing gap is approximately 40,000. Currently, however, there are less than 17,000 full-time nursing faculty in the system.

The average age of a nursing professor is 52, and the average age of an associate professor is 49. Retirement accounts for about 25 percent of the decline in nurse faculty.

In 2005, 81 percent of accredited nursing schools stated they needed additional faculty. Only 350 to 400 nursing students receive doctoral degrees each year. Given that 52 percent of nursing schools require doctorate degrees as a criterion for professorship, it is imperative to increase the number of student nurses receiving doctoral degrees.

Because of the faculty shortage of those both willing and skilled to teach, nursing schools turned away over 30,000 qualified applicants in 2005 and 16,000 in 2004 to entry-level BA nursing programs.

Madam Chairman, my amendment directs an additional $37.2 million for nurse education retention, which would double funding from fiscal year 2007 levels. This account targets the education, practice and retention in response to the growing nursing shortage.

And in anticipating a potential objection that the amendment doesn't specify this, it will be possible to fund this amount from other accounts while still providing increased funding for other accounts, for example, like Job Corps' construction and renovation or Job Corps administration. In other words, within the underlying bill, it is possible to fund this amount while still providing increases to other accounts. Other accounts have been increased. I simply would like to make sure that we provide additional funding to address the critical nursing shortage that we are facing in our country, to both improve access, improve quality and decrease the cost of our health care.

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, if I could, I'd like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman who's offered the amendment.

I'd like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana what is the offset that he's proposed to pay for this additional expense.

Mr. JINDAL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JINDAL. The amendment actually increases and reduces funding, so it's more to indicate an intent. But as an example, what I offered as an example was it would be possible to fund this amendment from accounts, for example, from the increase in the Job Corps construction and renovation account, from the Job Corps administration account, from other accounts that have been increased, while still leaving increases in those accounts.

So, even though this amendment does not take money from those accounts, it could be funded in that way.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Just a further inquiry to the gentleman. In order to add funds at a certain point in the bill, you have to derive those funds from another point in the bill. Would you please, for the record, identify where these $37 million come from.

Mr. JINDAL. If the gentleman would yield, again the amendment increases and then reduces by $37.2 million. But, for example, the money could come from the Job Corps construction and renovation fund, which is currently funded at $12.9 million above the President's request, from the Job Corps administration fund, which is funded at $28 million above last year's.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Would the gentleman care to identify which of those two funds he will provide this offset from?

Mr. JINDAL. Absolutely. The amendment doesn't do this. But, for example, $7.9 million could be taken from the Job Corps construction and renovation fund. From the Job Corps administration fund, $14 million could be taken. From the community service employment fund, the remaining funds could be taken. In all three cases, it would actually leave more funding than was there in fiscal year 2007.

So, again, the amendment doesn't actually reduce those accounts by those three amounts, but the funding could be provided in that way, still leaving increased funding in those three accounts.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Reclaiming my time, Madam Chairman, my understanding is that these funds, the offset would have to be provided from within the HRSA account, and while the amendment may be in order, I don't believe the offset is correct procedure.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1930

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment, leaving aside the underlying question of the funding issue of where the dollars come from. I appreciate the ranking member's point with regard to that.

I want to go to the point the gentleman raises as far as the necessity and the importance of making sure that we have appropriate dollars spent on nurse education and retention and to have a level of funding for 2007. I come from the great State of New Jersey, and within the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent, I represent several, over five good hospitals and also long-term health care facilities as well.

As I travel about the Fifth Congressional District, and I meet with the various hospitals and the administrators from such, and I also meet with the people from the long-term health facilities as well, when I travel down to Trenton, our State capital, to meet with our State hospital associations as well, one of the first issues that always comes up in our discussion is the issue of the availability and quality of nurses in the State of New Jersey, I should say the availability of quality nurses in the State of New Jersey. Every nurse that we have is a quality nurse. We just need more of them in the State.

To that end, on a positive note I should add, we have initiated for some facilities in our State where we are providing more nurse training than we ever had before. One of the things, I will just say from a parochial interest, is once we do have that training for the nurses, we are going to do everything we possibly can to make sure that they stay after being trained in the State of New Jersey, but we will, of course, if need be, maybe allow them to go out to some other States as well down South, where I believe they probably have a need as well.

But this is a bill from a national perspective. I know the gentleman can speak to this more eloquently than I. This is not simply an issue up in the Northeast, and this is not an issue down South as well. I am sure that I can speak to any Member of this body from any portion of this country, and they will tell me similar stories that I am recounting here right now, that we have a lack of quality, skilled nurses in this country.

Maybe there are other underlying reasons for this. One that comes to mind, of course, is the rate of compensation for nurses. When you talk to nurses, when you consider the number of hours they put in as far as the training they have to go through initially, and then the net length of the time they have to get the other skills necessary to become a nurse, and then the amount of pay that they get, it is certainly not commensurate to what they provide to this community and to this country. On top of that, of course, is the long hours that they must struggle with in their jobs, and the conditions that they have to work with and under in certain circumstances as well.

So I take my hat off to the nursing establishment, the nurses, the young people, men and women that decide to go into this career. If there is anything we can do as a national body to facilitate that and encourage and foster this, I will support it.

So I commend the gentleman for coming up with the idea to make an amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriation bill to double funding for nurse education and retention, as they said, from the $37.2 million that's currently in the bill.

I commend his work. If I can work with him on this initiative or other initiatives in the future to address the issue of nurse retention, I am more than happy to do so.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chair, this is another one of those ''let's pretend'' devices that I guess we are going to be afflicted with the next 2 days.

This amendment doesn't do nothing to nobody, and it doesn't do nothing for somebody. The fact is that it pretends to move $37 million out of this account, and then it puts $37 million back into this account and pretends that something has been accomplished.

There is no congressional direction that I know of that's being accomplished by this amendment. There is no consensus about what it does. It makes no changes in either the bill or the report. As a practical matter, it doesn't do anything except let somebody pretend that they have just done something for nurses' education.

If it makes you feel good to play a ''let's pretend'' game, go ahead and vote for it. But let's not kid ourselves. This amendment is not a real amendment. It has no real impact. It pretends to have an increase. It has, in fact, no offset. It's simply a shell game.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 35, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $11,037,000)''.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chair, 2 years ago the President signed the Stem Cell Research and Therapeutic Act into law.

This bipartisan legislation is designed to turn medical waste to medical miracles by deriving stem cells from umbilical cords and placentas after the birth of a child.

Cord blood transplantation is saving lives and is doing so today. It is one of the most promising and exciting fields in the area of regenerative medicine. The bipartisan legislation, Madam Chair, establishes a nationwide integrated bone marrow core blood stem cell transplantation program.

The good news, according to a July 13 technical assistance briefing memo by HRSA, is that six major grant recipients, Duke, New York Blood, Puget Sound Blood Center, Stem Cyte, the University of Colorado and the Anderson Cancer Center at the University of Texas have received funds for state-of-the-art programs that are now part of the newly created National Cord Blood Inventory.

With significant infrastructure now in place, and more blood grant centers imminent, and single point of access to facilitate the delivery of those units, more than 4,600 units of lifesaving cord blood has already been collected.

HRSA reports that approximately $22 million from fiscal years 2004 and 2007 appropriations will make collection of some 17,000 cord blood units possible by the end of fiscal year 2007.

"The question is—then what?

According to HRSA—in FY08—the new Cord Blood Program, just coming into it's own, will have to rely entirely on new appropriations.

So the bad news, it seems to me, is that if funded at about $4 million for FY08, the amount in the bill, the current grant recipients will have to dramatically scale back in their cord blood banking initiatives just as they're ramping up; just as breakout is occurring.

At $4 million, only about 3,000 units will be available in FY08 for medical realization of the goal of 150,000 units the experts tell us is needed to provide genetic matches for over 90 percent of Americans who can be aided by cord blood transplant.

We've come so far—the network is in place. And that money buys more cord blood which means more people cured and more research to save even more lives.

The $15 million that my colleague from Alabama and I are asking Members to support comports with the authorized level and is derived from within the HRSA allocation, which in the underlying bill is being increased by $69 million over last year and $1.3 billion over the President's request. Our shift represents less than ¼ of 1 percent of HRSA's $7 billion.

Surely, we can accommodate an $11 million shift—the net effect of the amendment—to a proven regenerative medical treatment that will mitigate—even cure—a myriad of diseases including leukemia and sickle cell anemia.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. OBEY. Same deal as we have offered several times earlier today. If the gentleman is willing to shorten his remarks, we are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I certainly appreciate that very generous offer.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I will be very brief.

Cord blood has proven to be very effective for many lifesaving purposes. We need to support this research.

I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman offered by New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTON OF TEXAS

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTON of Texas:

Page 36, beginning at line 5, strike ''*Provided further*, That within'' and all that follows through the end of the proviso.

Mr. BARTON of Texas (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I am willing to not speak at all if Mr. OBEY is willing to take my amendment without me talking about it.

I was chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee in the last Congress, and one of the things that I am most proud of was that in the late stages of that Congress we passed the Ryan White CARE Reauthorization Act of 2006. It's a 3-year reauthorization act. It was a bipartisan, bicameral compromise.

Some of the House Members that worked on it included Congresswoman MARY BONO on the Republican side, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO on the Democrat side, Senator ENZI, Senator KENNEDY, Senator BOXER, Senator FEINSTEIN, Congressman DINGELL, of course myself, and many, many others.

One of the cornerstones of that reauthorization was a formula change in the dispensation of HIV/AIDS funding to more reflect where the epidemic is actually still in play in this country. Under the old formula you had one-half of funds based on a formula based on population, things like this, and then you had one-half of the funds based on a discretionary fund.

Under the reauthorization we changed that to two-thirds formula and one-third discretionary. But because we were changing the formula, we did put in a hold-harmless provision for the formula funding.

What we were trying to do was make more funds available to those areas of the country where the epidemic was still prevalent and growing, and less funds on a discretionary basis where the epidemic had once been centered but was now thankfully not as prevalent. The pending bill before us changes that formula.

Now, normally, that would be considered legislation on an appropriations act, and a point of order would have been reserved by Chairman DINGELL of the committee, and all we would have to do is make a point of order, and it would be sustained. Chairman DINGELL did not reserve that point of order, so I have to rise to try to strike it.

My amendment does not change the amount of funding for HIV/AIDS. It does prevent this reversion of the formula so that we would keep the bipartisan, bicameral agreement, that we would have two-thirds of funds based on a traditional formula and one-third of the funding based on discretionary.

Now, the effect of the pending legislation that I am attempting to strike, if we don't strike it, two cities will benefit, Newark, New Jersey, and San Francisco, California. Every other city that currently receives AIDS funding and HIV funding will be disproportionately disadvantaged.

So I hope that the House will accept my amendment, and we will keep the formula that was agreed to after intense negotiations where we have a two-thirds and one-third split based on formula and discretionary, and a hold-harmless on the formula side but not a hold-harmless on the discretionary side.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) a question if it's appropriate.

I wanted to ask the gentleman a question specifically about his amendment and the hold-harmless clause and its impact possibly on Ryan White.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. In the reauthorization bill that was carefully negotiated on both sides of the aisle and the Senate, we maintained a hold-harmless provision for the formula funding under the bill, but we did not put that hold-harmless provision to the discretionary funding in the bill.

Discretionary funds are based on actual active case counts, how many HIV/AIDS patients you have. There is a methodology to determine how many of those individuals there are, and then the discretionary funds are distributed based on need.

In the legislation that's pending in the appropriations bill, the hold-harmless provision, which in the authorization bill we had on the formula side, is also applied to the discretionary side. The effect of that would be that an area that at one time had a large number of HIV/AIDS patients, but those patients had either passed away or been cured or moved out of the area, they wouldn't get to use the old patient count for their discretionary request. They could only count for discretionary purposes the number of active cases that they currently had in their area.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, what the chairman, I believe, and the committee sought to do by adding this language was to create a stop loss that does not prevent cuts, but rather reduces losses to a level that the jurisdiction can absorb in one fiscal year.

For example, the San Francisco EMA, which includes San Mateo and Marin Counties, for example, will still receive about a $2.3 million cut. The language caps losses for eligible metropolitan areas like San Francisco at 8.4 percent, misrepresents the 5 percent hold-harmless loss that was agreed to in last year's reauthorization, plus the average loss for all title I jurisdiction, which was 3.4 percent.

□ 1945

But I think it is important to note, and then I would be happy to yield if the gentleman would like to respond, here are some of the other jurisdictions that will benefit from the stop loss language which included in the chairman's mark: Hartford, Connecticut, 892,000; New Haven, Connecticut, 712,000; Nassau-Suffolk, New York, 432,000; Puerto Rico, 310,000; Caguas, 286,000; Sacramento, 195,000. And it goes on and on and on.

So what we are trying to understand here is how the chairman's language, which seeks to remedy a particular problem, is fundamentally changed by the gentleman's amendment.

I would be happy to yield for his response.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Under the old law, the funding was based one-half on a formula and one-half on discretionary, and the discretionary counted active cases and also cumulatively, I believe, cases of individuals who had expired because of the infection. Under the new formula that we passed in the reauthorization bill, we changed the formula to two-thirds instead of one-half, and we reduced the discretionary from one-half to one-third.

We did put a hold harmless provision in on the formula side, but we did not apply that hold harmless to the discretionary side. So we also had a specific hold harmless for the first year of the

new authorization which we are currently in.

The effect of the language that is in the pending bill basically puts hold harmless not only on the formula funding, which we increase from one-half to two-thirds, but it also puts it on the discretionary side, the effect of which would be areas which don't have as large a patient count as they once did would get more discretionary funding; conversely, those areas that 5 or 6 years ago, perhaps, didn't have much of an HIV/AIDS epidemic would be shortchanged.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, I know my time is just about expired; I know the chairman may have some concluding remarks, but this has been very difficult from the beginning, and the chairman's language in the mark seeks to remedy ongoing problems, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, over 20,000 people have died from AIDS in the San Francisco-Bay Area, and AIDS continues to be the second leading cause of premature death in our area. In addition, and it is because of improved treatments, because of programs like the Ryan White AIDS program, nearly 23,000 individuals are currently living with HIV/AIDS, more than at any point in the history of the epidemic. Therefore, it is not the right time for the people in the San Francisco-Bay Area to have any cuts in their AIDS/HIV programs, because it is starting to work but it isn't working well enough, including my own county of Marin County north of San Francisco and the county of San Mateo south of San Francisco. Our communities have the third largest cumulative number of AIDS cases in the entire country.

This amendment will recklessly and irresponsibly put the lives of many of our constituents at risk. The very idea truly astounds me, the very idea that these lifesaving programs would be cut, that there would even be an offer to cut them while we are spending $10 billion a month to occupy Iraq just is beyond my comprehension. I have to wonder, what are some people thinking about? What are their priorities? I can tell you my priorities are with the health and the well-being of our constituents.

Treatments and support programs and systems for HIV/AIDS have come a long way. Now is not the time to pull the rug out from under the programs that are working and to stop supporting those who are living with AIDS and HIV, particularly in the most affected areas such as San Francisco and Newark, New Jersey. Therefore, I urge my colleagues, please oppose this misguided amendment.

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

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Barton amendment. This issue of HIV and AIDS, first of all, is a matter of life and death, and I don't want to see us tamper around with the language which we have in this bill.

Despite the inclusion of language in the Ryan White Reauthorization Act to protect against these drastic cuts that would destabilize existing systems of HIV and AIDS, one jurisdiction's award was cut by 31 percent, or $8.6 million. Several other jurisdictions also received larger than anticipated cuts. So the language that we have creates just really a stop loss effort that doesn't prevent further cuts but just reduces losses to a level that a jurisdiction can absorb in one fiscal year, which still to me is just not acceptable, but it is the best we can do in this bill. For instance, as we said earlier, the San Francisco EMA will still receive a $2.3 million cut.

The language also caps losses for eligible metropolitan areas like San Francisco at 8.4 percent, which represents the 5 percent hold harmless loss that was agreed to in last year's reauthorization plus the average loss for all title I jurisdictions, which was 3.4 percent. Also, the losses for transitional grant areas which were not protected by the hold harmless in the reauthorization will be capped at 13.4 percent.

We heard earlier some of the jurisdictions that were included in the chairman's mark, but in addition there is Jersey City, New Jersey; Dutchess County, New York; and others.

My colleague from California just mentioned over 20,000 people have died from AIDS in the San Francisco EMA, and AIDS continues to be the second leading cause of premature death in the city and county of San Francisco. Also, nearly 23,000 people are currently living with HIV and AIDS, more than at any point in the history of the epidemic. San Francisco also has the third largest cumulative number of AIDS cases in the country. In fiscal 2006, San Francisco's EMA received about $27 million. In fiscal year 2007, it is only $18 million. This represents again, what I said earlier, a 31.4 percent reduction.

Provisions were included in last year's reauthorization to prevent drastic cuts of this sort, and we don't believe HRSA properly interpreted these provisions.

I hope that we oppose the Barton amendment. We do not need any more destabilizing initiatives that would affect people's lives. This is a matter of life and death. We need to look at how we can begin to move forward to make sure that all of those that need the HIV/AIDS services receive those services in terms of care, treatment, and prevention, and start looking at how to do that rather than do the things that the Barton amendment does. So I urge us to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Chairman, I had the privilege to serve 10 years as a county supervisor in the County of San Diego serving a community that desperately needed help with the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and I also happened to have been privileged enough to serve on Interstate and Commerce on the Health Committee that reauthorized the Ryan White Act.

The biggest issue here that is being discussed by the Member from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is the fact that the need should follow the patient. I am sure the gentleman from Chicago recognizes that all of these agencies and all of this money is supposed to be to service the people, not to groups, not to cities. It is human beings we are talking about in need. His motion is a compromise. It doesn't say don't strike the need on everything, but it says let's take half of it or take a portion and give priority to those who need it.

Madam Chairman, this would be like somebody thinking that it would be appropriate to send as much money to an empty hospital that used to serve patients as it is to send it to the new hospital that is full of patients. All he is saying is, let's take a portion of this and commit it totally to need. Not all of it, but a portion of it. How can we go back to our districts and say the agency in a certain city was more important than the patients and the people who are sick who just happen not to be sick in that same area?

The fact is having a formula that puts weight to those who used to be served is an inappropriate formula, and we all agreed in the 1990s that we were going to phase that out. The gentleman's motion only moves forward that agreement we have always had when we talked about Ryan White, that Ryan White was a young man, not an agency. Ryan White was a human being who had AIDS.

This grant, this program was never meant to serve groups, cities, or agencies except if they were the victims of this hideous disease called AIDS/HIV.

And so I think, let's stop a second. These groups and people that want us to send them money because they used to serve a large number of patients and realize that they may have to move or they might have to change their employment, that is not what this fund is for. It is for serving patients. And so all the gentleman is saying is, please, let's follow the need, and let's not say that it is for treating those who are sick if we are going to send it to agencies that are not serving. Let's send it to those agencies that are serving. At

least let's start moving towards the total amount of this fund. And the honor of Ryan White is to make these funds totally committed to serving patients that are ill today, the patients that need the service today, not patients of the past. We can't solve the problems of the past, but we can solve the problems that face us today, this year, and in the future, and that is by making sure funds are committed to those who are actually sick today.

And I would support all of the funds going to only those based on a formula of today's service, because we are talking about this year that these funds are supposed to be sent. The gentleman has accepted a compromise; I am willing to accept that compromise. We should be able to go this far, and common decency says the gentleman should get a chance to be able to have this compromise worked out.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I want to point out in the brief time that the gentleman from California still has, the Barton amendment doesn't lessen funding for this; it doesn't change the total amount of dollars at all. It simply protects the agreed-upon compromise that the stakeholders, the House, and the Senate on both sides of the aisle agreed to in the last Congress. And what the compromise was is, we moved more to a formula funding mechanism, two-thirds, and one-third for discretionary. And on the discretionary side, that is totally based on active HIV/AIDS case counts. It does not include people who have passed away from AIDS.

And the gentlelady that spoke earlier about the number of people in San Francisco that have contracted the disease and have passed away is totally right that those people, unfortunately, are no longer here. They should not be counted for the discretionary funding because you can't help them now.

□ 2000

We want the funding from the discretionary side to go to those that actually still have the infection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from California, but I think it's appropriate to recognize the gentlelady from California because I have struck the last word already. And if she will give me 15 seconds, I would be more than grateful.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, we agree that this is about people and not about cities, and that's why the committee has an overall increase in the Ryan White funding.

San Francisco has more people living, not dying of AIDS, but living AIDS, than any other point in the history of the epidemic. The need is not going down in any of the 11 jurisdictions protected by this language and, therefore, the committee is correct in opposing the Barton amendment.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to Mr. BARTON's amendment. I believe that it will perpetuate a system of winners and losers in the allocation of Federal resources for AIDS.

When Congress reauthorized the Ryan White AIDS program last year, we included language to allow the historic epicenters of the disease to continue providing care to those in need. The language was specifically intended to protect against drastic cuts that would destabilize the existing infrastructure for HIV/AIDS care.

Now, my friend from Texas has been absolutely consistent, and so have I. He's always been opposed to what I've just described, and I have supported it. So it's gone back and forth. But we've both been consistent in terms of our positions. I obviously respectfully disagree with his amendment, because I think it's important to understand, number one, A, that you have to protect the infrastructure. This isn't simply, when we say the care of people, you have to have infrastructure for it. And I think, underlying the gentleman's amendment is the notion that dead people are being funded, and that simply is not the case. We are both on the Energy and Commerce Committee. We've debated it there, and that's why I'm bringing some of the flavor of what we've debated there.

Over 20,000 people have died from AIDS in San Francisco's EMA. That's the eligible metropolitan area.

Now, the gentleman from California that spoke just a few moments ago talked about his time on the Board of Supervisors. That's where I came from in San Mateo County. And San Mateo and the City and County of San Francisco have been partners in this. And it's what has really held up and helped to build the infrastructure to take very good care of people. We take it seriously. Every dollar in this, every dollar in this has an effect on human beings. So this is not some tidy formula that somehow is not going to affect the infrastructure. So that's another reason why I oppose this.

San Francisco's award for fiscal 2007 was cut by 31.4 percent, or $8.6 million. Now, in Federal money, $8.6 million, unfortunately, is not considered serious money. This is devastating in this EMA. I know of what I speak. I've been there on the ground. I see where the dollars go and what people get.

Now, several other jurisdictions also have received larger than anticipated cuts. So I don't believe that the HRSA properly interpreted these provisions and that this bill, very importantly, corrects that error.

The stop loss language does not prevent cuts. Instead, it reduces losses to levels that can be reasonably absorbed in one fiscal year. And that's really a very important operational phrase, ''reasonably absorbed in one fiscal year.''

Any Member of Congress want to take a 31.4 cut in what their income is to help them take care of what they have to take care of their responsibilities and obligations? It's absurd. It's absurd. So that's why we are rising in opposition to the amendment.

So the language caps losses for the EMAs at 8.4 percent. And I think that this represents the 5 percent hold-harmless loss that was agreed to in last year's reauthorization.

I think the Barton amendment would prevent us from responding to the real needs of people that suffer from HIV and AIDS, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I rise tonight in support of the Barton amendment. I hadn't intended to speak about this, but I was listening over in my office, and I am extremely concerned about the structure of this provision that has been added to the bill.

By increasing the percentage of the ''hold-harmless aspect'' the concern has to be about where are those dollars going to come from to pay for those increases?

My understanding is that other communities where authorized identified need may now be placed at risk. And yes, that would include my home district in north Texas. That would include the City of Fort Worth, Texas, where there are great numbers of people who, where unfortunately, the rate of acquisition of AIDS is increasing.

Madam Chairman, this was a carefully negotiated compromise on our committee, appropriately so. It was an authorizing committee. At best, this activity tonight is authorizing on an appropriations bill. At worst, it is a thinly disguised earmark for the Speaker of the House. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Barton amendment.

I yield to the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I don't want to belabor this, but I do want people to understand what the compromise was. Those that represent, as has been characterized, the epicenter of the original contagion on AIDS/HIV, are protected in the compromise.

Two-thirds of the funding is based on a formula that advantages those areas where the epidemic started. And we hold that formula harmless. You can't have, on the formula funding, more than a 5 percent cut the first year. That's this year. Then next year you get 100 percent of what you got this year, and the third year you get 100 percent of what you got the second

year. So there's no drastic, there are some reductions because on the discretionary side the population centers are changing. And on the discretionary side, the compromise was not to have a hold-harmless, but to base those on actual active HIV/AIDS counts.

Now, if you accept the base bill and reject the Barton amendment, you're going to have two areas, primarily, I'm told San Francisco and Newark, that get more funding, and every other area in the country gets less.

And since all the AIDS groups supported the bipartisan compromise, and both Chambers did, I don't think it's fair to change that by putting something in a base text that there were no hearings on, there were no amendments on, it wasn't debated in the subcommittee or the full committee, the appropriations, it was just put in, and our only opportunity is to try to amend that bill right now.

And again, if a point of order had been raised against it, all we'd have to do is make the point of order, but it wasn't reserved. So I think what the compromise was in the last Congress is eminently fair, and was carefully crafted and, as Mr. BURGESS has pointed out, worked out with everybody having input, and that the Barton amendment, which just reverts it back to that base compromise should be supported.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURGESS. I'll be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Chairman, many people in this country would think the compromise being proposed doesn't go far enough. I think most people would say that the money for AIDS should follow the patient, not a bureaucracy. But it's equal protection.

Does somebody with AIDS in Fort Worth have any more or less of a right to Federal funds to take care of AIDS than somebody who lives in San Francisco? How about equal protection here?

Does an AIDS patient in Fort Worth have equal rights with an AIDS patient in San Francisco? That's the question here.

The compromise gives 75 percent preference to San Francisco. How much more preference do you want? And let's not talk about equal protection any more if you want to do this.

He has bent over backwards to try to cooperate and meet the people from San Francisco halfway at phasing this out. All we're asking for is stick to the compromise rather than continue to go. And I don't think that anybody that believes in equal protection can honestly say that an AIDS patient who happens to be in Fort Worth doesn't have the same rights and shouldn't be given the same protection and just as much money per capita as somebody in San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. 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 Texas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Such sums as may be necessary to carry out subpart 1 of part A of title VII of the Public Health Service Act. For administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program under such subpart, including section 709 of such Act, $2,906,000.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND

For payments from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, such sums as may be necessary for claims associated with vaccine-related injury or death with respect to vaccines administered after September 30, 1988, pursuant to subtitle 2 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for necessary administrative expenses, not to exceed $3,528,000 shall be available from the Trust Fund to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING

To carry out titles II, III, VII, XI, XV, XVII, XIX, XXI, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) (''PHS Act''), sections 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, 203, 301, and 501 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 811, 812, 813, 841, 842, 843, 861, and 951), sections 20, 21, and 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 669, 670, and 671), title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (8 U.S.C. 1522 note), and for expenses necessary to support activities related to countering potential biological, disease, nuclear, radiological, and chemical threats to civilian populations; including purchase and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, $6,141,753,000, of which $10,500,000 shall remain available until expended for equipment, construction, and renovation of facilities; of which $581,335,000 shall remain available until expended for the Strategic National Stockpile under section 319F–2 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6b); of which $50,000,000 shall be available until expended to provide screening and treatment for first response emergency services personnel related to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center; and of which $122,769,000 for international HIV/AIDS shall remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That in addition, such sums as may be derived from authorized user fees, which shall be credited to this account: *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, the following amounts shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 238j): (1) $12,794,000 to carry out the National Immunization Surveys; (2) $120,000,000 to carry out the National Center for Health Statistics surveys; (3) $24,751,000 to carry out information systems standards development and architecture and applications-based research used at local public health levels; (4) $39,173,000 for Health Marketing; (5) $31,000,000 to carry out Public Health Research; and (6) $88,361,000 to carry out research activities within the National Occupational Research Agenda: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for injury prevention and control at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may be used, in whole or in part, to advocate or promote gun control: *Provided further*, That up to $31,800,000 shall be made available until expended for Individual Learning Accounts for full-time equivalent employees of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: *Provided further*, That the Director may redirect the total amount made available under authority of section 3 of the Vaccine and Immunization Amendments of 1990 (Public Law 101–502) to activities the Director may so designate: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are to be notified promptly of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $12,500,000 may be available for making grants under section 1509 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 300n–4a) to not more than 15 States, tribes, or tribal organizations: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated, $10,000 is for official reception and representation expenses when specifically approved by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated may be used to implement section 2625 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff–33): *Provided further*, That employees of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Public Health Service, both civilian and Commissioned Officers, detailed to States, municipalities, or other organizations under authority of section 214 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 215), shall be treated as non-Federal employees for reporting purposes only and shall not be included within any personnel ceiling applicable to the Agency, Service, or the Department of Health and Human Services during the period of detail or assignment.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to cancer, $4,870,382,000, of which up to $8,000,000 may be used for facilities repairs and improvements at the NCI–Frederick Federally Funded Research and Development Center in Frederick, Maryland.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Page 80, line 2, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 41, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, the amendment that I'm offering tonight is a very simple, straightforward one. As was just read, it would remove $10 million from a program that was in fact zeroed out in the Bush administration's budget request, and then use those dollars, that money to increase the level of funding currently appropriated to the National

Cancer Institute at the National Institutes of Health.

Madam Chairman, some time ago President Nixon unofficially declared a war on cancer in his State of the Union Address back in 1971. Since then much progress has been made in the area of cancer research, thankfully. And over the last 3½ decades, science and research has continued to break down barriers in the fight against this dreadful disease.

Today, cancer is no longer the mystery disease that it once was, and researchers know infinitely more now today about the prevention, the detection and the treatment of the disease than ever before in history.

□ 2015

The results from all of this research is now beginning to bear fruit on people's lives every day. Fewer people are dying from cancer in 2004 than they were in 2003, according to the studies. An American public is witnessing declining rates for most major cases, including breast cancer, prostate cancer, and colorectal cancer as well.

So, Madam Chairman, I think that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has done a good job for increasing the budget of the National Cancer Institute this year in the bill, and Republicans supported a doubling of the budget at the National Institutes of Health in past sessions. I supported that. But I think we can do just a little bit more.

The account that this amendment would take from is the Alaska Native Education Equity program. That is a program, like we hear so often on this floor, that is basically a redundant program that the President has eliminated in his budget request. According to the administration, the Alaska Native students already receive benefits from the department in Indian education programs, which provide more than $118 million in formula grants to school districts and competitive grants for demonstration and professional development programs.

Now, Madam Chairman, when we consider how the Federal Government is prioritizing its spending, which really is what it is all about when we come to the floor on each and every one of these amendments, I submit that funding cancer research is more important than spending additional redundant money on a redundant Federal program.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, we have had a number of amendments that have dealt with line items at one point in the bill and then at a point later in the bill that has not been read yet, so I would respectfully suggest that the point of order is not appropriate as it has not been utilized on other amendments that have been offered and that all Members ought to be treated with equity in the offering of their amendments.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, if I may be heard further, that is a very quaint interpretation of the House rules. And, nonetheless, it does not at all address the fact that the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill, which I assume as a good conservative, the gentleman would be opposed to.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I would like to be heard on the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. The objection, if I understand it correctly, is that the assertion is that this increases the total of number of outlays for the bill. That would be the case if we are simply asking for an increase of $10 million for the Cancer Research Institute, but that is not what we are asking to be done. We are simply asking that $10 million in one line, Page 41, line 7, be increased by the $10 million but another line, page 80 line 2, after the first dollar amount insert, ''would be reduced by $10 million.'' So in point of fact, this amendment does not increase the total net dollar output of the underlying bill. It is a balanced amount. No increase, no decrease.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, if I might point out to the gentleman, just because it is neutral in budget authority does not mean it is neutral in outlays. It is not neutral in outlays, and, therefore, it is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to cardiovascular, lung, and blood diseases, and blood and blood products, $2,965,775,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL AND CRANIOFACIAL RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to dental disease, $395,753,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to diabetes and digestive and kidney disease, $1,731,893,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to neurological disorders and stroke, $1,559,106,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to allergy and infectious diseases, $4,632,019,000: *Provided*, That $300,000,000 may be made available to International Assistance Programs ''Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and Tuberculosis'', to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That such sums obligated in fiscal years 2003 through 2007 for extramural facilities construction projects are to remain available until expended for disbursement, with prior notification of such projects to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

Page 42, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $175,000)''.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, the bill we are debating today will direct $300 million to the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. This is an organization that was founded to fight deadly diseases in the world's poorest countries.

Madam Chairman, I have learned that the Global Fund's former executive director was spending money on activities well outside of its intended mission. According to a Boston Globe article which broke a story last February, the former executive director of the Global Fund frequently used Global Fund dollars in ways most of us, especially the American taxpayers, would find reckless.

Global Fund documents say he spent between $91 and $930 per day for limousines in London, Paris, Rome, Washington and San Francisco, averaging $376 a day. He spent $1,695 for a dinner for 12 at the United States Senate dining room here in Washington, D.C.; $225.86 to rent a suit; $8,780 for a boat cruise on Lake Geneva in Switzerland; $8,436 for a dinner in Switzerland for 63 people; $5,150 for a meal and drinks for 74 staff members at a retreat in Switzerland. The Global Fund documents cited other spending that included buying flowers for staff members and champagne at a retreat.

Madam Chairman, this sounds like American tax dollars being spent to improve the lifestyle of Global Fund employees. If you add up all the lavish spending just listed in the Boston Globe article, it comes to $24,512.72. At a dollar a dose, that money could have saved the lives of 24,514 infants from dying from malaria. That money could

have protected almost 5,000 families from being infected with malaria for a year at the cost of about $5 to spray a house with the cheapest insecticide.

Madam Chairman, the United States has contributed almost $3 billion to the Global Fund since 2001. I want to make sure that the Global Fund knows that the American people are watching the way they are spending their hard-earned dollars, and I want the director of the Global Fund to know that he is accountable to the United States taxpayers. And that is why my amendment reduces his salary from $320,000 a year to $145,000 a year, which is equal to the salary of the United States Global Fund AIDS coordinator.

I ask for support for my amendment. This is a shot over the bow to let the Global Fund know that we want American tax dollars spent to save lives, not to give lavish lifestyles to the Global Fund employees.

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

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I rise to strongly oppose the amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from Colorado.

First of all, as one who wrote the initial legislation that established the framework for the Global Fund, I want the gentlewoman to know that the Global Fund is the only international organization multilateral that is providing for care, prevention and treatment of those living with HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. It is a very successful effort. We have major international partners. We are the largest contributor to the fund. And I believe, and she can correct me if I am wrong, that the cut that she is talking about references a prior director of the fund who is no longer there. And, in fact, the fund has reorganized, is moving forward, and is doing quite well. And we discussed this in the subcommittee and we had testimony. We met with the officers and directors, the new executive director of the funds, and I would hate to see us cut a nickel from the Global Fund because we need every dime we can get to make sure that we address this global pandemic that is killing so many, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, could I inquire of the gentleman from New York, is the gentleman from New York intending to accept the amendment on his side?

Mr. WALSH of New York. I do, Madam Chairman.

Mr. OBEY. Then I would suggest accepting the amendment on this side. This is an amendment that does nothing, Madam Chairman, except, in my view, it is an effort to put people on the hook by ratifying some unacceptable conduct by someone who is no longer associated with the program. I don't intend to be associated with that kind of a problem, and so I think this is one of those nuisance amendments that is meant to enable someone to pose for political holy pictures without much effect.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2030

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:

An amendment by Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

An amendment by Mr. PLATTS of Pennsylvania.

An amendment by Mr. MARCHANT of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. JINDAL of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

Remaining postponed votes will be taken at a later time.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) 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 186, noes 237, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 642]

AYES—186

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
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
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—237

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
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)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor

Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
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
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Feeney
Hastert
Kucinich
Marchant
McMorris Rodgers
Rangel
Tancredo
Young (AK)

□ 2051

Messrs. WELCH of Vermont, PALLONE and PERLMUTTER and Mrs. BIGGERT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. HOBSON, GILCHREST and PICKERING changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PLATTS

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 250, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 643]

AYES—174

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Cuellar
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hobson
Holt
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mahoney (FL)
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McNerney
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—250

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Campbell (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hensarling
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
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
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Hastert
Kucinich
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Rangel
Tancredo
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 2057

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

Mr. FORBES and Mr. MCHUGH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARCHANT

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 277, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 644]

AYES—149

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)

Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

NOES—277

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Hastert
Kucinich
Rangel
Tancredo
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 2105

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JINDAL

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 243, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 645]

AYES—183

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boren
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Cuellar
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Engel
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—243

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty

Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Hastert
Kucinich
Rangel
Tancredo
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in the vote.

□ 2109

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 251, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 646]

AYES—173

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

NOES—251

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
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
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Hastert
Kucinich
McCaul (TX)
Rangel
Tancredo
Waters
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in the vote.

□ 2114

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALZ of Minnesota) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, 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. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2115

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 2007, during consideration of H.R. 1851, the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act, my vote on final passage was not recorded. I respectfully request that the RECORD reflect that had my vote been recorded properly on rollcall 629, it would have been registered as an ''aye.''

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE VIETNAM EDUCATION FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 205(a) of the Vietnam Education Foundation Act of 2000 (P.L. 106–554), 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 Directors of the Vietnam Education Foundation:

Upon the recommendation of the majority leader:

Mr. BLUMENAUER, Oregon.

Upon the recommendation of the minority leader:

Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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.

RAMOS/COMPEAN CASE

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, a long awaited Senate judiciary hearing on the prosecution of border agents Ramos and Compean occurred today. I was impressed with the Chair, Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN from California, and the questioning of Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas at the hearing.

The hearing brought to light the overzealous, overreacting and overreaching prosecution of these two Border Patrol agents, Ramos and Compean. It also showed us and the American public the difficulty our border protectors have on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Chief Aguilar of the Border Patrol said today that violence against border agents has increased. In just the first 4 days of last week, 11 assaults occurred against border agents. Over 2,000 assaults have occurred in the last 2½ years, and 12 officers have been killed in the last few years.

Not only is the border violent because of drug cartels, but violence occurs against these border agents. The border is not Disneyland, but the U.S. Attorney's Office showed they are living in Never Neverland by their relentless determination to see that these agents went to prison for 11 and 12 years a piece for just doing their job on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Much was said today, but I want to concentrate on the U.S. Government's main witness, the drug dealer who appears to have been a bought-and-paid-for witness that received immunity from prosecution. He received a get-out-of-jail-free card, received free medical attention for his wounds at the taxpayers' expense, and blanket amnesty to cross and recross the Texas-Mexico border whenever he wished. All this so he would testify against the two border agents, Ramos and Compean.

Mr. Speaker, as a former judge, it has been my experience that when prosecutors make deals with criminals in return for testimony, they usually get the testimony they want from the criminal, and the same is to be said in this case here.

These agents were sent to prison because one of them shot a drug dealer bringing in $1 million worth of drugs into the United States. The agents probably violated some Homeland Security policies, and maybe they should have been sanctioned or even fired, but to let the drug dealer go free because the agents violated a policy was an error in judgment on the part of our own government.

And the U.S. Attorney's Office had two choices, Mr. Speaker. They had the choice to prosecute a drug dealer bringing in $1 million worth of drugs, or they had the choice to prosecute two border agents that violated some policy, and our government chose poorly.

Of course, the Mexican Government got involved in this case and wrote an arrogant letter demanding prosecution by our government. It seems to me this may be the basis for the prosecution.

Let me tell you a little bit about this drug dealer. He received immunity from prosecution, but part of his deal was that he would cooperate with the U.S. Border Patrol and Federal prosecutors. The cooperation? Well, he never would tell who he was working for. He named no names of the drug cartels. He did not cooperate at all. And while he was waiting to testify in this case, he criss-crossed the Texas-Mexico border and brought in another load of drugs worth almost $1 million, and the Feds kept that from the jury.

Why wasn't it important to know about this second case? Because the entire prosecution was based on the testimony of the government's star witness, and the jury had the right to know that this drug dealer brought in another load of drugs while waiting to testify. So to judge his credibility as a witness, the jury had the right to know that, and that evidence was kept out at the insistence of the U.S. prosecutors.

The U.S. prosecutor made this drug dealer Aldrede to be some poor mule from Mexico that brought in a load of drugs for a little money for his sick mother down in Mexico, and that was not the case. He was an operative that moved back and forth across the Texas-Mexico border, and we know he brought in at least two loads of drugs just in a short period of time in this case.

This second load of drugs should have been brought to the attention of the jury. The prosecutors never prosecuted this Aldrede for that. They even had a DEA report that recommended prosecution. I've seen that DEA report, and based on my experience, a third-year law student could have prosecuted that case even though the U.S. Attorney's Office says, oh, there's not enough evidence. The jury should have known about this so as to have judged the credibility of this star witness.

So the government chose between border agents to be prosecuted doing their job or a drug dealer testifying and then bringing in drugs into the United States. Our government should be embarrassed about this case.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE ADMINISTRATION'S CASE FOR WAR AGAINST IRAN

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, for years the administration has been rigging its case for war against Iran with posturing, finger-wagging and name calling. Those are not my words. One of my hometown daily newspapers, the Seattle Post Intelligencer, authored those words as the first sentence of an editorial they published this morning entitled: ''Iran: No, not again.'' I will insert the Seattle PI editorial into the RECORD at this point.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligener Editorial Board, July 17, 2007]

IRAN: NO, NOT AGAIN

For years, this administration has been rigging its case for war against Iran, with posturing, finger wagging and name-calling.

And now, just as Iran has struck an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency for inspection of its nuclear plants, and just as the IAEA chief, Mohamed ElBaradei, has said that country is slowing progress on one of those facilities, the United Kingdom's Guardian newspaper reports that Vice President Dick Cheney is pushing for a military ''solution'' in Iran. Naturally, President Bush is backing him, going against Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert Gates, both of whom favor diplomacy over military action (heck, it worked with North Korea).

In May, Cheney paid a visit to the USS John C. Stennis in the Persian Gulf, 150 miles off Iran's coast, for no other reason than to deliver threats. The New York Times reported that while Cheney said nothing new, he ''stitched all of those warnings together, and the symbolism of sending the administration's most famous hawk to deliver the speech so close to Iran's coast was unmistakable.''

The U.S. rode roughshod over ElBaradei's insistence that Iraq didn't have weapons of mass destruction (he was right). And look where we are now. More than 3,000 American troops and tens of thousands of Iraqis dead in war that defies reason and sees no end. We fear the same might happen in Iran.

The fact is, the mainstream newspapers at home and around the world

are expressing grave concerns over what they fear may be the sequel to Iraq, namely, a military strike against Iran.

One of the sources used by the PI editorial is the Guardian newspaper of the United Kingdom which published a story yesterday with this headline: ''Cheney Pushes Bush to Act on Iran.''

The Guardian reports that: ''The balance in the internal White House debate over Iran has shifted back in favor of military action before President George Bush leaves office in 18 months.''

Ominously, the story adds: ''Although the Bush administration is in deep trouble over Iraq, it remains focused on Iran. A well-placed source in Washington said, 'Bush is not going to leave office with Iran still in limbo.' ''

Thoughtful newspapers and other worldwide people believe the Vice President is pushing for a military strike against Iran. The Vice President's presence and speech aboard an aircraft carrier near Iran in mid-May sent an unmistakable message, says the New York Times.

As the Guardian reports, The Vice President is winning the war for war inside the administration, and now the American people have to be brought along. That means the administration and its surrogates will make the data say what they need it to say.

We're already beginning to see how a new national intelligence assessment released just today will be manipulated. The report makes a persuasive and fact-driven case for getting our soldiers out of Iraq, because the President shifted away from the real war against terrorism to pursue his own agenda in Iraq.

But instead of a sober assessment of what's gone wrong in Iraq, we're hearing that terrorists have reconstituted their operations inside Iran. And the insinuation for military action is clear.

Like many, I would like to know what's really going on in Iran and what Iranian leaders are thinking and doing. Well, where can we turn for an assessment we can trust? We know the Vice President wants to use deadly force in Iran. We know that there are credible media reports that say the Vice President is winning the war to go to war with Iran. So how are we going to get accurate and reliable information from this administration or anyone associated with it?

Today, the State Department announced it wants a new meeting directly with Iran to talk face-to-face, government-to-government. Ordinarily, I would see this as a welcome, even positive, sign that the administration has finally begun to see the wisdom in diplomacy.

Is that the case, or is an announcement that comes on the same day as the New Intelligence Estimate a sign that the Vice President is about to declare mission accomplished? We don't know the answer, and we don't know what happened in Iraq.

But we do know what happened in Iraq. The PI editorial board reminds us how the administration ran over the International Atomic Energy Agency, its chief, to make a war in Iraq, quoting the PI. Look where we are now, more than 3,000 American troops and tens of thousands of Iraqis dead in a war that defies reason and sees no end. We fear the same may happen in Iran. So do I.

Tell the President not to go after Iran.

□ 2130

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.)

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.)

OIL INDUSTRY WILL BE UNABLE TO MEET WORLD DEMAND OVER NEXT 25 YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the oil industry admitted this week that it will be unable to meet world demand over the next 25 years. In case anyone still needed a wake-up call about the importance of energy independence, surely, that is that call.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal reported on page 2 that a U.S. government-commissioned study, a study conducted by the oil industry itself, reveals that oil and gas supplies will not keep pace with worldwide demand through the year 2030.

According to the oil industry study, demand is expected to increase between 50 and 60 percent due to mounting consumption in the developed world, plus the growing economies of China and India.

According to the Journal, the finding suggests that far from being temporary, high energy prices are likely for decades to come. The study's conclusions appear to be the first explicit concession by the petroleum industry itself that it cannot meet the burgeoning global demand for oil, which may rise as much as 120 million barrels a day by 2030 up from 84 million barrels a day currently.

These findings are consistent with what the United States Government already reported in February through the Energy Information Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy. They projected world liquids demand to increase to 117 million barrels per day in 2030.

They also projected the real price of crude oil in 2030 to be about $95 in nominal terms, which would be over $59 a barrel in this year's dollars, and the price of natural gas to be $9.50 per 1,000 cubic feet. In other words, the U.S. Government itself, through the Energy Information Administration, an arm of our Department of Energy, acknowledges we will become more dependent on foreign energy in coming years. Not less dependent, but more dependent. Not more independent, but more dependent. To me, that is not acceptable.

For the consumer, it means higher and higher gasoline prices. For the economy, it means higher trade deficits and slower growth. For our Government, for our Nation, it means less independence, greater entanglements and likely more wars.

President Bush has talked about energy independence. But what has he really done? In his most recent State of the Union, he talked about ending our addiction to oil and everybody dutifully applauded, but we are more dependent on foreign energy sources today than we were 6 years ago when he mouthed the words, indeed. Under his administration, this country is importing 1 billion more barrels of oil since he first took office. Today, we are importing three-quarters of the petroleum it takes to drive this economy.

Now, the Presidential candidates are criss-crossing our country, and each candidate has a piece in their stump speech that mentions the words, ''energy independence.'' But will any of them deliver anything significant on these promises?

I have introduced a number of bills which will move America toward real energy independence. My Biofuels Energy Independence Act of 2007, H.R. 2218, protects our feedstocks from commodity price distortions, and we see what's happening in the ethanol market and the biodiesel market today. We ought to have broad ownership of that industry and not allow the cartelized structure that characterizes today's oil and gas industry to be repeated in this new biofuels sector.

I am proud to be part of a coalition here supporting H.R. 969, a bill to expand the renewable energy standard and the renewable energy portfolio to spawn new energy production in this country and new business and new jobs related to it, to capture all those dollars that we are siphoning up and sending to other countries, to turn those around and bring them back home.

I have a bill to supplement the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, H.R. 682, with domestically produced biofuels. Soon I will be introducing the Energy Smart Communities Act that encourages and aids local jurisdiction undertaking energy efficiency initiatives, including solar roofs and wind turbines across our country.

My goal has always been simple, to devote the resources it will take to reinvent our economy and transform our

energy portfolio in this century, in the first decade of this century. Our Nation is, indeed, at a crossroads, and the stakes are in plain sight. Do we travel the road of independence, creating jobs here at home, making affordable energy available to our consumers and businesses, or do we remain in the grip of the petrol kingdoms of the Middle East?

Do we issue a new declaration of energy and independence from foreign control, or do we allow our foreign policy to be perverted by our addiction to oil? Do we get serious about climate change and move aggressively to develop cleaner, safer, alternative fuels, or do we leave our future in the hands of the world oil oligarchy? The choice is ours.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING THE 33RD ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S ILLEGAL INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I join some of my colleagues on the House floor to remember a horrific act taken by Turkey against the citizens of Cyprus 30 years ago. On July 20, 1974, the nation of Turkey violated international law when it brutally invaded the sovereign Republic of Cyprus. Following the Turkish invasion, 200,000 people were forcibly displaced from their homes, and a large number of Cypriots, who were captured during the invasion, are still missing today.

Until 3 years ago, both Democratic and Republican administrations here in the U.S. consistently condemned the Turkish government for its illegal occupation and pressured the government to come to the negotiating table in an attempt to finally reunify Cyprus.

Past administrations understood that the invading nation of Turkey was to blame for the division and should therefore be punished accordingly. As a result, past administration specifically forbid trade with the illegal government of the occupied north. Our government also prohibited direct flights into the occupied north. As long as Turkey continued its intransigence and refused to leave Cyprus, U.S. administrations correctly believed they should not be rewarded.

While this has been consistent U.S. policy, I have grown increasingly concerned that over the past 3 years we have witnessed a blatant shift in Cypriot policy from the Bush administration, specifically from Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. The Bush administration is punishing Cyprus for overwhelmingly voting in a democratic election against the United Nations Annan Plan.

The U.S. State Department and Secretary Rice seem more interested in rewarding those who illegally occupied the northern third of the nation back in 1974, than in actually reunifying the island. Over the past 2 years, our State Department decided to allow Americans to fly into the occupied north in direct violation of international law and the law of the Republic of Cyprus.

I joined many of my colleagues from the Congressional Hellenic Caucus in objecting to this action. The State Department responded by saying that it was interested in encouraging the elimination of unnecessary restrictions and barriers that isolate and impede the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community.

Unfortunately, it didn't end there. The State Department pursued the option of resuming trade with the occupied north, a direct violation of both domestic law in Cyprus and international law.

I am deeply concerned that the State Department's drastic policy reversal towards the government, and the people of the occupied north, will only delay reunification of the entire island. If the U.S. allows direct trade through routes in the north, what incentives do the illegal occupiers have to make any concessions? It's as if the State Department has completely forgotten who is responsible for the invasion of Cyprus in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the Annan Plan was unfair to the Cypriots in many ways, but the issues of property were the ones of most concern to many of the Cypriot Americans that I have talked to. Cypriot Americans are among the refugees that are being denied access to their property by Turkey.

Since these Americans cannot return to their illegally seized property, I believe these Cypriot Americans should be allowed to seek financial remedies with either the current inhabitants of the land or the Turkish government itself.

Earlier this year I introduced the bipartisan American Owned Property in Occupied Cyprus Claims Act. This legislation authorizes the President to initiate a claims program under which the claims of U.S. nationals, who Turkey has excluded from their property, can be judged before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

If this commission determined that Cypriot Americans should be compensated for their property, negotiations would then take place between the U.S. and Turkey to determine the proper compensation. My legislation would also empower U.S. district courts to hear causes of action against either the individuals who now occupy those properties or the Turkish government.

For 35 years now the people of Cyprus have been denied their independence and freedom because of a foreign aggressor. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in remembering what the Cypriot people have suffered and continue to suffer at the hands of the Turks.

I also urge my colleagues to join me in pressuring the Bush administration to return to a policy that once again takes into consideration that entire 33-year history of this conflict. The people of Cyprus deserve nothing less.

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

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. WELDON of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2145

ENERGY SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about energy security. We have talked about energy independence, and I think that is a subset of energy security.

We have to look at the world in total, and we have to realize that we need to secure our own energy sources if we are going to secure the future of our country. Even as I look at probably the most immediate issue, the war with terrorists, their actions against us, but if we take that and look at the world in total, when I see the lowest common denominator, it's energy. It is a fight or a battle for energy.

Those who are going to be able to power themselves without relying on others will not only have more options and purer choices in foreign policy

matters, but the reality is in this new emerging global economy, those that cannot be economically hijacked by foreign countries are going to be the winners. I want to make sure that we have a policy in place that recognizes the need for independence so that we can secure our future.

Now this means that we have to do some things. I don't know how many of you out there remember high school economics. I remember Mr. Croft's lessons at Northwest High School, and basic supply and demand.

When we look at resolving our energy issues, and, by the way, a barrel of oil hit over $75 today, we have to look at both sides of the equation. That's what we tried to do in 2005, the energy bill that was signed by the President. We tried to increase the amount of supply of energy and, at the same time, looking at how to conserve or reduce the demand for energy in our country.

Now, overlaying this discussion about energy, supply and demand, is a new discussion amongst us about global warming. This is driving our discussions on energy today. I fear that we have become, how do I say this, but so spooked by global warming that we are willing to go to the extreme and hurt ourselves.

And I really believe that part of my role and the role of the minority party here is maybe to swing back to a more practical level as we talk about energy and global warming.

Now, what a lot of people don't know when we talk about global warming or the CO_2 emissions, that is the gas that is depleting our ozone, the vast majority of that is created naturally, not by humans. Yes, human activity that I am going to talk about in a minute does contribute to that.

Now, as I understand, the major contributor and the most significant contributor to CO_2 emissions is livestock. So, of course, some have joined hands with PETA to make sure that we eliminate all the cattle, pigs, chickens, and we should just become vegetarians.

The next is humans. Not by our activity of burning coal and the coal-generated electrical plant, but just ourselves and our existence, our exhaling. And, therefore, we should have mandated policies to control population, i.e., abortion, and reduce the number of people on Earth. That is one of the policies out there.

Now, the discussion that we are going to have here in the House in the next 2 weeks is going to be on what energy policies do we implement here to lower CO_2 emissions and become energy independent. Well, the reality of it is, the policies that we are going to hear from the majority party will help to some small degree on the demand side and absolutely drive up or put more pressures, increased pressures, on supply, because they are going to eliminate some of our sources that we use for energy, make it more difficult and more costly to use and, therefore, create bigger demand. What happens when there is bigger demand? Prices go up.

So any of you out there that want to turn on a light, use your computer, heat or cool your homes, drive to work, under the policies that we are looking at adopting in this House over the next couple weeks, expect to pay more.

Now, this is why I think it is becoming so important here. I want to get back to our supply-and-demand lesson here. In this chart, the United States, because of our economic engine, our ingenuity, our intellectual properties that are being put into action, we are the largest consuming Nation. Now, look down here, we also rank number one in oil importation. We have to import to drive our economy, literally drive our economy, about 65 percent of our energy needs. Now, that is 12 billion barrels that we have to import.

When I think of energy, I have to separate it into two different issues. One is driving. About two-thirds of the oil that we import goes to refining into gasoline, to use in jet fuel and trucks to move goods from one place to another, as well as cars to get us to the grocery store, to get us back to work. If we are going to become independent, we have to look at a full array of fuels that we can generate here. That means biofuels to some extent. That means that we adopt policies on hybrid type of cars or other experimental cars that are out there. And, by the way, that does lower emissions. But remember, car emissions are pretty far down the list of what actually contributes to CO_2 emissions and the ozone. We can then look at a lot of other technologies. I am a proponent of hydrogen, for example.

Now, let's look at the other side of generating electricity that powers our economy and is part of the equation. Most of our electrical generation, about 52 percent nationally, is from coal. In the policies adopted by various committees of this House and that are going to be brought to the floor in some capacity either in the next 2 weeks or maybe even September, they make it much more difficult to use coal. I mentioned, 52 percent of the electricity in this Nation is generated from coal. In my district, it is over 70 percent. It is the cheapest way to generate electricity. It is plentiful. We have something like a 500-year supply of coal to generate electricity in this country.

So I feel that instead of doing what the majority party wants to do and shut down coal-fired plants, crippling our ability to generate electricity; and, by the way, nuclear is bad, too. Remember that, no nuclear power? Let's make it as difficult. Let's not find ways to deal with the waste. And so if we shut down coal, make it more costly at least to do it, no nuclear, that means you have one area to really rely on in generating electricity, and that is natural gas. Oh, and by the way, our policies don't allow for any more domestic supply of natural gas and oil, so we are going to shift everything to natural gas to generate. We barely allow it to be imported. We can't drill any more for it within our own 48 continental United States or offshore any more than we are doing today.

I don't understand this energy policy that is going to be brought to us. It seems to me to be a negative energy policy. In fact, I think the only energy that is involved in this bill is perhaps if we burn the darn thing we could generate some power. But, as was just mentioned to me, that would result in CO_2 emission, so we can't even do that.

Mr. Speaker and the American public, we need to become more engaged in this. We are on a path to cripple our economy. China is adding at least one new power plant a week based on coal. They have no problems using coal. I saw a statistic that was 2 years old, so it is probably much more significant now, but the Chinese were adding 120,000 cars per day. That is not even talking about India, whose economy is expanding at near double digits as well, and they are adding power in their cars.

The competition is extreme for oil. We need to recognize that. We need to expand it. That doesn't mean that we shut down our domestic fossil fuels. That means we add to it so that we become independent and secure our Nation's future.

At this time, I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my friend from Nebraska hosting this hour tonight. We listened earlier tonight to one of our colleagues from Ohio who recited some of the same statistics that you and I work off of, and that is, most reputable projections of energy usage in this country by 2025 and 2030 shows that, no matter what, even the rosiest predictions show that we still will be importing millions of barrels of crude oil and refined products every single day. And I don't know of any of us who thinks that America is better off by importing crude oil and refined products. Most of us would agree that that is a bad thing. Our balance of payments is out of whack.

As you mentioned earlier, our foreign policy options are different. Our risks and threats to this country are exacerbated by that dependence. And then you begin to talk about the solutions. We agree on those facts. It is kind of looking at the glass half full or half empty. The amount of water in the glass is the same; it is just how do we look at it. And the proposals that she began to tout and promote seem to cost American taxpayers an awful lot of money. They also seem to involve some sort of price-control scheme that would not allow the natural market forces to work and operate as we begin to export these ideas.

We will hear, as you said, over the next 2 weeks a lot of policies, and I think we ought to look at those polices through a lens that has four pieces. One lens would say does this policy help or hurt domestic production of crude oil and natural gas.

I am a CPA by trade and I operate pretty often just by straight logic, and the logic is that if we increase domestic production of crude oil and natural gas, it means we are less dependent on foreign sources of crude oil and natural gas. I have yet to have anybody refute that argument in any way that makes sense. So, promoting production of crude oil and natural gas I think is a positive. So as you look at their policies, challenge them.

If their policy continues to close off areas of domestic production and domestic exploration like ANWR, like the Inner Continental Shelf, then that policy does not make sense for America today. And many of the policies they have in place or want to continue in place have that result.

If their policies retard or restrict the construction of new refineries in this country, the ability to process our domestic crude into refined products, gasoline, jet fuels and other kind of things, and force us to import refined products, it seems to me that that is a policy we ought to challenge.

We in the minority spend a lot of time being against stuff, and I guess that is pretty much our role, but part of that is to be responsible devil's advocates. And if a policy curtails domestic production of crude oil and natural gas, that seems to be on its face something that you and I can challenge pretty easily.

The second lens would be does it increase our reliance on foreign sources of crude oil. And in this category, it would be things like does it promote or inhibit personal responsibility for conservation.

Republicans get beat up about not being wanting to conserve and wanting to use less fuel, but at the heart of that is the personal responsibility to use a little less gasoline than you used last week. The idea is that if all of us would use just 1 gallon of gasoline next week, if we did that, you would see an immediate increase of inventories. You would see a drop in the prices because the folks holding those inventories are wanting to sell them and sell them at a profit.

So policies that either encourage personal responsibility for conservation or discourage personal responsibility for conservation, I think we have got to be for and against. If it encourages that and those policies come forward in the next couple of weeks, I think we ought to back those policies and help us do a better job making good choices ourselves, goofy little thing like keeping the tires in our car aired up properly, taking all the extra weight out of the trunk. Doing those kinds of things, you would probably pick up 3, 4, 5 percent efficiencies in the use of gasoline and see a dramatic impact. Just using less, that helps reduce our imported refined products. So policies that they bring forward that increase our reliance on foreign sources of crude oil and natural gas, I think we have to challenge those.

The third would be does it encourage private investment in all sources of domestic energy, and that includes oil and natural gas. It includes coal, nuclear, wind and solar, and all those kinds of things that are out there.

Mr. TERRY. Your vision would include wind energy, solar energy?

Mr. CONAWAY. Yes. Let me say this: Even if the occasional turbine helped a bird commit suicide, yes, I would encourage wind turbines.

Mr. TERRY. So in one of the bills in one of our committees, it specifically makes it a criminal act to have a turbine that would contribute to the death of a migrating bird. Does that help or hinder the rollout of that alternative energy?

Mr. CONAWAY. Well, that folds into this exact policy, because things of uncertain public policies contribute to a decrease in private investment solutions.

Mr. TERRY. You mean, if an investor might go to jail because a bird flies into a turbine under one of the bills that may come to this floor in the next couple of weeks, that would hinder investment?

Mr. CONAWAY. You would think it would.

Uncertainties about tax policies. How is a particular investment taxed and treated under our code over an extended period of time or changes in that policy contribute to a reduction in the private investment in these various sources. Other government initiatives, like things like the government picking winners and losers in a particular area as opposed to looking to the market to do that, to give incentives to the markets to create the most efficient kinds of policies that are in place. But, nevertheless, anything that comes in front of this body that retards or discourages or puts in question the private investment into all domestic sources of energy, I think we have to challenge those, and respectfully.

And the fourth lens I would look at is what does this do to the consumers. At the end of the day, you and I and the people who pay the light bills when we turn the switch on, who buy the gasoline at the pump have to pay those costs.

□ 2200

And if we do things as a part of these policy initiatives that come forward over the next couple of weeks that arbitrarily and capriciously increase costs to consumers, then we need to challenge those. There has to be a pay the fiddler at some point in time. I mean, we have to pay for whatever sources of energy that we've had. We've enjoyed low gasoline prices for a long, long time, and we're coming to the end of those lower prices just because crude oil and natural gas are finite resources.

You've already mentioned the increase in demand from around the world that we're in competition with those. And it's not likely that we'll see a significant decrease in the price of gasoline.

On the one hand, high gasoline prices help us to look at doing things a different way. They help make other alternatives more viable for the consumer, because at the end of the day, the consumer across this country has to be willing to pay the cost for whatever it is you're talking about. You can't subsidize. You can't use government programs to overcome lack of a consumer participation.

So any of these now policies that cause cost to consumers to go up arbitrarily and too quickly I think we have to challenge.

Let me make one final point that you talked about, and that is converting either coal or nuclear plants to natural gas fired plants. Natural gas does not transport across oceans well. We've got to liquefy it. We've got to put it into tankers. We've got to have facilities for regasification and all those kinds things, and so importing natural gas is very difficult in comparison to how easy it is to import crude oil.

So as we increase on natural gas, our local domestic cost for natural gas will go up. They're already the highest cost for natural gas in the world and because we are relying on it so much.

The other point is that if all 38 nuclear permits that are currently in some form of approval are approved and those plants are built in the next 20 years, nuclear power will still represent only 20 percent of our demand. So if we're going to have nuclear that's going to actually help lessen the load on natural gas, then we've got to have a nuclear plant increase from where just the current system, the current new plants and new facilities and existing plants are in process.

So as we look at these policies that come at us over the next couple of weeks, let's use common sense. Let's look at things that can be rolled out in a scope that makes sense. It's one thing to be able to do something on a very tiny, microscopic scale. But unless you can convert that into a significant portion of the demand or the supply of energy, whether it's electricity or gasoline or other sorts, other forms of energy that we use day in and day out, then you're barking up a tree and you're not helping the circumstance.

So we've got some work to do, being in the minority, over the next couple of weeks to help point out the areas where we think these policies that are coming forward fail the American consumer.

Mr. TERRY. I appreciate your comments and putting more meat onto the bones here. And I'll mention that in my district, again, it's about 70 percent, almost 70 percent coal. We do have nuclear. We use natural gas only as a peaking, which is basically this time of year. It was 99 degrees at home today, and I'll guarantee you Omaha Public Power is running their peaking plant during the day so that people can run their air conditioners. And there's a lot of things that we could do on the conservation side, as you said, and we need to push those.

But at the same time, we seem to be adopting policies that restrict the supply. And I think even though the policies that are going to be proposed here don't necessarily further restrict than already have been natural gas, what they do is move more energy, or force more energy to electrical generation by natural gas without doing anything to increase the supply of that natural gas.

And the gentleman from Pennsylvania has come to the floor many times. He is one of the leaders in the House in discussion of what we need to do to increase supplies of natural gas, and how ridiculous it is that our prices in the United States are probably five times more than anywhere else in the rest of the world.

So I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I want to thank my friend from Nebraska for his leadership here tonight and for his sharing time with us.

I personally believe that energy is the Number 1 issue facing America's economic future. I don't think, I think that available, affordable energy is a greater threat to the American economy than terrorism is. That's my personal view.

Before we talk about natural gas, I want to look at what we're using. Now, these are 2004 figures, but they've changed very little. It takes the Energy Department several years to compile them. These are the figures that we made the last chart out of a few months ago.

Currently 40 percent of our energy is petroleum. Just about 22.9 or 23 percent is natural gas, and a similar figure is coal. Now that's 86 percent.

Then you get down here to nuclear, 8.2, and now you're up to 94 percent. So renewables are those figures on the left. And the largest, which surprises a lot of people, is biomass, which was 2.8, hydroelectric, 2.7, geothermal, 0.3, solar, 0.06, and wind, 0.01. Now, I think we need to look at that.

And then we look at the next chart, which is the Energy Department's estimates. Now, these are the people that deal with us every day. In 13 years, in 2020, these figures don't change much, according to their statistics. Now, I hope they're wrong because the energy bills that are coming at us do not deal with petroleum, do not deal with natural gas, certainly do not deal with coal and do not deal with nuclear, which provides 94 percent. And I don't believe they deal with hydroelectric. That's another 3 percent. And so we have about 4 percent that's in play.

And I think what we have to be concerned about, if we focus on that 4 percent, woody biomass, solar, wind, geothermal and hydrogen, can we take care of the needs of this country, because when you don't have emphasis on these, and you don't continue to drill new wells, and you don't continue to promote coal to liquids or coal to gas to furnish our mass amounts of energy needs, then these volumes go down, and that's where we've been at as a country.

We've had a policy not to produce American energy, oil, gas or coal. We are gaining 2 percent foreign dependence every year, so we're at 64 percent. We've been gaining. Since I have been in Congress it's been 2 percent a year, every year. And that's a trend that nobody thinks is appropriate or positive for America because it's foreign, unstable, often unfriendly countries with unstable governments.

Some new statistics that I'll just add to this that are a little concerning; 80-some percent of the oil and gas in the world is owned by countries that do not have democracies, unstable countries. They own the energy of the world. In fact, Exxon, our largest oil company, is 14th in the world in ownership of energy. There are 13 countries that own, starting with Saudi Arabia and Russia and Iran and Iraq, and you can tell that's not exactly our friends, on down the road, all of those types of countries that own the energy of the world, and we are totally dependent.

Now, I'm pleased that the House and the Senate are both going to be dealing with an energy bill, but I think it's important that we have some energy production in those bills.

Now, the natural gas issue is one that has, I think, is really driving us economically in the wrong direction. We use 20 some percent of our natural gas now to make electricity. The gentleman from Nebraska just mentioned that his State doesn't do that, but the country does that. The States of California and Florida, the big users of energy in this country, consume huge amounts of electricity produced by natural gas, and that's an increasing figure daily.

About 12 or 13 years ago we took away the moratorium. It used to be just used for peaking plants in the morning and the evening because people felt natural gas was to precious to use to make electricity.

Natural gas is the feedstock for hydrogen, which the Representative from Nebraska talked about is one of our future fuels. We currently make it out of natural gas. Ethanol, the big push on ethanol consumes huge amounts of natural gas in the production of ethanol, so we don't make ethanol without consuming huge amounts of natural gas. The same with biodiesel. It's the feedstock.

Now, here's where the rubber meets the road in America. Natural gas is an ingredient in almost everything that's manufactured, or it's used in large amounts to heat, treat and bend products.

Petrochemicals, all the petrochemical companies, 55 percent of their cost of producing their chemicals because they use natural gas as an ingredient, they use it as a fuel is natural gas.

Polymers and plastics, 45 to 50 percent of their cost is natural gas because they use it as an ingredient and they use it as a fuel.

Fertilizer, from 50 to 70 percent of the cost of making fertilizer to grow the corn to make the ethanol is made by natural gas. In the last 2 years, 50 percent of our fertilizer production has gone offshore.

Petrochemicals, polymers and plastics are moving offshore. Why? Because America has the highest natural gas prices in the world, and have had for 6 years. That was not true 6 years ago. South America, a buck and a quarter. Our average retail price last year was between 12 and $13. Like I said, we have consistently, for 6 years, had the very highest natural gas prices in the world.

To show you, Dow Chemical uses huge amounts of natural gas. In 2002, they spent $8 billion to buy natural gas. In 2006, they spent $22 billion, and of course those numbers just keep rising.

If we don't deal with the natural gas issue, America will not compete as a nation, because we use natural gas in producing almost all of our products, whether it's melting steel, melting aluminum.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. TERRY. Dow Chemical has thousands of employees. They're just one of many petrochemicals that rely on natural gas. If the price of natural gas remains high or goes higher, where do they go? I yield back to you.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. They just committed $32 billion to build new plants in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Libya.

Mr. TERRY. And all of those jobs go to those countries now.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. That's right.

Mr. TERRY. Because of our natural gas policy.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. There's about 100 chemical plants in the world under construction, none in the United States. And that's a tragedy because those are some of the best working man jobs. When you bend steel, when you bend aluminum, when you heat treat products, when you dry grain, you use natural gas. I mean, natural gas heats 60 percent of our homes, heats about 70 percent of our businesses.

Now, if natural gas was affordable, it would be the natural next fuel for vehicles, because we could fuel, if it was affordable, we could fuel a third of our auto fleet and that would be much quicker than CAFE. And I'm not opposed to CAFE. But it would be much quicker than all the things they're talking about because it could displace 2.5 million barrels a day, just for short haul vehicles who don't go long distances. One of the problems with natural gas as a vehicle fuel is distance because you can't store, you can't have a big enough gas tank to run long distances on a tank of natural gas.

But we have, on the Outer Continental Shelf, that's from 3 miles to 200 miles offshore, every country in the world produces both gas and oil there. Now, they may have 20-mile distance out or 30-mile distance out. But they produce, after you pass 11 to 12-mile it's out of sight. And countries around the world, when I tell them we don't produce there, just look at us and they say, why? Norway, Sweden, Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, all environmentally sensitive countries, they all produce there. We're the only known modern society that does not produce oil and gas.

Now, I have a proposal that opens it up for gas because we have not been able to pass it. I would support oil, but natural gas is more important to us because how it fuels our industry, how it heats our schools, how it heats our homes, how it heats our hospitals, how it plays such a role in our economy, how it's an ingredient in so many of our products, in fertilizers and petrochemicals and plastics. So we need natural gas.

So I put the priority, and we have a bill that says the first 20 miles remains locked up. The second 25 miles State option, State control, and the next 50 miles is open unless the States pass a bill to lock it up. They can do that. The second hundred miles is just open. That's the bill that I have proposed. And I think it's vital to the future of this country, because if we opened up the Outer Continental Shelf on the East and West Coast and the rest of the gulf we would have ample supply of natural gas for many, many years.

□ 2215

Now, we need to produce other kinds of fuel. I mean, what I think a lot of people are not aware of is there is an energy shortage in the world. In fact, right now OPEC controls the price. I believe the price ends the day at somewhere between $75, $76 for oil. Gas is about 7 bucks, which is the cheapest it has been, but this is the slowest time of year in the use of gas. This is gas that is going into storage that you add a couple, 3 bucks to, and then there are distribution costs, and it comes back out on a next year's average price. And this year the price of gas is higher than last year so far in storage.

So we are going to have a 25 to 30 percent increase in gas prices, and it appears we are going to have, because here we are with not one storm in the gulf, which always disrupts supply. Right at the moment, we don't have a large sending country in trouble with their government. So things are kind of calm, and we have $75 oil, and we are at the high usage time, right in the mid-summer. So now all we have to do is have a storm or two in the gulf, like we did 2 years ago, and have a country have some sort of disturbance or a government overthrown, and we have $85 or $90 oil, and we know what that is going to do to the American economy. In fact, I am not sure we are really sure what $3 gasoline, which is prevalent today, is going to do to the economy long term because we have had spikes for short periods of time. But now, in my view, $3 is the base price, and it is going up from there. It is just a matter of how much it goes up.

I think what is important for Americans and Members of Congress to understand is that we have to really get serious about energy policy for this country. I am for wind and I am for solar and I am for geothermal and I was part of the Hydrogen Caucus when I first came. I am for all of those.

But they are tiny fractions when you look at the amounts they produce. And we also know that wind has its opponents and solar has just had trouble getting off the ground. I mean, it just has trouble growing. I read an article today that said ethanol, the new fuel, we spent $5.1 billion last year, subsidizing that by paying the tax on it. So it doesn't come free. And it seems foolish to me that we as a country now want to buy our natural gas from foreign countries and bring it in ships and be once again dependent.

I have had that argument with a lot of leaders in the last few years that LNG could be part of the solution, but it is not the solution. And that has turned out true because countries like Spain and Japan outbid us because they will pay more for a tanker load of natural gas than we can afford to. So we don't often get it because it becomes a commodity once a ship is loaded. But I want to get across to Members of Congress and to the American people is that we want to be for the clean and green fuels, but I think natural gas is one of those.

Natural gas is one of the cleanest fuels we have. And if we had ample supply of it, we could be expanding the use of it, not just detracting the use of it. It could be our bridge until we figure out how to make cellulosic ethanol, until we figure out how to get hydrogen vehicles, until we figure out how to charge our cars up at night with electric and have batteries that will last and all these things we are working on, we need a bridge to get to them because what is going to happen if we allow ourselves to have $100 oil from foreign countries, unstable governments, who are totally going to own this country?

The major balance of payment, and I will just show you that in conclusion, is the last chart here. This is one on manufacturing decline as natural gas prices have risen. But here is the one on the balance of payment. The major portion of the balance of payment, a huge portion, is energy prices. And as energy prices go up and we continue to import, that figure is going to grow. We could almost cut our balance of payment in half if we stopped importing energy.

Now, we are not going to be able to do that but we could move a long ways. But we need cola liquids. We need to develop the hydrogens and the winds and solars and all of those. We need to do more nuclear. We need all of those because China is increasing their energy usage 15 to 20 percent a year, and they are just drying up the marketplace. They are just sucking it dry because they are, and many other countries, are developing a strong energy portfolio; so they have energy. The United States has done little to secure its economic future with clean, green, affordable energy.

And I hope when we finally pass bills here that we have some energy in them that will secure our economic future with clean, green, affordable energy and specifically natural gas.

Mr. TERRY. I really appreciate your tutorial there. What is our supply in the United States of natural gas? We had the gentlewoman from Ohio that was down here that was talking about petroleum and how limited we may be at our peak here within the next 30 years. How about natural gas?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. We have anywhere from a 50- to 100-year supply. There are huge amounts in the Midwest, but the Outer Continental Shelf has actually not been measured. But we had old seismographic 40 years ago. Actually this Congress has prevented, and I see the Senate right now is preventing, seismographic from being done in the portion of the gulf that has not been produced.

Mr. TERRY. You mean we won't even be able to measure how much?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Not only do we prohibit usage but we prohibit the measurement.

Now, there was a lot of drilling off the coast of Florida a few years ago. We bought those leases back. That was very fertile gas. There is very fertile gas up in Georgia, the Carolinas, Virginia, New Jersey. The east coast is loaded with gas, and it is very rich, and it is where the population is. And when you produce in the ocean, it is out of sight. It is beyond the site line. The habitat for fisheries improve. They love to be around the rigs. They love to be around the platforms. And, of course, the underground piping comes in the ground under the water. It is not even seen. It is clean, green fuel. And they talk about it harming a beach. I don't know how gas harms a beach. I have never seen dirty natural gas. It's clean. It doesn't stain anything. It isn't colorful. It's just a gas. So it has been somewhat amazing. We have lots of natural gas.

Mr. TERRY. So just what we know, 50 to 100 years, and, by the way, I understand one of our largest pockets of natural gas that is in Wyoming was made into a Federal monument or a park, making it federally illegal to even drill there. So that is what happens when we find new pockets. We rule them off limits. That just astounds me that we have got that much. And when we are talking about securing our future, wanting to become independent, the other side and us are worried about global warming. And

this is a clean fuel. You have stressed it. It is a clean fuel, which is why the policies that we are seeing are moving electrical generations towards natural gas. It makes no sense to me that we won't increase supply at the same time.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. When we started down that road, natural gas was less than $2 a thousand. And it has hit as high as $14 and $15 in peak periods. But Daniel Yergen, who wrote the book ''The Prize,'' spoke in the Senate shortly after that process started, and I happened to be there with Steve Largent. And he said if we don't open up supply, we are going to make natural gases so high that Americans will struggle to heat their homes, struggle to run their businesses, struggle to heat their hospitals. We are not going to make products in this country much longer that consume a lot of natural gas.

I predict if we don't deal with the natural gas issue, simple things like glass and bricks will be made in Trinidad, where gas is about a buck a thousand. That is not very far from here. Trinidad is in northern South America, probably a boat, a ship, a day away. It wouldn't take long to get to the east coast with a ship of bricks and glass. And that is a tragedy if we start importing those kinds of things that the American working man has made.

This is about jobs for working people. It is about the economy for the working people of this country. Energy punishes the poor and the middle class. The rich will go right along. The rich environmentalists who are against will live right on. They won't change their life-style. They will live in their huge homes and fancy cars and they will do their thing because money is not a problem. But the middle-class working people will not have a middle-class job anymore. They will have a poor man's job. And the poverty rate in this country will skyrocket.

Mr. TERRY. We talked about jobs, that we are losing our manufacturing, our middle class. And what a lot of people don't understand is it is our energy policy that is driving those jobs offshore. Yes, there are some that are offshoring, taking maybe telephone answering jobs over to India. But our policies are driving a lot of our good manufacturing jobs away.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Some of the best jobs in America are producing energy. When you buy Luke Oil gasoline down here, that is produced in Russia, and only the person selling it makes money in America.

Mr. PEARCE can tell you how many people make money because he knows that business in the production of energy. He will give you some great information.

Mr. TERRY. Then let's bring him up.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his discussion on energy security.

And for my discussion tonight, I would like to begin at the same point that my friend from Ohio from the other side of the aisle began. She was quoting accurately an oil industry study which says that supply cannot keep up with demand, that prices are going to be high, that supply is going to be tight, and that is for the foreseeable future through the next decades.

Now, the response that we had in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 was literally to, number one, recognize that it is not possible to convert overnight; so we had incentives there for the very hard-to-get oil and gas. That is the deep, the very deep, ultra-deep, and then offshore.

Now, the offshore platforms are extraordinarily expensive. They maybe look something like this. Our friends from Louisiana would recognize many of these, and California. These units cost over $1 billion to $1.5 billion. We don't invest in them easily, but they produce a tremendous amount of energy. It is the belief of those who are concerned about the energy business, concerned about the fact that prices are high, that supply is low, they really only have two choices if prices are high and supply is tight. You can lower demand, which Americans have not seen to want to do, or you can increase supply.

So these units here, we had great incentives for those, and we felt like that would bridge us during the years to where consumers would begin to consume differently.

But I would ask our average listener, how many people do you know who actually put biodiesel in their car or their truck? How many are using any fuel other than straight gasoline? We have got some of it augmented by ethanol. But how many cars really do significantly reduce the consumption?

If the answer is not many, then you would be concerned about the time to convert. And we have had testimony in our Resources Committee where both sides of the aisle say we are probably on a 20- to 40-year conversion that you and your family probably will not drive a different car for 20 to 40 years that has a different power source than what it has got right now. So we either recognize the truth in the matter and we encourage supply while we are converting to those renewables, and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 had great stimulation. I think the difference, though, is that when we are confronted, as business-supporting conservatives, with the idea that the oil industry study says the supply is limited, it cannot keep up with demand, that we probably should increase supply.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle, and I would quote, said that we are going to reinvent our economy in the first decade of this century.

Now, it is not possible to reinvent an economy in 2½ years because we are already at year 6½. It is just not possible to reinvent an economy in 2½ years, and that becomes the great disconnect on the discussion.

I would like to spend the rest of my time talking about the energy suggestions that our current majority has. We have recently marked up H.R. 2337. We have recently passed that out of the Resources Committee. And I will tell you that we need to make one point perfectly clear, that H.R. 2337, the Rahall energy bill, which is intended to be a piece of the package that is brought to this floor, will cost Americans jobs. It will increase the cost of natural gas and gasoline. And it is going to stunt the growth of the alternative and renewable energy industry.

□ 2230

H.R. 2337 is called the Energy Policy Reform and Revitalization Act. It could be called the ''American Job Outsourcing Act,'' it could be the ''Chinese Full Employment Act,'' or it could be the ''Funding Mechanism for Hugo Chavez,'' but to declare that it is the ''Energy Industry of America Revitalization'' is intended to be a stretch of the facts.

During congressional hearings in Congress, we've heard a lot of testimony from witnesses talking about the impact of our actions on the cost of energy. So I would refer to another chart which simply talks about the cost of our energy is going to be increasing dramatically. We have received this testimony that the cost of energy probably will go up to a 23 percent increase in some areas, 29 percent on the California coast, 32 percent in the Texas region, 21 percent in the South, and in the Southeast, 19 percent; 20 percent in New York. So you see significant energy increases because of the increasing consumption of natural gas.

One witness, Paul Cicio, testified that America has lost 3 million manufacturing jobs to overseas competition due to this kind of energy increases. It is an important point because we need good jobs in America. High-tech industries and high-tech manufacturing are the future of our economy, yet they're tremendously energy dependent. You can't put a server farm in Washington or San Jose unless you have the energy to power it. You can, however, put it in Beijing because the Chinese are committed, like one of my friends said, building 544 coal-powered plants over the next 10 years to ensure they have enough cheap power. Cheap power is the key to keep their economy moving forward.

At the hearing we talked about, a couple of months ago, how Dow Chemical was going to build a $22 billion facility in Saudi Arabia because of the price of energy here in the U.S. And yet, what we're doing is restricting our access to energy here in the U.S. while we're not restricting the overseas, ensuring that we're going to import more energy, ensuring that jobs are going to continue moving to those cheap sources of energy.

American prices are simply too high, and we're doing nothing about it. And

the renewables, though they have promised, the renewables are far, far into the future, decades into the future, where they begin to affect us.

We can see that energy prices are already high and headed higher. The projections show that they're going to be 20 to 30 percent increases, which drive these billion dollar projects overseas.

I would comment that the Dow Chemical plants in both China and Saudi Arabia are going to take 10,000 jobs, those are 10,000 jobs which would be in the hundred thousand dollars range if they're here in America, and yet because of the low energy prices overseas compared to here, we're going to export those jobs. And it simply does not make sense.

Since 2000, our offshore gas production has dropped 40 percent. Our next chart will show that production decrease. It's very difficult to see, the yellow line is on the top, moves along here. And we see the energy decreasing as it moves across the chart.

We would recognize that onshore gas is actually a flat stable line, but the offshore is decreasing rapidly. And yet the Outer Continental Shelf, where we have great potential large, large resources, we're restricting access to those areas. Meanwhile, in the Rocky Mountains, where we restrict access there, those are fields which already have been drilled, so it's not as if they're pristine. We just are limiting our access to our own resources, which then compounds the problem that Ms. KAPTUR started out with initially. Prices are high, supply is tight. And we're seeing that supply gets tighter, and we're going to then increase the price.

Another thing that H.R. 2337, the Rahall energy bill, is doing is limiting shale completely. We're restricting the regulatory framework that was supposed to be out already and saying that it won't come forward. And without regulation, the industry is simply going to die. Now, that's important because in the long term, the 20 to 50 year term, shale causes America to be the Saudi Arabia of energy. If we consider just oil, Saudi Arabia has the dominant amount of energy in the world. But when we consider shale, the U.S. then becomes the dominant energy producer, and yet we're killing that industry completely.

We're in the shape that we're in today because of our decisions over the past 30 years. We chose not to build new refineries. We have chosen not to have nuclear energy. We have chosen not to drill more in this country, but instead, to restrict access on Federal lands, and so we simply have a problem of tight supplies and high prices. And those are going to continue for the foreseeable future.

Now, what does 2337 do regarding renewable energy? We hear our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the need for renewables, but this bill begins to hurt the renewables. It begins to restrict the renewable energy development, also. It just doesn't make sense.

But we heard from four Democratic witnesses at one hearing that coal cannot be a part of America's energy future if we're to combat global warming, but according to the bill H.R. 2337, it's about the only energy source left because of restricting oil and gas in 2337. We also give deep restrictions onto the wind industry so that the Wind Energy Association came out opposed to the bill saying it cripples our industry.

The bill places new costs and restrictions on the solar industry, requiring new labor provisions, per acre fees, and purchasing restrictions. So this bill harms domestic oil and gas production, reducing domestic production, increasing our reliance on foreign oil, but it also begins to limit our development of the alternative energy sources, but even worse, the most restrictive thing for alternatives is that there were corridors that were implemented in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Those corridors recognize that places where renewables are created are not where the population is generally. New Mexico is one of the few States that would be self-sufficient on wind, yet we can't consume all of the wind energy that we would produce there. And so there were corridors that were lined up to take the renewables from where they're produced maybe in New Mexico to Los Angeles or New York, wherever, and yet those energy corridors receive a death blow in this bill, H.R. 2337, which again is passed out on pretty well party lines and is coming to the floor of the House as a part of Ms. PELOSI's energy package. And yet you have to ask, where is the energy in the bill? Because I see where the limitations on oil and gas are; I see where the limitations on shale are; I see where the limitations on wind and solar are. Exactly where is the energy production going to come from?

I guess with the carbon sequestration that is in the bill, to the dismay of our friends on the other side of the aisle, it's going to ensure that coal is our only source of fuel for the future. But they're also trying to limit its use.

Finally, regarding royalties. This bill attempts to capture royalties owed to the American Federal Government. Like the chairman, I strongly believe that American taxpayers should receive the royalties that are due. Nevertheless, we differ when it comes to the method of collection.

I support a Royalty in Kind program where we simply declare the number of barrels produced. We can meter that, it's very easy. We don't have to calculate the price because the price changes every day. And so the take to the Federal Government changes every day if we're contemplating dollars, but Royalty in Kind is very simple, but it also puts a lot of accountants out of business, puts a lot of tax lawyers out of business. And so we could call the provisions here where we kill the Royalty in Kind program in 2337, the ''Tax Lawyer Full Employment Act.'' Because that's what it's going to do, it's going to put people in the courts saying, now exactly what was the price on November 7 of 2001 when you sold that gas? It would be so much easier just to take the meter reading, take the government's percent, and put it into the government's coffers.

In our legislative hearing on this bill, leading Members on the other side of the aisle chastised our royalty regime saying it parallels countries whose corrupt governments are blowing up the rigs. That was a quote. Then they're moving to this country to exploit our low rates. But how ironic is that? You wish for the U.S. to set an example for the world on climate change, but want to follow the lead of Venezuela and Nigeria on royalties.

I support increasing production that will bring good, safe jobs and energy to America. I support efforts to keep the ''American take'' as a portion of energy development to a reasonable level that ensures companies have the money to provide safe working conditions, keep their facilities up to date, and reinvest in development and exploration.

Finally, we had comments all through the time that the royalties received by the U.S. Government are so much lower than Russia, so much lower than Venezuela. Yet I would like to share a final chart with you that shows some of the problems.

This picture is in Russia. And I will guarantee you that you will see no oil field in America like this. The opponents on the other side of the aisle of the level of royalties that we take currently simply want to make a moral equivalency between the kind of government and regulations that allow this, and the government and regulations in this country which have produced one of the strongest energy economies in the world, which have produced the most dramatic economy of American exceptionalism in the world, and yet they're trying to unravel that and undo that.

I would hope that we all would look at the energy suggestions from our friends on the other side of the aisle, that we would carefully evaluate the fact that the supply cannot keep up with the demand, that prices are going to be high, and the supply is going to continue to be tight unless we do something about it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding tonight and appreciate the discussion on both what we've done in the past, and what we're looking for in the future according to 2337.

Mr. TERRY. Well, I thank you for your input.

I just fear that the policies that we're looking at to adopt in this Nation are going to jeopardize our security, jeopardize our future. We need to look at a balance.

I appreciate you being here, and all of the others that came to speak.

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor on Tuesday nights, as often the Blue Dog Coalition does. And tonight the Blue Dog Coalition wanted to come to the floor of the House of Representatives to have a discussion about energy policy in this country. I think that energy policy is an issue that is so important on so many levels, in terms of the integrity of our economy, in terms of our national security, in terms of the affordability for those who are underserved.

It touches so many different issues. And that's why I think it's important for the Blue Dog Coalition to make its voice heard, to take on this very complicated issue that has so many different components, and to try to address it in a pragmatic and practical way. Because like so many issues in Washington, this is one that's not going to be solved by those on the extreme ends of the ideological spectrum, it is going to be solved by people who want to sit down and roll up their sleeves and come up with practical solutions on how we can provide an affordable and secure energy supply for this country.

Now, I am joined by two other Blue Dogs this evening, my colleague, Mr. SCOTT from Georgia, and my colleague, Mr. MELANCON from Louisiana. We look forward to having a discussion tonight about this issue. And the Blue Dog Coalition energy principles is a document, the Blue Dog Coalition has endorsed that identifies certain principles that we think ought to be the basis of how we go about formulating energy policy in this country.

And by way of introduction, I wanted to yield as much time as he might consume right now to my colleague, Mr. SCOTT from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much. It is certainly a pleasure to be with both the gentleman from Louisiana, and for you as well, Mr. MELANCON.

This is definitely a major, major priority as far as the future of this country is concerned. Our energy policy is interwoven directly into our vital national security. There is no question about it.

We have, for the past 50 years, progressively gotten more and more dependent on oil from the Middle East. There is a reason why Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, those Middle Eastern countries are so vital.

It is so important for us to try to hopefully find a way in which we can get peace in that region. We don't know the answer to all of this; it is largely going to be up to those Middle Eastern countries. But we are so directly tied to the future stability of that region, largely because of one thing, that is, our energy. And that has been a mistake, that we are tied to our future energy needs to the most unstable region in the world. And we now need to move very rapidly to excise ourselves from that.

The other reason why our energy policy is so vital and so important, and again, part and parcel of our national security, is because of global warming. Make no mistake about it, there may be differing opinions about global warming, there may be differing opinions about climate change, but one thing is certain, the facts do not lie. This Earth is getting warmer by the day, by the year.

Scientists have pointed out that the Earth's climate is increasing in warmth at a rate of one-tenth of a degree in each of the previous decades.

□ 2245

That may sound like a little. But when you look at just 2 degrees since the turn of the century, that is a major, major fact; the fact of dependency on oil in the Middle East, the most unstable region, the fact that we are experiencing the damage of global warming. The reason for the global warming is the excretion of carbon dioxides into the air, and that gives us the greenhouse effect.

So on those two points, we have no choice but to proceed directly ahead and provide the kind of sterling leadership this Nation deserves, as you so aptly pointed out, Mr. MATHESON, in a very responsible way, in which both sides of the aisle can come together. Everybody can come together and understand that this is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democratic issue. This is an issue for the future of the American people and the people of the world.

Mr. MELANCON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his comments. Being from an oil-producing State such as Louisiana, we have for decades been producing America's energy needs. To this day, approximately 30 percent of all the energy supply is domestically produced in our coastal areas in Louisiana. The same areas that produce all that oil and gas are also home to what we refer to as America's wetlands. The coastal marshes of south Louisiana are predominately the ones we are losing the most.

Ironically, in my district they provide roughly 30 percent of the seafood to this country. Now, people say, how can the oil industry and the seafood industry coexist side by side? Well, for a number of years, back at the beginning of time, so to speak, when the oil and gas industry began offshore drilling and wetlands drilling, there weren't the environmental standards and all the other standards that are put forth now. There wasn't the technology that is there today. So, yes, there were mistakes made.

We have learned from our mistakes. Our Government has recognized it. The States have recognized it. They have addressed those issues. If you look back after the storms, after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, if you look at the devastation that occurred across the Gulf Coast, did you hear of oil spills? The worst spills that you had actually were the gas tanks that were leaking fuel and oil on land at the oil refineries and from the service stations throughout the flooded areas.

There's a misconception. There's a fear by people that's more the fear of fear itself that people seem to concern themselves with. We have in this country, as was mentioned by some of the previous speakers in the first hour, an industry that may be misunderstood. It is called ''big oil''. But if you look who is producing the oil and gas in the United States, for the most part it is small, the independent. It may be a company such as Devon out of Oklahoma. Yes, it is on the stock market, but it was a company started in 1971 by a father and son. They took that gamble. They got out there.

It has, in fact, by the numbers I have seen, been determined that for the major oil companies to drill in the United States, whether onshore or offshore, whether deep water or shallow water, it is more expensive an investment and proposition than it is to drill in other parts of the world. Of course, there are some security problems going on in other parts of the world.

As we look at what we believe in in this country and what we should believe in in this Congress, we talk about energy independence. And energy independence, as mentioned, is not about Republicans and Democrats. It is about the old folks. It is about the young starting families. It is about the working people. It is about everybody that pumps gas in that car. It is about everybody that goes to a job.

When you look at natural gas, as Mr. PETERSON talked about, it is a clean fuel and we have ample supplies throughout this country and we ought to be producing those fuels. However, our own policies have seemed to stymie us.

The Blue Dogs have put together a package that we are proposing that is a principle, not a package, a principle that we feel we ought to be looking at and having guide us as we go through the process of developing energy legislation.

We are not going to get this country moving forward unless we encourage development of oil and gas, alternative fuels, green fuels, whatever. It all has to be part of the mix. This is not about one fuel being better than the other. This is not one fuel seeing if it can ''out politic'' another fuel. This is about trying to bring together the country to devise an energy policy, and we as the Blue Dogs felt that it was time for us to try and take the lead and to give some guidance and leadership in this matter.

With that, I turn the floor back over to my friend, Mr. MATHESON.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I think the comments from the gentleman from Louisiana are spot on in the context of we need it all. We need to look at a very diverse portfolio of energy supplies in terms of where we are today and where we want to be in the future. We want to, of course, develop as many different types of energy and diversify our portfolio, because, at the end of the day, having an affordable and secure source of energy is what makes the most sense for this country and for our economy.

While all of us would like to see a bunch of new technologies put in place immediately, the reality of this situation is it is going to take a commitment in the public policy arena and the private sector to bring a lot these technologies along.

These energy principles that the Blue Dogs have published represent a set of guidelines. I don't think the Blue Dogs come to the table saying we have all the answers. These are complicated issues that are going to require a lot of thought and a lot of work. But I do think that these principles help articulate a zone of reasonableness, if you will, within which this debate ought to take place.

Since we have kind of led into it, one of the key principles is that of fuel diversity, where the Blue Dogs think we should not be picking winners and losers, as Mr. MELANCON said. We think you have to have a diverse energy supply portfolio to have future success in this country. So we encourage any policy that is going to add to fuel diversity, that is going to add to energy infrastructure in this country.

In the long term, if we are going to have energy independence, there is no question that a whole basket of opportunities are going to help create that. It is going to include issues of conservation and energy efficiency. It is going to include new fuels. It may be cellulosic ethanol, it may be biofuels. There may be other sources that are alternative sources compared to what we use today. And it is also going to include conventional sources of energy that we have today as well.

We have to take the longer view on this, and the longer view is at some point we may have a whole different set of energy options that don't exist today. How we get from here to there is going to take a commitment to develop those technologies and a commitment to make sure we access conventional supplies we have today to keep this economy moving in the right direction so that we can all have the economic growth and opportunity that is going to allow these technologies to develop.

So, we as Blue Dogs believe in it all, whether it is oil, or gas, or biofuels, or coal, or nuclear, or hydroelectric, or geothermal, or other technologies that I may not have even mentioned. You really need to put all of that on the table, all that on the table, to give this country the opportunity to make progress and to move forward and to have a responsible, diverse energy supply.

That is one of the key principles that the Blue Dogs have tried to articulate, and I think it is one that everyone in this Congress ought to be able to get their arms around in some form and see if they can recognize the value to this country if we do that.

Mr. SCOTT, I am happy to yield to you.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. MATHESON, I would like to maybe pick up on a point you made on the diversity and alternative sources of energy. Let's just take one for a few moments and put this one on the table, because I truly believe that this is one of the major directions we are going to have to go in.

As you know, one of the problems with our dependence on oil and petroleum, aside from the Middle East and the political volatility there and the unstableness that is there, even if we had and were able to produce some of this oil on our own here, we have a refining problem. We are very short in our refining capacity.

It has been almost a quarter of a century since we even built a new refinery. There are reasons for that, environmental, people don't want them around, but they are not there. But that is another reason.

So, one of my interesting visits not long ago was to go down to South America, to Brazil, to visit Brazil. One of the reasons I wanted to go to Brazil was because I wanted to find out what they were doing and how they were doing it with their energy problem.

Here is one salient fact: Brazil and Argentina both are not dependent upon the Middle East for oil. They have moved very rapidly and are setting the curve for ethanol production.

Now, 85 percent of their automobiles are ''flex'' automobiles, in other words, running on a combination of mostly ethanol made from sugar cane.

If Brazil can do those two things, get clean energy, get ethanol, make it from a grown product that continually renews itself, and at the same time not be dependent on oil from the Middle East, surely we can learn something from what is going on in Brazil. And I did. A group of us went down to Brazil. We spent a lot of time down there. We talked to people and we found out some things there.

I believe, quite honestly, a major feature, not all of it, but a major feature of our way out and our way forward in becoming energy independent rests in the production in this country of ethanol.

Again, we have got to be very responsible as we move forward with ethanol production. We have got to have a level of moderation with it and we can't go overboard with it. It is very interesting that President Bush in his State of the Union, if you recall when he was talking about energy, mentioned it. He said we can solve our problem with ethanol made from corn, and he put some large figure out there.

But if we even just went with that, it would put such downward pressure on our food stock, on our cost of beef and poultry and chicken and pork, who feed off of corn. Corn cannot do it alone. So it has to be a dual approach with cellulosic, which is made out of pine straw and pine trees and wood chips and switch grass, which we have plenty of.

The point that I am making is we can move rapidly here, and we are. As a part of our farm bill that we will be marking up this week, that we are in the process of marking up, we and the Democrats and Blue Dogs, who make up a large part of the Agriculture Committee, are in the leadership on this, and it is one of the areas in which all of us can be very proud. But certainly within our Blue Dog Coalition, we are providing the leadership on finding a way out of our energy dependence, and we are doing it through our farm bill.

Just think, that we can grow our way out of dependence on oil in the Middle East. We have got all of it right here in this country, and I think getting the ethanol plants moving, using corn where we can, but there is a certain limit we have to have there, but use these other means of cellulosity, the wood chips, and putting the incentives in this package, as we have in the farm bill to explore and develop ethanol plants and plants of operation.

□ 2300

Also, we have to do it near the points of distribution. And in the process of creating this new industry, we create jobs when we create a clean energy source and that is one of the major steps I believe for us as we move towards energy independence.

Mr. MELANCON. I think about the technology as it was brought up a second ago. One of the concerns that we have to have here as a Congress is there is a lot of technology out there. But there is a lot of perception that there is more technology than is factually out there. What we can't do with Federal policy is put demands and time slots, et cetera, production, that far exceeds what the technology provides for.

We need to make sure that we put a bill out there that is going to be reasonable. We don't want to run off our good-paying jobs. As discussed by Mr. PETERSON earlier, natural gas is a basis for everything from fertilizer to foods to plastic, heating our homes, you name it, it is there. We need to make sure as the government, that we provide in the policy sections of these bills not only the financial support mechanism through tax breaks and other mechanisms to encourage the development of alternative fuels and to encourage the research and development of these new concepts, these new technologies, we as a government need to put that carrot out there so as to get industry to participate and to get involved in it and not discourage it.

Some of what we have seen in some of the legislation is a concern to us because it is going to be difficult to become energy independent if you are delaying the time frames for providing drilling permits to drilling companies, if you are having longer review periods for whether and when you can drill. We don't want to walk over the environmental issue. We want that to be taken under full consideration.

But right now the International Energy Agency is telling us that by the year 2030 if not sooner, this world will be short on oil and natural gas and the fossil fuels that we need to drive all of our economies worldwide. Now when you start looking at who holds the key to all the energy in the world, it is not the United States. It is in fact not the oil companies. It is the foreign countries most of whom are not necessarily our best friends.

So as a country, we need to start thinking about energy independence if we are going to stay strong. I have told people that being a strong country means when times get tough, as they did back in World War II, my parents and others, they manufactured airplanes and boats. The Higgins Crafts were made right in New Orleans. The wives went to work at the plants. The husbands went to war. And wives went to war, too, I'm being discriminatory, but everybody played a part. We were producing all of the food we needed in this country at that time and more. We were producing the energy that we needed and more. We could manufacture everything that we needed and more. And now, we as a country have come to a position where we need to import most of our energy.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, the United States imported 36 percent of domestically consumed crude oil and petroleum products and 4.3 percent of our natural gas supply in 1973. In 2005, we imported 66 percent of our crude oil and 16 percent of our natural gas from foreign sources. Morever, EIA projections indicate that the United States will consume 21 percent more oil and 19 percent more natural gas by 2030. Those numbers are dramatic, and that is just one country in this world who has been and should continue to be one of the strongest and mightiest and most independent countries in the world.

But what fuels the farms, is the energy that we need. What fuels the ability to get the energy, is the farms that feed the people. So it is part of a cycle. We need to make sure that if we are going to stay a strong, independent, viable country that can defend itself should it need to, then have to have an energy policy and we as Blue Dogs believe we need to provide and help guide this Congress in a way that brings us good energy policy for the long term, not for the next week, not for the next month, not to the next Congress, but for years to come.

We are drilling in areas and there are questions amongst our friends and colleagues. When you look at the gulf coast area, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas and Alabama who front on the gulf, are producing oil and gas for this country. Florida has ample supplies, but there are some restrictions off the coast, and if you come up the entire East Coast and West Coast. Now I don't fault my friends from those States not wanting to drill off their shores. But at the same time, we can't sit and talk about bringing oil and gas prices down if we are not all into this national effort. That is another issue. That is not going to be part of this bill, but that is something that CHARLIE MELANCON concerns himself with.

Mr. MATHESON. The gentleman mentioned that up to 16 percent of our natural gas is now being imported.

When we throw out the term energy, there are all different forms of energy, and it is dangerous to look at simple policy solutions when oil policy has its own implications. We know about dependence on foreign oil, but I don't think a lot of people realize we are increasing, although not yet to the same degree, but we are increasing our dependence on foreign supplies of natural gas as well. We have seen a lot of price increases over the past 5 to 7 years in the United States, and natural gas is such a key component of our economic model in this country. Those price increases can have such damaging effects on the integrity of our economy, let alone reaching each individual, particularly those on fixed incomes.

I think it is important to note, and that is the statistic that my colleague from Louisiana mentioned, we are importing natural gas into this country. I don't think a lot of people know that we are importing a lot of natural gas into this country. I want to piggyback on one other thing, short term and long term.

We have talked about how in the long run we hope technology takes us into some new places. But how do we get there. We can invest in developing those technologies, but traditional energy sources that we are using in the country today, be it oil or natural gas or coal or nuclear power, those are key components of the portfolio today. And as we move ahead in the long run and look for alternative fuels, I am sure they will provide a significant piece of that portfolio as well. But in that period before that takes place, this Congress ought to enact policies that help encourage a reliable supply of those conventional fuels that we are utilizing today. It is going to be important for our economy, it is going to be important for making process as an economy, and I think that is consistent, in fact I know that is consistent with where Blue Dog energy policy recommendations have gone.

I want to mention a second principle that is in this document, and that is the concept, because we are so concerned about maintaining energy security. We certainly don't want to go in the wrong direction. So we have taken our term PAYGO which is usually in the Congress in the context that if there is a new program that you want to spend money on, you have to find a way to pay for it. We have used that term in terms of Blue Dogs believe in energy PAYGO. That is we don't think that we should be enacting policies in this country that reduce existing domestic production. We are concerned because there are some policies out there by some of our colleagues in this Congress that we are concerned may do just that. That doesn't match up with the notion of trying to make sure that we have a secure, reliable, affordable energy supply. And the statistics that my colleague from Louisiana mentioned about the projected growth demand in the future in this country, you don't want to go backwards and be cut back on our existing domestic capabilities and in that context increasing even more so our reliance on foreign supplies.

Another critical part of the Blue Dog principles is the notion that when you find yourself in a hole, stop digging. We don't want to create a greater reliance in terms of our reliance on foreign supply. And it is not just with oils. You have to put natural gas into that discussion as well because we are importing more natural gas than we have in the past, and we have to be very careful about if we reduce our natural gas production capabilities in this country, what that means in terms of prices and putting us in an even less secure, less dependent position than we are today.

I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I think you made a significant statement there, Mr. MATHESON, that when you are in a deep hole, the first thing you do is stop digging.

I want to very, very briefly share, and I am sure there are some American people who are watching our discussion this evening, on just how serious a situation we are in. I talked about instability in the Middle East and our dependence upon oil.

Clearly there are two known facts. Right now, 42 percent of all of the known oil reserves rest under the basin in the Middle East, in Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia. That is nearly half of all of the available oil supplies that we know of in the Earth. And it is not renewable. It doesn't renew itself. Eventually at some point oil is going to run out.

When I was at NATO, and we had a meeting over in Paris this past winter, our winter NATO meetings, a question was put to a noted economist, John Malone, and he made a profound statement. He said we didn't leave the stone age because we ran out of stone; nor will we leave the oil age because we have run out of oil. What he said was that civilization as we know it could very well run out before the oil runs out with the rapid rate we are going with the damage that oil-driven energy sources around the world are causing with the greenhouse effects.

I thought it would be very interesting to share with the American people just how serious this is given the fact that oil is not a renewable source of energy, given the fact that almost half of it is in a very unstable region, and much of the world is still depending upon. But according to the Energy Information Administration, here are some startling facts. They say that world daily oil consumption is projected to grow by 1.4 million barrels this year in 2007 and by 1.6 million barrels in 2008. That is daily oil consumption. You talk about running out with that rapid rate, and each year it goes up. In addition, the EIA projects a steady increase in natural gas and electric use in the United States which will create upward pressure on prices. This doesn't paint a very good picture.

And then it goes on to say that almost all scientists agree that the Earth's climate is rapidly changing and getting warmer, having increased by 2.6 degrees Fahrenheit since the turn of the century. Now as I mentioned earlier, on the surface of it, 2.6 doesn't seem like much, but it is major. The Earth's global average temperature is now approaching or possibly has passed, according to this report, the warmest experience since human civilization began over 12,000 years ago. Now it is approaching the warmest it has ever been in the history of mankind. Global warming is a fact. Climate change is a fact.

And it goes on to say that over the past 150 years, measured carbon dioxide concentrations have risen by more than one-third. The question is not whether greenhouse gases will result in climate change, but rather the magnitude, the speed, and the geographic details and the likelihood of impacts stemming from this trend.

I am not painting a gloom and doom picture here. We are talking about facts so we can get a sense, a greater sense of urgency in this Congress and in the world. So many places over in the world we are fighting and killing one another over what could very well be in the scheme of things very trivial. We are all in the same bucket as human beings.

□ 2315

This earth of ours is precious, and for no other reason more important than saving this earth for our future generations, the air we breathe all rests in the decisions that we make in this Congress today.

I know and I share the same feeling with you all that we feel very honored and very privileged to be elected and serving in Congress at a time when this is our challenge. And when they write the history books and perhaps our grandchildren and children will look and say, well, what did grand-daddy or my daddy do at that time, the history books will reflect very proudly that we provided the leadership at a very crucial time to move this Nation forward in getting away from oil dependency and getting into clean energies.

We have the means to do it. We know we need to do it, and we have the direction to do it.

Mr. MELANCON. I'd like to expound on what Mr. SCOTT just had to say. I've talked about that since the storms that devastated south Louisiana. I've seen the marshes of south Louisiana that I grew up hunting and fishing in, where my son and I have spent many, many weekends and weekdays and just out there enjoying the land and the water. And I've got a new grandson, and of course, after these storms, seeing the damage to these wetlands, these estuaries, seeing and hearing the facts that I'm hearing on climate change and the concern with, as I tell people, there will always be a planet called earth. The question is will there be an earth with life or with quality of life.

And we are in the generation, we are in a time in this Congress where I believe, as you, we have an opportunity to do it, but we have to do it right because I don't think we're going to get multiple chances at it. We've got to try and make those decisions as wisely as we can so that, whatever it is that we do, it is for the next generation and those that succeed them.

Hopefully, when they read the history books, the three of us and the other Blue Dogs and the other Members of this Congress, both Republican and Democrat, will go down well in history as saying they had the foresight.

Think about the people that put together and wrote the Constitution of the United States, and look at how we've lived with that Constitution for well over 200 years, and you think about it. It should be possible that people of our times and our capabilities can come together and work and come up with a policy that gets this country, gets this world and makes it work for us so that we can all live in harmony and peace.

And one of the things that I can remember a number of years back in one of the presidential elections, one of the presidential candidates went to the grocery store and didn't know what the checkout scanner was. Well, you know, there are kids in this world, I hope there's no Members of Congress that still believe that milk comes from the dairy department at the grocery store and not from the cow on the farm.

And the same with gas from the gas pump. There's many people out there that don't realize that you have to go and drill for oil in order to put that gasoline in that automobile to run those kids to baseball or basketball or cheerleading or whatever.

And so we need to understand what it is that drives the country. It is not a mechanical pump at the convenience store at the corner. It is an industry that needs to have a return on investment, and it is the government that needs to set policy that makes it so that the industry wants to produce it and produce it in volumes.

Yes, we have not done what we should be doing to encourage investment not only in the refining capacity. We're starting to see that. We did some of that about 2 years ago. There is some on-line. In my district alone, there's at least two refineries that are expanding. One of them will be a huge expansion project.

And the problem that I've always said is it's not that we can't produce the oil and gas or buy it from some other country, but you still have to have the capability of processing it through. But you still have, because you are not producing it fast enough in this country, dependence upon foreign oil coming in.

Ironically, this past week, speaking of climate change, there was a scientist that decided to swim in the Arctic Ocean and dove in and swam 6/10ths of a mile in 29-degree water in the Arctic Ocean. The symbolism there was we have a problem. He is the first man in history to swim for any length in the Arctic Ocean in a swimming suit. He might need other testing, but at the same time I think he's proved his point to me.

For those people that don't think that there's such a thing as global warming and/or climate change, the scientific community has documented it. It's there. We've talked about it. You don't have to believe everything that's said by a Member of Congress. Sometimes I doubt some of the things I hear, but the things that I see, the horrific hurricanes, the tornado activity throughout the country in areas that have never been affected, the floods that are occurring consistently, the droughts that are occurring throughout the United States, some people say, well, you just know more about them because the news is there. No, they're there. They're being documented. They are more frequent, more severe than we've ever seen.

So we need to move fast. We need to move together. We need to come together as a country, as a Congress, and put together policy that our kids and our grandkids and the future generations will have hope that the world will be as good as it was for us.

Mr. MATHESON. Well, I thank my colleague and I want to follow up with two more of the principles. There are eight in total by the way. We've already talked about a couple.

But one of the Blue Dog energy principles does have to do with climate change, and my two colleagues really have described mostly the thinking behind these principles, but to put in summary, the Blue Dog principles say, look, there's broad scientific consensus that climate change is happening.

Blue Dogs also believe it's taken place over a significant period of time. We need to make sure we get this right with a methodical approach, and it may very well be a long-term approach to try to change the direction we're going, but we want to make sure we get it right. There are some folks who want to act very quickly and in a radical way, and that may not be the best solution.

We also wanted to make sure we had a global approach. If we simply enact policies in this country, we may be exporting jobs and pollution overseas, and that doesn't get us to where we need to be because this is a global issue. So the Blue Dogs want to have an approach that tries to encourage global participation, an approach that does not disproportionately affect one industry or one sector. It needs to be an economy-wide approach in how we look at this issue and how we try to reduce our carbon footprint in affecting the climate change issue.

So I think the Blue Dogs have laid out a framework that makes a lot of sense. Again, as I said before, we don't claim to have the answer to every single aspect of this issue. We think we've established a framework that makes a lot of sense for people making good, sound decisions.

A second principle, and it really follows up on what my colleague from Louisiana said a little earlier, he was talking about how people sometimes don't know what it takes to get energy to the point where you use it. People just pull the pump at the gas station. They don't have any real appreciation for the complex process it takes to get it to that point. And that applies to all forms of energy.

I think people take for granted when they flip a switch and the light goes on, that the light just goes on, and they don't have a full appreciation for what it takes to generate that electricity and get it delivered to that building or that house where the light switch exists.

And so another one of the Blue Dog energy principles recognizes we need to invest in the energy infrastructure in this country. It doesn't just happen without investment. It costs money, and whether it's a refinery expansion or whether it's an ethanol plant that my colleague from Georgia was talking about that we want to develop in this country or whether it's finding renewable sources, let's say, wind energy that makes electricity, that costs money. It doesn't happen without that type of investment.

It's going to take significant commitment from both the public and private sector in this country to ensure we have an energy infrastructure that can deliver reliable sources of supply and affordable sources of supply.

So we need to look for those. Again, the Congress we need to look for those public policy options, public policy decisions that create the environment for that to happen. It's not going to be done all by the government, nor should it be by the way. We want the marketplace to evolve and pursue the most efficient technologies and efficient delivery systems, the most efficient ways to make this happen, but we can help set the table, if you will, to make sure we have the right incentives in our economic model to encourage that to happen.

So that's another one of the Blue Dog energy principles that I think is very important, and we specifically point out within the electorate sector that we need to make sure we have investment in the transmission grid, investment in making sure it's efficient distributed generation.

During the previous hour, one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle had their Special Order here just before us. I think one of my colleagues mentioned the notion that you may have a significant wind resource where you can put up a number of windmills, but it's going to go be in a remote area, and you have got to get that product, that electricity created by those wind turbines, from that remote area to where the load factor is, and that's going to be let's say in urban area that may be hundreds of miles away, and you have got to invest in a transmission system that allows that to happen.

So, as I said at the start of my comments at the start of this hour, it's a complicated issue. You can mention with energy and everyone kind of nods their head, but if you really start looking at all the sub-issues below that, there are a lot of issues out there. And the Blue Dogs are trying to articulate a pragmatic, practical approach to try to capture all those issues and have a good discussion with Members of both parties and try to create those good public policy decisions to help us get to where we want to be as a country.

So I wanted to again follow up on those two comments that my colleague from Louisiana mentioned, and with that I'm happy to turn over time again to Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much. I think in addition to the plans and the points that we have offered here, there's the other side of this that we have got to face, and that is human behavior. We've got to provide leadership to change human behavior when it comes basically to the one instrument that is causing so much of the pollution, that is causing the earth to get warmer. That is the automobile, and we have to move on both fronts. We have to move on the front of getting the American people to do, and we can do this if we use our policy right, if we use our incentives right.

One is that we need to provide encouragement and incentives for individuals to get out of their automobiles, to use other means of transportation, especially in our large urban areas.

Let me tell you about my region of the country that I represent which is Atlanta. The Atlanta area has one of the highest carbon dioxide emissions area in this country, and with that is traffic congestion, which is about to choke the great promise of our city, not only in our region, not only in terms of the traffic but the air we breathe.

So we have got to move and provide the leadership to get alternative means of transportation moving people from place to place without such great dependency on the automobile. Just think about the time and productivity and hours that's a waste in the human productivity of sitting in traffic jams, let alone the waste of energy and the idling of the motors just in the traffic jams alone. We can't continue that way. We've got to do things.

Commuter rail is one of the areas that we are working. That's hard. It's hard to get people out of their automobiles, but it might be good policy for us to move to an area of good Federal tax dollars being used as incentives to be able to give people opportunities to get on these commuter rails. Perhaps we ride for free. Perhaps they're down in a subsidized cost. We've got to do something.

In Europe and in France and throughout Europe and in Japan, they have got trains now that are zipping people along at 100. They have got one over in Asia and Japan somewhere that's going about 150, 160 miles an hour. Where would we be without the rapid commuter rail systems we have in the northeast? Can you imagine if we didn't have it? You think traffic is bad between New York, Boston and Washington, D.C. Just think it what it would be like if we didn't have those systems.

So there are ways in which we've got to do that.

□ 2330

The other thing is; and I am not saying, I know how hard it is, I love my car. We are a society in a culture in America that has just grown up with the automobile. It's a part of us from the drive-ins to all the things that we associate with the good life. Get a home, get a car. You are in America.

But maybe, in addition to getting them out of those cars with incentives and the commuter rail and other means, maybe we can do something with the car itself. They are doing some things, American ingenuity is already at work in New York. The Ford Motor Company is now putting together an electric car. They are already out there. We have moved, and I think we are moving with the proposal in this Congress, to give an incentive, to give a tax write-off, tax benefit, some help, for people who will buy cars that run on the batteries and electricity. They have this.

I think there is a lot more we can do, in changing the habits of the American people, changing to get them out of the automobiles, and then changing the nature of the automobiles themselves, and then, of course, getting the clean sort of renewable energy we can to put them in. These are the kinds of proposals and approaches that I think this issue calls for, and I think it's the way forward in the future.

Mr. MELANCON. I think about Americans, myself as an American, and how spoiled we are with just being able to get in our car and go where we want, when we want. I like to tell people, and it's not that I should be bragging on it, because I'm not, but I think I'm probably a typical American family man. I

have got a Suburban and a Tahoe, I mean, that's not good, but I have got a boat. My son has a boat. We like to hunt, and we like to fish.

We have lifestyles that we have been fortunate enough that we can live. But now we're coming to a point in time where instead of maybe having a Suburban and a Tahoe, I could do with just having one and have a more efficient vehicle that got better mileage.

Part of what we are talking about in the energy efficiency system CAFE limits. Now, you can get to the limits drastically, as Mr. MATHESON expressed, by just saying, by year 2015 or 2018, you have got to reach a certain limit for automobiles and trucks, and, you know, just damn everybody else, doesn't matter about the jobs, let's just get there.

Or you can take it as a curve that takes you to that point, maybe not as acutely as a straight line, and says that you got to get there by 2022, and you have got to achieve some goals on the way up there, that doesn't provide that we lose the manufacturing jobs and the manufacturers. I mean, after World War II, there were 33 vehicle types in America, our labels, as they call it. There are 335 now, different vehicle labels out there in the United States.

We are spoiled, and we still want to have those luxuries and be able to live those lives, the lifestyle. But we all have to start, first of all, all of us, are going to have to start pinching ourselves and come to the realization that we are going to have to make some changes in our lifestyles if we want to keep this world and this country vibrant in more ways than just fuel economy.

So the CAFE limits, we are going to have to choose, choose something that works, choose something that is not drastic, so that America can make that transition, so that America doesn't have to just drop everything and start all over again.

When we talked about infrastructure, we need to provide incentives so that you see some of the problems you have with providing electricity. In the northeast, you saw a lot of it over the last several years. Some of our transmission capacities and the grids Mr. MATHESON talked about. Yes, it's great to go produce solar power or wind energy, but you have still got to get it somewhere.

If you are going to do ethanol, they are saying there is a problem with putting it in the pipeline, so you will have to build special pipelines just for ethanol. But somebody has got to have incentive to go build those pipelines.

We talk about having fuel-efficient cars. They are all over the place, flex fuel. You can walk out of here. There are thousands and thousands and thousands of them. But you can't find a station to find E–85. It's not available.

So to do one thing that sounds good, it's part of a whole package, and that's what the Blue Dogs are trying to make sure that we keep focused. There was a guy that I knew once, he says, just remember, keep your eye on the ball, and the ball here is getting America moved forward, but getting America's energy policy done right.

That's what we have got to stay focused on as a country, as a Congress, and this administration, to help us make sure that we provide good, sound energy policy.

Mr. MATHESON. I think there are two broad issues out here. Our hour is drawing to a close, but there are two broad issues out here in the energy debate. One is energy independence and security, and the other is climate change challenge.

Now those issues are not mutually exclusive. In fact, a number of the provisions to pursue each of those issues are complementary, and we should look at it in that context. But I do think that the Blue Dogs have come up with a set of principles, we haven't been able to talk about every one of them tonight, and we will come back again on the floor to do that.

As I said, this is a complicated issue. There are a lot of layers to this issue, and this Congress needs to first recognize that level of complexity to make sure we make good decisions. You have to recognize the magnitude of the issue before you can make good decisions.

But I do want to touch on just one other area that is a principle the Blue Dogs feel is very important, and that's the notion that we need to have an aggressive effort at technology development. We talked a little bit about technology development tonight, but let's put it in perspective to where if we really want to get to a point where we have greater energy independence, and if we make progress on the carbon emission issue as well.

The technologies aren't there today that need to be there. First of all, is the technology called carbon capture and sequestration. More than half of all the electricity we make in this country is coal. You know what, this country has a lot of coal. In fact, one-fourth of the world's coal is right here in the United States. It's cheap, it's plentiful.

The way we burn it now we put CO_2 in the atmosphere. The hope is that we can develop the technology to capture that carbon and sequester it. But that technology isn't there yet today.

So, when Blue Dogs talk about we need to make a significant and aggressive commitment to technology development, that's one of the technologies. It's real straightforward. We will have coal as part of our energy mix. I think most people think that in terms for the long run in terms of our electric production. But we have got to solve that carbon issue, and we have got to invest in technology.

Second, we have had discussions about cellulosic ethanol. We can't rely on corn as our source of ethanol in this country. There has to be a better way to do it. We have got to move technology in that direction. A third one, just to throw an example, battery technology. We want to get to the point where we have the car you can go home and plug in at night and run on electricity. A lot of people have spent a lot of time and money trying to develop that battery technology. We are still not there yet.

That's an appropriate Federal role to invest and move ahead with that research and development. I just want to make sure, that's the other principle I get out tonight that the Blue Dogs believe in, that that's the right role for the Federal Government to do, to push the development of these technologies.

One of the greatest American strengths is innovation. That's what this country is all about. It's why we are a superpower. We have got to unleash that again and again. The government can't drive all that, but we can sure encourage it. That is what we ought to do.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. The one area we did not mention, because we need to, because it's going to play a very important role in the future, that's nuclear, nuclear energy. I know when you mention the words nuclear energy, folks get a little shaky, but that's an education job, that's a leadership job. But nuclear energy is reliable, it's low cost, everywhere we have the safety necessary, there's a licensing process that we go through, there are all kinds of features there. But nuclear energy is very, very important, it's going to play a very important role, and we have got to invest in it.

Finally, I have got to say, I think in reminding a great historian once said, on the bleached bones of many past civilizations are written those pathetic words, too late. Let us hope and let us know for sure with the action we are taking in this Congress that they will not be able to say that about our civilization on this energy and global warming. We are not going to move too late.

Mr. MELANCON. I agree with that, and in one closing remark, just a thought, as people in public life, you have times where constituents are there wanting things, and, of course, as there is the old expression, what have you done for me today? I hope when this energy policy debate is over, and we have come to a consensus and passed a bill, that it's a good bill, and that we can say to you, I worked to secure your energy future, and I hope that it's going to be one that carries you for generations.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Well stated.

Mr. MATHESON. I want to thank both of my colleagues for joining us. As I said, the Blue Dog coalition stands ready to work with people on both sides of the aisle. We approach these issues through a very, practical, pragmatic way. We want to do what's right for this country.

We are going to come back and talk about energy more and more. By the way, I think this is one of the great domestic policy issues. By that way,

that's foreign policy implications, as my colleague pointed out in his comments earlier. It's one of the great issues we face as a country, and it's helpful to help drive forward that debate.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for the time remaining before midnight.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I do have a lot of material to cover in the time that is available.

I thought it was appropriate, as we end this legislative day here in the United States House of Representatives, that we talk a little bit about health care, because health care will be one of the central arguments, one of the central themes that consumes this country over the next 16 months as we lead up to the presidential election. Indeed, you are already hearing presidential candidates talk about their various visions for health care.

One of the things that concerns me greatly is the issue of the issue of the state of our physician workforce. In my home State of Texas, the Texas Medical Association puts out a periodical every month. In March the title of the magazine they put out was ''Running out of Doctors,'' a great concern of mine.

A year and a half ago Alan Greenspan came and talked to a group of us right before he left as Chairman of the Federal Reserve board. And someone asked him about Medicare and about how we are going to pay for Medicare in the future. He acknowledged that it was going to be difficult, but at the appropriate time he felt that Congress would be able to step up to the job of doing what was going to be necessary to pay for Medicare. He paused, and he said, well, what concerns me greatly is will there be anyone there to provide the services that you need?

That's what I would like to address this evening. I think if I could, I am going to confine my remarks to the limited time I have to four areas. I want to talk a little bit about medical liability, I want to talk a little bit about the status of the physician workforce in regards to the developing physician, the person who may be in college or high school considering a career in health care, I want to talk about the physician in training, and I want to concentrate greatly on what I call the mature physician, the physician who is in practice, and some of the effects of current governmental policy where we reduce payments to physicians year over year and the pernicious effect that is having on the physician workforce.

First, just touching on liable, my home State of Texas had a significant problem with he had some call liability. In 2003, the State legislature passed a medical liability reform based off of a prior California law, the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975, which was passed by California, but we updated it for the 21st Century.

Indeed, the law passed by the Texas Legislature in 2003, was based off the California law, that had as its basis caps on noneconomic damages, but in California, that was a fixed $250,000 cap for all noneconomic damages. As you can see from the visual aid, Texas trifurcated the cap. We have a $250,000 cap on physicians for noneconomic damages, $250,000 cap on a hospital for noneconomic damages and a $250,000 cap on a second hospital or nursing home, if one has been involved.

□ 2345

Well, this was passed back in 2003. How has the Texas plan fared? The year I first ran for Congress, 2002, we had dropped from 17 insurers down to two. It was almost impossible to get medical liability insurance at any price because of the effects of the legislation passed. There are now 14 insurers back in the State, and most of those have come back in without an increase in premiums.

Three years after passage, the Medical Protective Company had a 10 percent rate cut which was their fourth since April of 2005. Texas Medical Liability Trust, my last insurer of record, declared an aggregate cut over the past 4 years of 22 percent. Another company called Advocate MD filed a 19.9 percent rate decrease. And another company called Doctors Company announced a 13 percent rate cut, real numbers that affect real people and affect real access to care.

Probably one of the most significant unintended beneficiaries of this legislation that was passed in 2003 in my home State of Texas was the smaller not-for-profit community hospitals. These were hospitals that were self-insured and had to put large amounts of cash up as a cash reserve against a potential lawsuit. What has happened since this law has past is these hospitals have found they have been able to take more of that cash and invest it in capital, invest it in nurses' salaries, exactly the kinds of things you want your smaller, not-for-profit community hospital to be doing in your community.

Mr. Speaker, I took the language of the Texas plan and modified it so it would work within the constructs of our language here in the House of Representatives and actually offered this language to the ranking member of our House Budget Committee, who had the bill scored by the Congressional Budget Office. And the Texas plan, as applied to the House of Representatives to the entire 50 States, would have yielded a $3.8 billion savings over 5 years. Now, not a mammoth amount of money in Congress speak; but when you talk about a $2.99999 trillion budget, any savings that you could manage is in fact significant. And this is money that could have gone for a pay-for for many of the other things that we talk about doing for health care in this body.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people ask me: Well, if Texas has solved the problem, so why are we even concerned about it on the national level? One is the savings that was demonstrated by the Congressional Budget Office. Another is this, Mr. Speaker: consider the cost of defensive medicine.

A 1996 study, 11 years ago, done by Stanford University revealed that in the Medicare system alone, just Medicare, not Medicaid, not the Federal prison system, but in the Medicare system alone the cost of defensive medicine was approximately $28 billion to $30 billion a year. Ten or 11 years ago it was at that expense, and I submit that that number is significantly higher today if anyone would rework those numbers.

Another consideration is young people getting out of school. They look at the cost of professional liability insurance and say, you know what, I am going to stay out of those higher risk specialties because it is just not worth it to me.

Now, I do want to draw my colleagues' attention to a bill, H.R. 2583. This bill addresses graduate medical education. It is an enhancement for graduate medical education, and would develop a program that would permit hospitals, hospitals that do not traditionally operate a residency program, the opportunity to start a residency program to help again build physician the workforce of the future. On average, it costs $100,000 a year to train a resident, and that cost for a smaller hospital can actually be an impossible barrier to entry. But because of this bill, that would create a loan fund available to hospitals to create residency programs where none has operated in the past; and it would require full accreditation and be generally focused in rural suburban or inner urban communities.

Another bill that I would direct my colleagues' attention to, H.R. 2584, this bill is designed to help medical students and those who have just recently graduated from medical school with a mix of scholarship, loan repayment funds, tax incentives to entice more students into medical school and create incentives for those students and newly minted doctors. The program will have an established repayment plan for students who agree to go into family practice, internal medicine, emergency medicine, general surgery, OB/GYN, and practice in an underserved area. It is a 5-year authorization. It is fairly modest at $5 million a year and would provide additional educational scholarships in exchange for a commitment to serve in a public or private nonprofit health facility determined to have a critical shortage of primary care physicians.

Mr. Speaker, in whatever time I have left, I do want to address again the group that I call the ''mature physician,'' and I want to address that from the perspective of the formula that is called the ''sustainable growth rate

formula.'' That is the formula under which Medicare reimburses physicians.

Why is that important? Let me show you this. If we look at how Medicare pays for the administration of care in this country, we have a situation where doctors are paid under a different formula from hospitals, from insurance plans, from drug companies, from nursing homes.

And look at this graph, Mr. Speaker. What you see is that physicians receive cuts year over year, unless Congress steps in at the last minute and does something, which we did for several years here right after I first got to Congress. But compare that with Medicare advantaged hospitals and nursing homes where every year there is a cost-of-living update, the Medicare economic index, if you will, that adjusts payments upward. But year over year there is a reduction in reimbursement, and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services for Physicians provides this cut for physicians who take care of the patients.

It is not a question of doctors wanting to make more money; it is about a stabilized repayment system for services that have already been rendered. And it is not just affecting doctors; it affects patients. Not a week goes by that I don't get a letter or a fax from some doctor, usually in my home State of Texas, oftentimes in my district but sometimes it is someplace far afield. But they say, You know what? I have just had enough of what Medicare is doing to my reimbursement schedule and I am going to retire early. I am no longer going to see Medicare patients in my practice, or I am going to restrict the procedures that I offer to Medicare patients.

In fact, I had a young woman come up to me that I trained with at Parkland Hospital and tell me what Medicare was doing to her wasn't right and, as a consequence, she was not going to be offering a certain set of high-risk procedures to her patients any longer.

And the question is, where will those patients go for that treatment? I saw it in the hospital environment before I left practice to come to Congress and, again, I hear it in virtually every town hall that I hold back in my district. Someone will come up to me, either as a question in the formal part of the meeting or afterwards, and say, how come in this country you turn 65 and you have got to change doctors? And the answer is, because the doctor they were seeing found it no longer economically viable to continue to see Medicare patients because this was happening to them, and year over year they weren't able to pay the cost of delivering the care, never mind taking a paycheck home to support their family.

Medicare payments to physicians are modified annually under this SGR formula. The process is flawed, it needs to be repealed, because it mandates physician fee cuts that have gone on in recent years be continued indefinitely, and they become quite substantial over time.

Now, the quandary that you always hear quoted is that simple repeal of the SGR is cost prohibitive. But we could, Mr. Speaker, consider doing that over time. We could consider setting a date in the future by which the SGR would be repealed and perhaps bring that cost down to an attainable level.

The bill that I have recently introduced, H.R. 2585, would repeal the SGR in 2010. Now, in the new physician payment stabilization bill, 2 years from now the SGR formula goes away. But there are incentives provided to physicians in the year 2008 and the year 2009 based on some quality reporting and technology improvements.

More importantly, by resetting the baseline of the SGR formula, the CBO estimates that the practical effect of my bill would bring a 1.5 percent update in 2008 and a 1 percent update in 2009, and a complete elimination of the SGR by 2010. The CBO score calculates a savings of $40 billion off the total price tag of an SGR elimination.

Again, there are also in addition to essentially what is a Medicare economic index update for 2008, a little less than that for 2009, and then elimination of the formula and a full MEI update starting in 2010, which would be a significant change from where we are now. In addition to that, bonus payments for physicians who are willing to voluntarily do some quality reporting and bonus payments for physicians who are willing to voluntarily participate in some health information technology upgrades, computerization of their practice, if you will.

One of the main thrusts of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services to look up, to ascertain the top 10 conditions that drive the highest percentage of payments, and then require CMS to adopt reporting measures relating to those conditions. In fact, those have already been developed. We are not going to reinvent the wheel here. The American Medical Association Physician Consortium has already developed those reporting measures that are driving spending so high.

Mr. Speaker, the old bank robber Willie Sutton, when he was asked, Why do you rob the bank? He said, Because that's where the money is. Mr. Speaker, let's go where the money is. Let's go to those top 10 things where the greatest amount of money is spent, those top 10 diagnostic codes or top 10 diseases where the major amount of money is spent in Medicare, and it amounts to about 70 percent of the savings in Medicare, because that is where the greatest amount of savings is going to occur.

If we can deliver more care in a timely fashion and we can improve outcomes, you are actually going to spend less. And, again, that is the thrust of this bill. That is why you postpone the repeal of the SGR by 2 years, to get that savings that is going to happen by doing things better, quicker, smarter, the same types of things we saw when we began to provide a prescription drug benefit under the part D part of Medicare. Those costs that were originally projected by CBO and the Office of the Management of the Budget of the White House, actually, those scores were way too high.

The actual figures for the first year of the operation of the Medicare prescription drug program came in lower. Why did it come in lower? Partly because of competition and partly because the cost-effective thing also turns out to be the right thing to do oftentimes in the practice of medicine. A lot of savings are in fact available in this system if we only again have the courage to do that.

Let me just speak briefly about health information technology, because it does receive a lot of attention. Here in the House of Representatives we worked on several bills last year. We will probably have an opportunity to have several bills this year. Indeed, a reform in health information technology is part of the bill that I introduced, H.R. 2585, to repeal the sustainable growth rate formula.

But let me just point out a couple of things. I don't know that I was a big believer in electronic medical records when I left the practice of medicine and came to Congress. They are expensive, a big cost for a small practice to set it up. They slow you down. When you are in practice, it adds minutes to each patient; and if you are seeing 30 patients a day and you add 2 minutes to each patient, that is an extra hour. How are you going to be compensated for that extra hour that you spend?

Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of the medical records room at Charity Hospital in New Orleans. It was taken in January of 2006, 5 months after Hurricane Katrina hit there. And this had been completely under water, of course, when the city was flooded. When the Corps of Engineers got the water out, this is what was left. And you see a typical medical records room with all of these paper charts. But this black discoloration is not from smoke or soot; that is black mold that has grown on these charts. It is not safe to let anyone go in there and try to retrieve data from those charts because of what has happened with the mold contamination.

All of those records are lost, tens of thousands of patients. A patient who might have been waiting for a bone marrow transplant or a kidney transplant, a patient who is in the middle of their cancer therapy, All of that was lost in those records.

Mr. Speaker, in January of this year we heard a lot of stories about Walter Reed Hospital, and I went out to Walter Reed to look for myself about what was happening with the treatment of our soldiers who are on medical hold. And Sergeant Blades took me around the complex and showed me the things that had been in all of the newspapers.

And then he said, You know what bugs me even more than anything else. I could live with all of the other stuff, but here is the real problem I have. He was trying to assemble his medical records so he could make his case to the VA about a disability claim he had.

He had been in the service for a number of years, he had suffered some injuries during his time in the service, and he wanted to be able to make his case for disability payments. He said he will spend probably 20 to 24 man hours on his medical records making the case, going through it with a yellow highlighter. And then he said, It goes and sits on someone's desk for 2 week's time and then it is lost. And the reason for that is there is not an electronic medical records system that the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense can communicate with each other. So he has to go back and reconstruct the paper trail of his 20 years in the service and document all of the problems that he has had with his injuries over time in order to make his case for a disability claim.

And that is what was concerning him more than anything else that day, was that it took so much time to get these things assembled and he was at the mercy of someone misplacing that record off their desk, and he would have to go back to square one. His medical hold would be either extended or denied, and he would have to start all over again with assembling his medical record. He advised his men to make two or three copies of their medical records before they submitted it to the appropriate person in the infirmary.

Mr. Speaker, I know our time is about up. I appreciate the indulgence of the time this evening. Again, health care is an important topic. We are going to spend a lot of time on it in the weeks and months to come. And, again, it will be part of the central theme of Presidential elections on both sides of the political spectrum. And to be sure, I will be back here on several occasions talking about some of the things that I think are most important. But when you look at the problem with losing physicians, when you look at the problem with how we treat our Medicare physicians, the problems they have in getting their payment rates straightened out, what happens if you don't take care of that? You lose doctors. Patients don't have the physicians to see.

What will Congress do in that event? I don't know. Parliament over in Great Britain decided it was in their best interest to bring physicians in from overseas on visas and give them waivers. Someone else paid for their education and they worked cheap. But we also saw in Scotland over the 4th of July weekend, that didn't turn out to be a good idea.

HEALTH CARE

Introduction

This evening I will address my concerns about the delivery of health care services in this country. The future of medical care in this country will be hotly debated in Congress and especially over the next 18 months as we approach the 2008 Presidential elections and the 111th Congress that convenes in 2009.

We will be deciding the avenue through which our system will be based—on the table exists two choices. First is to expand the government or public sector's involvement in the delivery of services—popularly referred to as ''universal health care'' or termed in the early 90s as ''Hillary Care.'' Or second, whether we encourage and continue the private sector involvement in the delivery of health care. These two options bring about a plethora of questions and concerns, and I am hopeful that my explanations tonight will shed light on the direction we should be taking to have the United States remain as the best health care system in the world.

Now some people may feel that is an overstatement. They will cite uninsured numbers of the cost of prescription drugs. But while these issues abound, they are statistics and the old adage remains, ''there is truth, there are lies, and then there are statistics.'' You can make the numbers say whatever you like or the outcome of polls can be manipulated just by massaging how you ask the question. So I will dispense with these avenues and simply explain the situation at hand and the solutions currently available.

I'll be discussing different principles guiding the debate about private versus public delivery of health care services, but let me give you a background on how we got to the system we have today. The idea that we must solve this problem is not new. Secretary Leavitt has even remarked the necessity tackling the decision between these two philosophies. As he said in an op-ed recently, ''Should the government own the system or should we organize the system.''

History

Coming out of World War II, the United States had a flourishing economy and an upsurge in the birthrate clearly coining the phrase ''Baby Boom'' generation. The U.S., unlike many of our allies coming out of the war was able to benefit from the economic prosperity by developing a hybrid system for the delivery of health care including both a public and private involvement. Europe, in contrast, was suffering from depleted resources and fatigue after World War II. It was clear from the outset that their economies, in particular that of Great Britain, were unable, from the private sector, to uphold the delivery of health care. The government had to run the health care system.

Next we fast forward roughly 20 years to the mid-60s and the Presidency of Lyndon Baines Johnson, a fellow Texan from across the aisle. During his tenure, both Medicare and Medicaid programs were signed into law. These large, government-run programs were created to focus on hospital care for the elderly and basic health care services for the poverty-stricken respectively.

Decades later, it was evident that the government-run Medicare program was slow to change, a behemoth to operate and extraordinarily expensive. By 2003, Congress recognized that the outdated model of providing largely hospital-only care to the elderly was insufficient. The government system needed to catch-up to the robust private system that was already focused on prevention and disease management. Finally, Congress passed the Medicare Prescription Drug Plan that gave seniors coverage for the medications. While the program has been successful, and has provided greater benefits for seniors, it did not come without considerable discussions and a massive push by the success of the private sector. And here is our crossroads today.

Currently the government pays for nearly half of all health care administered in this country. With a current GDP of roughly $11 trillion, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services states that Medicare and Medicaid Services alone cost $600 billion. The other half of health care is broken down with primary weight being carried by the private industry, and charitable and self-pay accounting for the rest.

As these numbers increase, and the Federal Government continues to funnel the American taxpayer's dollars into its coffers, we must ask if this is the best use of taxpayer dollars? Is the government doing an excellent job of managing your money? Do you think the government is better suited to care for your health care needs? Who is better to handle the growing health care crisis in this country?

I argue that the government-only, or universal health care system, is unsustainable in America and will hamper our innovation and delivery of the most modern health care services available.

I can site two specific examples that support my premise that a private-based system is better equipped, more flexible, and less expensive (being driven by the market) than a government-based system. First we can look to our northern border at Canada. Canada boasts a universal health care system but what it fails to highlight is the tremendous wait list for treatment that patients must endure. Their access to care is limited. Now this is not a significant problem if you are a wealthy Canadian because you can take your money, cross the southern border in the U.S. and receive care immediately. If you were waiting for bypass surgery, would you prefer to get into the hospital as quickly as possible or be placed on a waiting list that could take months? Is your health, or the health of your loved ones something that you can take a gamble with?

My second example stems from the British Isles where they suffer so of the same fate. The British National Health Service is a 2-tier system that faces continued allegations of ageism. The system can simply no longer treat patients over 80 because the system recognizes that the patients at this age will simply not survive their wait time. It is a sad reality, but it is true.

So I return to my premise that the private sector is more nimble and financially a more stable arena from which to build our future health care system. Noting this complex relationship, how should Congress do its job to ensure we have the best health care system possible? Congress must promote policies that keep the private sector leading the way with some interaction by the well-run government programs.

Uninsured

One issue that springs to mind concerns the uninsured population, which the U.S. Census Bureau estimated at some 46 million back in 2005. Now I want to be specific . . . access to health care is not the issue. Those individuals classified as ''uninsured'' means they are not covered by a specific plan; it does not

mean they cannot seek health care services. In fact, no one is denied health care services in this country. Two specific examples of where access is available through the State Children's Health Insurance Program and Federally Qualified Health Centers.

SCHIP

In 1997, the Republicans introduced a new program designed to help provide medical coverage to every vulnerable child. The program, commonly referred to as SCHIP, operates a joint Federal-State partnership. It provides flexibility for States to determine standards for providing health care funding for those children who are not eligible for Medicaid but whose parents cannot truly afford health care insurance. The program has been very successful across the board.

As SCHIP is being reauthorized this year and heavily debated on both sides of the Capitol, I continue to push for clarification on two issues. First, the intent of SCHIP is clear—the acronym said CHILDREN. However, some States have opted to spend funds on others instead of children. To stop this process, I introduced H.R. 1013, making certain that SCHIP funds are spent exclusively on children and pregnant women—not on any other group.

Second, it is imperative, as we move forward in this debate, that individuals have the flexibility to use SCHIP funds to procure health care coverage that works best for them. Some legislation I've seen would carve people out of the private insurance market; this was never the intent of SCHIP nor should it be an outcome from this debate.

SCHIP is an example where children and pregnant women can receive medical coverage. This eliminates a large number of those classified as ''uninsured.'' As the differing bills appear from both House and Senate committees of jurisdiction, and I hope that this language is included.

FQHC

For those others that are not children or pregnant women, they too have access options, namely, Federally Qualified Health Centers. This patient access to health care even without ''insurance'' serves an estimated 15 million ''uninsured.'' So what are FQHCs? An FQHC provides comprehensive primary health, oral, and mental health/substance abuse services to persons in all stages of the life cycle.

Both SCHIP and FQHCs are designed to help the poorest, youngest and underserved communities. But what about those individuals that can afford to pay some of their health care services? There are two programs available that assist individuals and companies in receiving health care coverage: Health Savings Accounts and Association Health Plans.

Health Savings Accounts

Health Savings Accounts (HSA) are a tax-advantaged medical savings account available to taxpayers who are enrolled in a high deductible health plan—a health insurance plan with lower premiums and higher deductibles than a traditional health plan. It is sometimes referred to as a catastrophic health insurance plan.

For an HSA, the funds contributed to the account are not subject to income tax, but can only be used to pay for qualified medical expenses. But perhaps one of the best parts of having an HSA is that all deposits to an HSA become the property of the policyholder, regardless of the source of the deposit. Patients actually have a say in how and where they spend their health care dollars. Additionally, any funds deposited, but not withdrawn each year, will carry over into the next year.

The popularity of HSAs has grown considerably since its inception. Although numbers are only verified from 2005, by December of that year, some 3.2 million individuals had coverage. Of that number, 42% of individuals or families with income below $50,000 were purchasing HSA-type insurance. This fact notes that HSAs are an affordable option. In addition, the number of previously uninsured HSA plan purchasers over the age of 60 nearly doubled, proving that the plans are also accessible to people of all ages.

Association Health Plans

Of the roughly 46 million Americans who are uninsured, nearly 60% of them are employed by small business. And some of these individuals prefer a more traditional health plan but their small business employers find offering a health benefit simply too expensive. To unburden small business owners, Congress devised the concept of association health plans.

AHPs allow small businesses to arrange their health benefits alongside other like-minded organizations there by spreading risk among a much larger group, lowering the administrative costs, and providing better benefit options to employees.

Physician Workforce Issues

But are we putting the cart before the horse? In a conversation with Alan Greenspan, before he stepped down as Chairman of the Federal Reserve, he was concerned about whether there would be an adequate labor supply to meet the demand for medical services in the future. The truth is our country faces an oncoming physician shortage. We need to ensure that doctors in practice today, those at the peak of their clinical abilities remain in practice and provide services to those with the most complex issues. So what steps do we need to take to ensure physicians remain in practice?

Medical Liability

First we must tackle an issue that continues to plague the medical community: medical liability. We need common-sense medical liability reform to protect patients, to stop the skyrocketing costs associated with frivolous lawsuits, to make health care more affordable and accessible for all Americans, and to keep necessary services in communities that need them most.

We need a national solution. Currently, our state-to-state coverage leaves us in jeopardy and tangles up the court system. Amazingly, we have an excellent example of the direction we should be taking on the Federal level by modeling legislation after what the State of Texas already has in place, which is getting ready to celebrate its 4th anniversary as law.

Texas brought together the major stakeholders in the discussion, including doctors, hospitals and nursing homes. Now some might point out that manufacturers were not present, but the State was clear to leave open the option for their participation at a later date.

My home State of Texas had a significant problem as far as medical liability was concerned. We had lost most of our medical liability insurers from the State. They had simply closed shop and left because they could not see a future in providing medical liability insurance in Texas. We went from 17 insurers down to 2 by the end of 2002. Rates were increasing year over year. My personal situation, running my own practice, was that rates were increasing by 30 percent to 50 percent a year.

In 2003, Texas State legislature passed a medical liability reform based off the California law, but updated for the 21st Century. Instead of a single $250,000 cap, there was a $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages as it pertained to physicians, hospitals and to second hospitals or nursing homes—an aggregate cap of $750,000.

So how has the Texas plan faired? Remember that I stated we dropped from 17 insurers down to 2 because of the medical liability crisis in the State? Now, we are back up to 14 or 15 carriers; and, most importantly, those carriers have returned to the State of Texas without an increase in premium.

In 2006, only three years after passage, Medical Protective had a 10% rate cut which was its 4th reduction since April of 2005. Texas Medical Liability Trust declared an aggregate of 22% cuts. Advocate MD filed a 19.9% rate decrease and Doctors Company announced a 13% rate cut. These are real numbers. That is a significant reversal. More options mean better prices and a more secure setting for medical professionals to remain in practice.

Probably one of the most important unintended beneficiaries of this was the small community not-for-profit hospital, who was self-insured for medical liability. They have been able to take money out of those escrow accounts and put it back to work for those hospitals capitalize improvements, paying nurse's salaries, the kinds of things you want your small not-for-profit community-based hospitals to be doing, not holding money in escrow against that inevitable liability suit that might occur.

I took the language of the Texas plan, worked it so it would fit within our constructs here in the House of Representatives and offered it to the ranking member of the Budget Committee. He had scored by the Congressional Budget Office, and the Texas plan, as applied through the House of Representatives to the entire 50 States, would yield a savings of $3.8 billion over 5 years. Not a mammoth amount of money when you are talking about a $2.999 trillion budget, but savings nonetheless, monies that we will leave on the table in this budgetary cycle that could have gone to some of the other spending priorities that we hear so much about. You can look to me for legislative action on this issue in the coming months.

Consider this—a 1996 study done by Stanford University revealed that in the Medicare system alone, the cost of defensive medicine was approximately $28 to $30 billion a year. That was 10 years ago. I suspect that number is higher today. That's why we can scarcely afford to continue the trajectory we are on with the medical liability issue in this country.

Another consideration is those young people getting out of college who are considering medical school. The current system keeps young people out of the practice of a health care for their livelihood because of the burden that we put upon them. This is the thing that we have to consider. We have to focus on how we are affecting our physician workforce

for the future, how we are affecting the health care that you are our children and our children's children will receive.

Physician Workforce and Graduate Medical Education Enhancement Act of 2007

Part of ensuring this future workforce includes helping the younger doctors with residency programs. The funny thing about doctors is we to have a lot of inertia. A lot of us tend to practice very close to where we did our training. The bill I propose is designed to get more training programs in areas that are underserved, like rural or inner cities. We must get young doctors training in locations where they are actually needed.

The ''GME,'' or Graduate Medical Education, Enhancement Act of 2007 would develop a program that would permit hospitals that do not traditionally operate a residency training program the opportunity to start a residency training program to build the physician workforce of the future.

On average, it costs $100,000 a year to train a resident and that cost for a smaller hospital can be prohibitive. Because of this cost consideration, my bill would create a loan fund available to hospitals to create residency training programs where none has operated in the past. The programs would require full accreditation and generally be focused in rural, suburban, inner urban or frontier community hospitals.

A diverse group, including the American College of Emergency Physicians and American Osteopathic Association, supports my GME legislation.

High-Need Physician Specialty Workforce Incentive Act of 2007

Locating young doctors where they are needed is part of solving the impending physician shortage crisis that will affect the entire health care system. Another aspect that must be considered is training doctors for high-need specialties.

My High-Need Physician Specialty Act of 2007 will establish a mix of scholarships, loan repayment funds, and tax incentives to entice more students to medical school and create incentives for those students and newly minted doctors. This program will have an established repayment program for students who agree to go into family practice, internal medicine, emergency medicine, general surgery, or OB/GYN, and practice in underserved areas. It will be a 5-year authorization at $5 million per year.

This bill would provide additional educational scholarships in exchange for a commitment to serve in a public or private nonprofit health facility determined to have a critical shortage of primary care physicians.

Prominent groups such as AARP, the American College of Physicians, and the ERISA Industry Committee, support my High-Need Specialty legislation.

Physician Stabilization

So far we in addressing the Physician Workforce crisis we have discuss medical liability, the placement of doctors in locations of greatest need and the financial concerns of encouraging doctors to remain in high-need specialties. The next portion of my remarks is related to perhaps the largest group of doctors in this country and certainly, the largest and still-growing group of patients—our ''Baby Boom'' generation and the Medicare program.

As the baby boomers age and retire, the demand for services is going to go nowhere but up. And if the physician workforce trends continue as they are today, we may be not talking about funding a Medicare program, we may be talking about there is no one there to take care of the seniors.

Year-after-year there is a reduction in reimbursement payments from the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services to physicians for the services they provide their Medicare patients. This is not a question of doctors wanting to make more money; it is about stabilized repayment for services already rendered. And it isn't affecting just doctors—this problem affects patients. It becomes a real crisis of access.

Not a week goes by that I don't get a letter or fax from some physician who says, ''You know what, I have just had enough and I am going to retire early. I am no longer going to see Medicare patients in my practice, or I am going to restrict the procedures that I offer Medicare patients.''

Unfortunately, I know that is happening because I saw it in the hospital environment before I left the practice of medicine to come to Congress. But I also hear it in virtually every town hall that I do back in my district. Someone will raise their hand and say, ''How come on Medicare, you turn 65 and you have got to change doctors?''

And the answer is because their doctor found it no longer economically viable to continue to see Medicare patients because they weren't able to pay the cost of delivering the care. They weren't able to cover the cost of providing the care.

Medicare payments to physicians are modified annually using the sustainable growth rate (SGR) formula. Because of flaws in the process, the SGR mandated physician fee cuts in recent years have been only moderately averted by last minute fixes. If no long-term congressional action is implemented, the SGR will continue to mandate fee cuts.

Unlike hospital reimbursement rates, which follow closely the Medicare Economic Index (MEI), which measures the increasing costs of providing care, physicians reimbursements do not. In fact, Medicare payments to physicians cover only about 65% of the actual cost of providing patient services. Can you imagine any industry or company that would continue in business if they received only 65% of what they spent.

But the simple repeal of the SGR is simply too cost prohibitive. But if we do that over time, perhaps we can bring that cost down to a level where it is manageable.

Paying physicians fairly will extend the careers of many physicians who are now in practice who would otherwise opt out of the Medicare program, seek early retirement, or restrict those procedures that they offer to their Medicare patients.

It also has the effect of insuring an adequate network of doctors available to older Americans as this country makes the transition to the physician workforce of the future.

In my new physician payment stabilization bill, the SGR formula would be repealed in 2010, 2 years from now, but would also provide incentive payments based on quality reporting and technology improvements.

Recently, CBO estimated that the practical payment effect from my bill would bring a 1.5% update in 2008, a 1.0% update in 2009, and a complete elimination by 2010. The CBO score calculates a savings of $40 billion off the total price tag of an SGR elimination.

These incentive payments would be installed to protect the practicing physician against that 5% cut that will likely occur in 2008 and 2009. That would be voluntary. No one would be required to participate in the quality program or the technology improvement, but it would be available to those doctors or practices who wanted to offset the proposed cuts that will occur in physician reimbursement in the 2 years until the formal repeal of the SGR happens.

Now I know this is perhaps a frightening thought to some physicians—I'm sure I would have been wary at first when I ran my own practice. But step back and view the long-term solution. This is the only logical, economically viable and I reiterate long-term solution.

Now, why do it that way? Why not just bite the bullet and let's go ahead and get the SGR out of the way and get it repealed? Remember, it costs a tremendous amount of money to do that. Another problem that we have in Congress is we are required to submit all legislation to the Congressional Budget Office to find out how much it costs. If we are going to be spending the taxpayers' money, how much are we going to spend? Over what time will we spend it?

Because of the constraints of the Congressional Budget Office, we are not allowed to do dynamic scoring. Unfortunately, we can't do look-ahead and say, ''You know, I think if we do this, we are going to save some money.''

But, by postponing the repeal of the SGR by 2 years' time; taking the savings that occurs during that time and applying it to the SGR formula; we may actually get a number that is doable as far as releasing the SGR and replacing it with the Medicare Economic Index similar to the way hospitals are reimbursed.

One of the main thrusts of this bill is to require the Center for Medicare and Medicare Services to look at their top 10 conditions that drive the highest percentage of payments. The bill would require CMS to adopt reporting measures relating to these conditions that have already been developed. It is not reinventing the wheel. The American Medical Association Physician Consortium has already developed those reporting measures that drive that spending so high.

You know, the old famous bank robber Willie Sutton, when he was asked why do you rob the bank, he said that is because that is where the money is. Let's go to those top 10 things where the greatest amount of money is spent, because that is where the greatest amount of savings can occur. If we can deliver care in a more timely fashion and if we can improve outcomes, we are actually going to spend less. And by focusing on those top 10 programs, at least initially, that will be the greatest return on investment for CMS and ultimately will be the greatest return on investment for retiring the SGR.

The same considerations may apply to the Medicaid program as well, so it will be a very useful exercise to go through that and identify those top 10 conditions. And where cost savings may be most easily gathered, not only will it have an improving effect on Medicare, but I suspect on Medicaid as well.

This will also include a report back to doctors on what their volume and intensity is. This information will not be made generally public, but it will be made available to the individual physician so they can see how they are doing; how they are doing relative to other doctors in

their practice, other doctors in their community, and other doctors around the country. Physicians are a competitive group; I assure you these reports will be read.

Health Information Technology

There is also going to be a provision in the bill to help physicians' offices bring their information technology, their infrastructure, hardware and software, up to a standard where it will begin to derive benefit not only the patient and the practice but also to the Medicare system in general.

The provision will also create a safe harbor that will allow clinics, physicians' offices, and hospitals to share health information technology platforms. These standards will be established and available to physicians' practices so they will understand how they need to comply. The standards must be established no later than January 1, 2008.

Back in the day, I wasn't always a big proponent of things like electronic records. I wasn't sure if it would deliver the payoff that people said it would. But here is a picture of the medical records department in Charity Hospital in New Orleans. This picture was made in January 2006, about 4 or 5 months after Hurricane Katrina and the downtown flooding that occurred. It is the medical records room. These records are ruined. You can see this is not smoke or soot damage; this is black mold that is growing on the records. You look there and it almost goes on to infinity, tens of thousands, hundred of thousands of records that were active, ongoing charts of people's medical conditions absolutely now unavailable. No one is going to get into that medical records department and risk inhaling the spores from the mold that is covering those charts.

This is the kind of problem that you can get into with a paper medical record. Of course the youngsters of today, the college students of today, the young physicians of today, they understand this very well. They are all connected and wired in. They would no more imagine turning in or doing a paper for one of their classes where they just had a single copy, a single paper copy, the old adage ''the dog ate my homework,'' most students will have a paper on a CD or on a flash drive readily accessible and retrievable in many forms. We should do no less with our medical records.

But it costs money to do this. It is going to require a push from the private sector. I prefer to think of a bonus payment as being an inducement, an enticement for physicians' offices to participate in this type of program. But it is also just good medicine. It is good patient care.

We all heard about the troubles at Walter Reed Hospital a few months ago. I went out to Walter Reed probably the week after the story broke in the Washington Post and talked to this young man who took me around Building 18. Yes, there was some concern. It was a crummy building. But his biggest concern was spending hours and hours with his medical record, his service record, going through the various parts and highlighting things. He had a yellow marker, a highlighter, highlighting parts of his medical record because this is how he was going to establish the benefits that he was going to receive in the VA system for his disability.

He said ''I can spend 20 man-hours putting this medical record together and it ends up on someone's desk and it doesn't get picked up, and then no one can find it and I have to start all over again.'' That was his main message to me that day.

Now the VA system has been indeed very forward-thinking in its embrace of electronic medical records and its investment in information technology. The problem is the medical records from the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs do not possess the interoperability necessary to make this type of activity unnecessary.

Delivering value to the patient is of paramount importance. And it is my contention that if we do make the bonus payment generally available to physicians, this will be something that they will embrace. There is a learning curve, to be sure. It is going to slow people down a little bit initially. But ultimately, the rapidity of the system will be impressive. And even in a smaller physician's office the ability to never have to wait while they find your medical records would be amazing. Once physicians and medical offices become used to this technology, they will embrace it.

Another unintended benefit to providing incentives for health information technology is the rapidity with which the health care system itself can learn. When I say the health care system, I specifically address the possibility that treatments and the delivery of quality health care services can be faster, cost less and simply be better. Wouldn't it be great to have that information and know what treatments were effective and what treatments were only marginal? That information can be literally at a physician's fingertips with the right type of computer architecture and technology environment. I believe the time has come that we do need to embrace that.

So the physician payment stabilization bill will include a federal incentive to implement health information technology along with provisions providing safe harbors for the sharing of software, technical assistance and hardware, as well as the creation of consortiums.

Health Care Price Transparency

Once you have established measures that will allow for a medical workforce in the future—through a nation medical liability law, ensuring a medical workforce in areas that you need and in locations that need them, and by stabilizing physician reimbursements, you can refine other health care projects.

Perhaps the foundation of understanding health care is to understand its costs. The average consumer has little understanding about how much any service or prescription drug costs because they are supplemented by the government and often their employer. This must change.

In August 2006, President Bush issued an executive order calling for increased transparency within the federal government's health care agencies. The legislation I have proposed in the past is an extension of that executive order, giving States the tools to become part of a necessary solution for health care consumers.

The bill would require states establish health care transparency requirements for hospitals and health plans, as well as conduct a study on what information is most useful to consumers.

For example, the Texas Hospital Association has created a web-based tool that allows consumers to compare hospital-to-hospital cost called Texas PricePoint. This website assists consumers that are considering nonemergency procedures at area hospitals. Texas health care consumers now can view and compare charge data on inpatient hospital services. Couple this data with hospital quality information and consumers will be able to truly shop for health services based on quality and cost. What a remarkably simply idea that is literally educating and engaging the consumer in making his or her health care choices. Knowledge is an essential tool for making informed decisions.

This type of planning tool should be made available to all patients, across the country, at any time. Think of it like a ''Travelocity'' or ''Priceline'' for health care servIces. Wouldn't that be terrific? The long and the short of it is that this is possible. And Congress can make this happen if we commit ourselves to the process.

Conclusion

I recognize that all of this information is technically complex, sometimes even boring to listen to, but it nonetheless tells an incredibly important story. It is the story of how the most advanced, most innovative and most appreciated health care system in the world needs help. The end of the story should read ''happily ever after.'' So how do we reach that conclusion? The last chapter should read, ''A Private Industry Leads to a Healthy Ending.''

As I stated in the beginning of this hour, we are in a debate that will forever change our health care system. We must understand what is working in our system and what is not. We cannot delay making changes and bringing health care into the 21st Century.

I believe that the only way this can work is if we allow the private sector to lay the foundation for improvements. The pillars of the amazing health system we have now must be rooted in the bedrock of a thriving private sector, not on the shaky ground of a public system that has proven costly and inefficient in other countries.

We must devote our work in Congress to building a stronger private sector in health care. History has proven this is a tried and true method. We can bring down the number of uninsured, increase patient access, stabilize the physician workforce, modernize through technology and bring transparency to the system. Each of these goals is within our grasp. We must only have the foresight and determination to achieve each goal.

There is a reason why people come from around the world to the United States for health care treatments—we are the best, but we must make adjustments to remain at the top of the game.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for July 16 and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. BORDALLO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONAWAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, July 24.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 24.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Purple Heart Recognition Day''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution commending the 1st Brigade Combat Team/34th Infantry Division of the Minnesota National Guard upon its completion of the longest continuous deployment of any United States military unit during Operation Iraqi Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 18, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2543. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Manufactured Home Dispute Resolution Program [Docket No. FR-4813-F-03] (RIN: 2502-AH98) received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2544. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation to update the National Housing Act and modernize the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) mortgage insurance program to ensure that the FHA continues to play a key role in serving low- and moderate-income homebuyers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2545. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation to reauthorize the American Dream Downpayment Act, Section 271 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2546. A letter from the Senior Vice President for Resource Management, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's Buy American Act reporting for fiscal year 2006, pursuant to section 837 of Division A of the fiscal year 2006 Departments of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, Pub. L. 109-115; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2547. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Republic of Panama pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2548. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alachlor, Chlorothalonil, Metribuzin; Denial of Objections [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0050; FRL-8135-3] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2549. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0772; FRL-8439-7] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2550. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0772; FRL-8439-8] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2551. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the Clark and Floyd Counties 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0715; FRL-8440-2] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2552. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of LaPorte County To Attainment for Ozone [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0459; FRL-8440-4] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2553. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the South Bend-Elkhart 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0305; FRL-8440-3] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2554. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Public Hearings and Submission of Plans [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0903; FRL-8439-6] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2555. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 07-07 informing of an intent to sign the Joint U.S./U.K. Weapon and Sensor Resource Management Algorithm Development and Evaluation Project Arrangement between the United States and the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2556. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to the Government of Singapore (Transmittal No. 02-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2557. A letter from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2558. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress, transmitting the Annual Report of the Library of Congress, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 139; to the Committee on House Administration.

2559. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Report to Congress on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans: Fiscal Years 1995-2000,'' pursuant to Section 811A of the Native American Programs Act of 1974; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2560. A letter from the Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart C; Nonrural Determinations (RIN: 1018-AT99) received July 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2561. A letter from the Assistant Director, Fisheries & Habitat Conservation U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Injurious Wildlife Species; Silver Carp (Hypophthalmichthys molitrix) and Largescale Silver Carp (Hypophthalmichthys harmandi) (RIN: 1018-AT29) received July 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2562. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Peck's Cave Amphipod, Comal Springs Dryopid Beetle, and Comal Springs Riffle Beetle (RIN: 1018-AU75) received July 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2563. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Bald Eagle in the Lower 48 States From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (RIN: 1018-

AF21) received July 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2564. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of draft legislation entitled, ''Cooperative Conservation Enhancement Act''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2565. A letter from the Acting Director, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's report on the Minerals Management Service Royalty-in-Kind Operation for Fiscal Year 2006, as required by Section 342 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2566. A letter from the Executive Director, Department of the Interior, transmitting the 2005 annual report of the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training (National Center), pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2567. A letter from the Associate Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, ''The Fiscally Responsible Energy Amendments Act of 2007''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2568. A letter from the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2006 report to Congress on the ''The Status of U.S. Fisheries''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2569. A letter from the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's biennial report regarding the administration of the Endangered Species Act from October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2006; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2570. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program for the period October 1, 2004 through September 30, 2005 as required by section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2571. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Administration's position on the budgeting for the Cedar Bayou, Texas Navigation Improvement Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2572. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Administration's position on the budgeting for the Unalaska, Alaska Navigation Improvement Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2573. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the 2005 Annual Report of the Assistant Secretary for Veterans' Employment and Training of the Department of Labor, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 4107(c); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2574. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, ''To amend title 38, United States Code, to improve veterans' health care benefits, and for other purposes''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2575. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States — Jordan Free Trade Agreement [USCBP-2007-0001 CBP Dec. 07-50] (RIN: 1505-AB75) received June 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2576. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advance Electronic Presentation of Cargo Information for Truck Carriers Required to be Transmitted through ACE Truck Manifest as Ports in the States of Maine and Minnesota [CBP Dec. 07-53] received July 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2577. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement [USCBP-2007-0056 CBP Dec. 07-51] (RIN: 1505-AB76) received June 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2578. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — EXTENSION OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED ON PRE-CLASSICAL AND CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL OBJECTS AND BYZANTINE PERIOD ECCLESIASTICAL AND RITUAL ETHNOLOGICAL MATERIAL FROM CYPRUS [CBP Dec. 07-52] (RIN: 1505-AB80) received July 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2579. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance under Subpart F Relating to Partnerships [TD 9326] (RIN: 1545-BE34) received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2580. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Withholding Exemptions [TD 9337] (RIN: 1545-BE21) received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBEY: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2008 (Rept. 110–236). 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. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the authority of the Internal Revenue Service to use private debt collection companies, to delay implementation of withholding taxes on government contractors, to revise the tax rules on expatriation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3057. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure and foster continued patient quality of care by establishing facility and patient criteria for long-term care hospitals and related improvements under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3058. A bill to amend chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, to provide full payments under such chapter to units of general local government in which entitlement land is located, to provide transitional payments during fiscal years 2008 through 2012 to those States and counties previously entitled to payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BUYER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas):

H.R. 3059. A bill to increase the corporate average fuel economy standards for automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 3060. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and title 5, United States Code, to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans and Federal employees health benefit plans provide coverage of colorectal cancer screening; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Oversight and Government Reform, 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. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 3061. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require that Medicare prescription drug plans using formularies cover all drugs included in 6 specified therapeutic categories, to establish protective requirements for coverage determinations, reconsiderations, and appeals related to such drugs, and to require annual reports on such determinations, reconsiderations, and appeals; 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. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 3062. A bill to authorize appropriations to provide for South Pacific exchanges, provide technical and other assistance to

countries in the Pacific region through the United States Agency for International Development, and authorize appropriations to provide Fulbright Scholarships for Pacific Island students; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

H.R. 3063. A bill to revise the boundary of Martin Van Buren National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 3064. A bill to suspend certain nonessential visas, in order to provide temporary workload relief critical to the successful reorganization of the immigration and naturalization functions of the Department of Homeland Security, to ensure that the screening and monitoring of arriving immigrants and nonimmigrants, and the deterrence of entry and settlement by illegal or unauthorized aliens, is sufficient to maintain the integrity of the sovereign borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL of New York:

H.R. 3065. A bill to amend title 38 United States Code, to modify the rate of reimbursement of State and local agencies administering veterans education benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois):

H.R. 3066. A bill to permit pass-through payment for reasonable costs of certified registered nurse anesthetist services in critical access hospitals notwithstanding the reclassification of such hospitals as urban hospitals, including hospitals located in ''Lugar counties'', and for on-call and standby costs for such services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to exempt small public housing agencies from the requirement of preparing an annual public housing agency plan; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3068. A bill to prohibit the award of contracts to provide guard services under the contract security guard program of the Federal Protective Service to a business concern that is owned, controlled, or operated by an individual who has been convicted of a felony; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 3069. A bill to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationship of the Dunlap Band of Mono Indians as a distinct federally recognized Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 3070. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize additional compensation to be paid to certain veterans in receipt of compensation for a service-connected disability rated totally disabling for whom a family member dependent on the veteran for support provides care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3071. A bill to require the immediate redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 3072. A bill to reduce the risks to Colorado communities and water supplies from severe wildfires, especially in areas affected by insect infestations, to provide model legislation that may be applied to other States experiencing similar insect infestations or other forest-related problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BACHUS):

H. Res. 552. A resolution calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to remove barriers to United States financial services firms doing business in China; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. REYES, Mr. CARTER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. POE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KIND, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. LEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FARR, and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H. Res. 553. A resolution mourning the passing of former First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson, and celebrating her life and contributions to the people of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BACA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HILL, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ARCURI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 554. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Passport Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 25: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 135: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 136: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 154: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 171: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 406: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. WU.

H.R. 436: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 462: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 507: Mr. HOLT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 592: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 601: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 642: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 643: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 687: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 694: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 726: Mr. WEXLER and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 729: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 741: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 743: Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOREN, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 760: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 779: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 784: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 790: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 864: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 867: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 871: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 895: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 920: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 946: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 969: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BACA, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1014: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1023: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 1040: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1046: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 1061: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1064: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 1078: Mr. WYNN and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1091: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1125: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1142: Mr. DENT, Mr. HARE, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 1232: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1233: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1279: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1299: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1302: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1304: Mr. SPACE, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1308: Ms. MATSUI and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1320: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1343: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1389: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. WALSH of New York.
H.R. 1400: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1416: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1456: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 1466: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 1479: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1498: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1506: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1512: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 1518: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1532: Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 1533: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1534: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1542: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1553: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. GRANGER, and Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 1609: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1620: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1671: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1709: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1779: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
H.R. 1814: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 1818: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1869: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1871: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1878: Mr. NADLER and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1909: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1911: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1932: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1952: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1956: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2003: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2015: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. WATSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2016: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2017: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2035: Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 2036: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2045: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 2060: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 2065: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2070: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 2095: Mr. OBEY and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2111: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2116: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TERRY, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2122: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2126: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2164: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 2183: Mr. PUTNAM and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2188: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H.R. 2244: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2248: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2265: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2268: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BAKER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2287: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2295: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2298: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2325: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2343: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2353: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. REYES, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2371: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2395: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2421: Mr. WATT and Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 2464: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 2470: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 2484: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2490: Mr. GINGREY.
H.R. 2505: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 2568: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2605: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 2606: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2610: Mr. WEINER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2623: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2677: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2715: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2716: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 2743: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2744: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2787: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 2802: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2809: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2821: Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 2831: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 2840: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2842: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÃNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 2905: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 2925: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2927: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. FOXX, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MICA, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2929: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2941: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 2943: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2966: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2991: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3007: Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 3012: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. REGULA.
H.R. 3030: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3031: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3037: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3042: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3046: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.J. Res. 45: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. WAMP.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. COHEN.
H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. UPTON.
H. Con. Res. 108: Ms. LEE.
H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. WELLER of Illinois and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H. Res. 95: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H. Res. 235: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 258: Mr. HONDA, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LATHAM.
H. Res. 282: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H. Res. 303: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. SALAZAR.
H. Res. 433: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H. Res. 484: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. LAMPSON.
H. Res. 508: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 509: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 515: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. HARE, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BERRY.
H. Res. 528: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HODES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. SARBANES.
H. Res. 530: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H. Res. 535: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Res. 536: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H. Res. 539: Mr. COHEN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 541: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ISSA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SNYDER, and Ms. BORDALLO.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.25 percent.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 125, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 522. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Departmental Management—Salaries and Expenses'', and increasing the amount made available for ''DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—School Improvement Programs'' (for activities authorized by part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), by $15,665,760.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Burpee Museum, Rockford, Illinois, for educational programming and exhibits.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $150,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the South Carolina Aquarium, Charleston, South Carolina, for exhibits and curriculum.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $150,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Corporation for Jefferson's Poplar Forest, Forest, Virginia, for expansion of exhibits and outreach.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $200,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 12: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Kansas Regional Prisons Museum, Lansing, Kansas, for educational and outreach programs.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $100,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Shedd Aquarium, Chicago, Illinois, for exhibits and community outreach.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $150,000.

H.R 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for Rhode Island College, Providence, Rhode Island, for development of a Portuguese and Lusophone Studies Program.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Education—Higher Education'' is hereby reduced by $100,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the American Ballet Theatre, New York, New York, for educational activities.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Education—Innovation and Improvement'' is hereby reduced by $150,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, for exhibits, education programs, and an archival project.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $200,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 97, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $255,625,000)''.

Page 97, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $255,625,000)''.

Page 98, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $55,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for Missouri State University, Springfield, Missouri, for a college preparatory pilot program .

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Education—Innovation and Improvement'' is hereby reduced by $100,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Exploratorium, San Francisco, California, for its Bay Area Science Teacher Recruitment, Retention, and Improvement Initiative.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Education—Innovation and Improvement'' is hereby reduced by $300,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''The Office for Civil Rights'' of the Department of Education is hereby decreased by $2,000,000 and increased by $2,000,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 84, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 84, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO. 22: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the evaluation of the Upward Bound program described in the absolute priority for Upward Bound Program participant selection and evaluation published by the Department of Education in the Federal Register on September 22, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 55447 et seq.).

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MRS. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MRS. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 42, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $175,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. PLATTS

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Page 24, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $27,995,000)''.

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,163,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,942,000)''.

Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $900,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the Entertainment Education Program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(b) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Ombudsman Program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(c) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to provide additional rotating pastel lights, zero-gravity chairs, or dry-heat saunas for its fitness center.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. SHAYS

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 107, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. WHITFIELD

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 48, line 26, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. WHITFIELD

AMENDMENT NO. 29: Page 49, line 25, before the period insert ''*Provided further*, That, of the funds made available under this heading, $10,000,000 is for carrying out section 399O of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g–4)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT—Office of Civil Rights'' is hereby decreased by $2,000,000 and increased by $2,000,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 31: At the end of bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED'' is hereby decreased by $2,000,000 and increased by $2,000,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MRS. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT NO. 32: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used, directly or indirectly, to provide, subsidize, advertise, teach, or advocate, any form of attachment therapy.

(b) In this section, the term ''attachment therapy'' means any therapeutic or parenting technique or method used on a child which involves physical coercion, non-emergency physical restraint, age regression, recapitulation of a developmental stage, deprivation of physical needs, isolation or close confinement, or any other intervention fitting a category of child abuse as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administration for Children and Families.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 96, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 307. The amounts otherwise provided by this title are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Departmental Management—Program Administration'', and increasing the amount made available for ''School Improvement Programs'' (for carrying out activities authorized by part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), by $25,000,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 34: Page 58, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $21,000,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $21,000,000)''.

Page 60, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $15,00,000)''.

Page 60, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, insert after the first dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $21,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 35: Page 58, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $42,450,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $42,450,000)''.

Page 60, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $29,280,000)''.

Page 60, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $13,170,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, insert after the first dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $42,450,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 36: Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $46,500,000)''.

Page 77, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $46,500,000)''.

Page 83, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $46,500,000)''.

Page 83, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $46,500,000)''.

Page 83, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $46,500,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Public Broadcasting Service to sponsor events at the Filmmaker Lodge at the Sundance Film Festival.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 38: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 39: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 4.8 percent.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 40: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the following:

Children Uniting Nations, Los Angeles, CA;

Crisis Nursery of the Ozarks, Springfield, MO;

Jefferson County, Golden, CO for child abuse prevention and treatment programs;

New York Center for Children, New York, NY;

Shelter for Abused Women, Winchester, VA;

Arrowhead Economic Opportunity Agency, Virginia, MN;

Beth El House, Alexandria, VA;

Children's Home Society of South Dakota, Sioux Falls, SD;

Christian Outreach of Lutherans, Waukegan, IL;

Individual Development Account, City of Detroit, MI;

Early childhood resource centers, City of Fort Worth, TX;

Services for New Americans program, City of San Jose, CA;

Cliff Hagan Boys and Girls Club—Mike Horn Unit, Owensboro, KY;

Communities In Schools, Bell-Coryell Counties, Inc., Killeen, TX;

Covenant House Florida, Ft. Lauderdale, FL;

Eisner Pediatric and Family Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA;

Every Citizen Has Opportunities, Inc., Leesburg, VA;

Family Center of Washington County, Montpelier, VT;

First 5, Alameda County, San Leandro, CA;

Friendship Circle of the South Bay, Redondo Beach, CA;

Greater New Britain Teen Pregnancy Prevention, Inc., New-Britain, CT;

Hamilton-Madison House, New York, NY;

Healthy Learners Dillon, Columbia, SC;

Helping Children Worldwide, Herndon, VA;

Hennepin County Human Services and Public Health Department, Minneapolis, MN;

Hillside Family of Agencies, Rochester, NY;

Hope Village for Children, Meridian, MS;

Horizons for Homeless Children, Boston, MA;

New American's Center, Kingsborough Community College, Brooklyn, NY;

L.I.F.T. Women's Resource Center, Detroit, MI;

Lawrence County Social Services, New Castle, PA;

Lutheran Social Services, Duluth, MN;

Marcus Institute, Atlanta, GA;

Mary's Family, Orlean, VA;

Mecklenburg County, Charlotte, NC;

Missouri Bootheel Regional Consortium, Portageville, MO;

Monterey County Probation Department, Salinas, CA;

Nashua Adult learning Center, Nashua, NH;

National Energy Assistance Directors' Association, Washington, DC;

Network for Instructional TV, Inc., Reston, VA;

Nurses for Newborns Foundation, St. Louis, MO;

Organization of the NorthEast, Chicago, IL;
Pediatric Interim Care Center, Kent, WA;
Public Health Department, Solano County, Fairfield, CA;
Sephardic Bikur Holim of Monmouth County, Deal, NJ;
Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, TX, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL;
Susan Wesley Family Learning Center, East Prairie, MO;
TLC for Children and Families, Inc., Olathe, KS;
United Way Southeastern Michigan, Detroit, MN;
Midwest Clinic for Autism Spectrum Disorders, University of Central Missouri, Warrensburg, MO;
Visitation Home, Inc., Yardville, NJ;
Allied Jewish Federation of Colorado, Denver, CO;
Amalgamated Warbasse Houses, Inc., Brooklyn, NY;
California Senior Legal Hotline, Sacramento, CA;
Durham-Chapel Hill Jewish Federation, Durham, NC;
Howard Brown Health Center, Chicago, IL;
Jewish Community Services of South Florida, North Miami, FL;
Jewish Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis, Minnetonka, MN;
Jewish Family Service of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM;
Jewish Family Service, Los Angeles, CA;
Jewish Family Services of Delaware, Inc., Wilmington, DE;
Jewish Federation of Central New Jersey, Scotch Plains, NJ;
Jewish Federation of Greater Monmouth County, NJ;
Jewish Federation of Greater New Haven, Woodbridge, CT;
Jewish Federation of Middlesex County, South River, NJ;
Jewish Social Service Agency, Fairfax, VA;
Shenandoah Area Agency on Aging, Front Royal, VA;
United Jewish Communities of Metro West, NJ, Parsippany, NJ;
National Center on Smart Technology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL;
Adler Aphasia Center, Maywood, NJ;
Advocate Good Shepard Hospital, Barrington, IL;
Alameda County Public Health Department, Office of AIDS Administration, Oakland, CA;
Vannie E. Cook Jr. Cancer Foundation, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX;
Bayside Community Center, San Diego, CA;
Berean Community & Family Life Center, Brooklyn, NY;
Bienestar Human Services, Inc., Los Angeles, CA;
Boys and Girls Club of Delaware County, Jay, OK;
Center for Prevention of Childhood Obesity, California State University-Fullerton, Fullerton, CA;
Charles R. Drew Wellness Center, Columbia, SC;
Charter County of Wayne, Michigan, Detroit, MI;
Chez Panisse Foundation, Berkeley, CA;
Children's Hunger Alliance, Columbus, OH;
Center for Injury Research and Policy, Columbus Children's Research Institute, Columbus, OH;
Marin Breast County Research, County of Marin, San Rafael, CA;
CREATE Foundation, Tupelo, MS;
County-wide Physical Fitness Assessment Pilot Project, DuPage County, Wheaton, IL;
East Carolina University, Brody School of Medicine, Greenville, NC;
EI Puente, Brooklyn, NY;
Friends of the Congressional Glaucoma Caucus Foundation, Lake Success, NY;
Haitian American Association Against Cancer, Inc., Miami, FL;
Healthy Eating Lifestyle Principles, Monterey, CA;
Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters—Florida, Coral Gables, FL;
Ingalls Development Foundation, Harvey, IL;
International Rett Syndrome Association, Clinton, MD;
Kips Bay Boys and Girls Club, Bronx, NY;
Asthma Education Center, Long Island University, Brooklyn, NY;
Louisville Department of Public Health and Wellness, Louisville, KY;
Center for Physical Activity, Middle Tennessee State University;
Murfreesboro, TN;
Myositis Association, Washington, DC;
Natividad Medical Center, Salinas, CA;
Nevada Cancer Institute, Las Vegas, NV;
North Shore Health Project, Gloucester, MA;
Partners Enabling Active Rural Living Institute, Plymouth State University, Plymouth, NH;
Providence Cancer Center, Portland, OR;
Pulmonary Hypertension Association, Silver Spring, MD;
San Antonio Metropolitan Health District, San Antonio, TX;
SHAREing and CAREing, Astoria, NY;
Silent Spring Institute, Newton, MA;
Southeastern Center for Emerging Biologic Threats, Atlanta, GA;
St. Elizabeth's Medical Center, Wabasha, MN;
St. Francis Medical Center Foundation, Lynwood, CA;
St. John's Regional Medical Center, Oxnard, CA;
St. John's Well Child and Family Center, Los Angeles, CA;
Interdisciplinary Diabetes Prevention and Management Consortium, University of Arizona College of Medicine, Tucson, AZ;
University of Findlay Center for Public Health Preparedness, Findlay, OH;
Center for Minority Health, Education, Research and Outreach, University of North Texas Health Science Center, Fort Worth, TX;
Initiative to Combat Obesity in Early Childhood, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL;
South Texas Border Health Disparities Center, University of Texas Pan American, Edinburg, TX;
Texas Health Science Center-Houston, School of Public Health, University of Texas, Brownsville, TX;
Virgin Islands Perinatal Inc., Christiansted, VI;
Diabetes Research Initiative, Voorhees College, Denmark, SC;
Wayne County Department of Public Health, Detroit, MI;
WestCare Foundation, Las Vegas, NV
Yale New Haven Hospital, New Haven, CT;
YBH Project, Inc., Albany, GA;
Access Health, Inc., Muskegon, MI,;
Bedford Ride, Bedford, VA;
Bi-State Primary Care Association, Concord, NH;
City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco, CA;
Detroit Primary Care Access Project, Coleman A. Young Muncipal Center, City of Detroit, MI;
Waterbury Hospital, City of Waterbury, CT;
Gadsden County, FL Quincy, FL;
Jefferson Area Board for Aging, Charlottesville, VA;
Orange County's Primary Care Access Network, Orlando, FL;
Piedmont Hospital, Atlanta, GA;
Thurston-Mason County Medical Society, Olympia, WA;
Valley Hospice, Inc., Steubenville, OH;
ABC Unified School District, Cerritos, CA;
Chicago Academy and Chicago Academy High School, Academy for Urban School leadership, Chicago, IL;
Action for Bridgeport Community Development, Inc., Bridgeport, CT;
African-American Male Achievers Network, Inc., Inglewood, CA;
Akron Public Schools, OH for a Math, Science, and Technology Community;
Alamance-Burlington School District, Burlington, NC;
All Kinds of Minds, Chapel Hill, NC;
American Ballet Theatre, New York, NY;
Amistad America, New Haven, CT;
An Achievable Dream, Inc., Newport News, VA;
Center for Mathematics Education and Innovation, Angelo State University, San Angelo, TX;
Apache County Schools, St. Johns, AZ;
Arab City Schools, Arab, AL;
AVANCE, Inc, EI Paso, TX;
AVANCE, Inc., Del Rio, TX;
AVANCE, Inc., Waco, TX;
Barat Education Foundation, Lake Forest, IL;
Bay Haven Charter Academy Middle School, Lynn Haven, FL;
Language and Literacy Center, Baylor University, Waco, TX;
Best Buddies International, Miami, FL;
Best Buddies Maryland, Baltimore, MD;
Big Top Chautauqua, WI;
Idaho SySTEMic Solution, Boise State University, Boise, ID;
Principal's Institute, Bowie State University, Bowie, MD;
Boys & Girls Club of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI;
Boys & Girls Town of Missouri, Columbia, MO;
Boys and Girls Club of San Bernardino, CA;
Automotive Technology Program, Bradford Area School District, Bradford, PA;
Student Success Center, Brookdale Community College, Lincroft, NJ;
Bushnell Center for the Performing Arts, Hartford, CT;
Cal State Northridge Assessment and Accountability, California State University Northridge, CA;
At-Risk Youth Development Program, California State University, San Bernardino, CA;
Canton Symphony Orchestra Association, Canton, OH;
National Music Education Program, Carnegie Hall, New York, NY;
Central County Occupational Center, San Jose, CA;
Central Pennsylvania Institute of Science and Technology, State College, PA;
Centro de Salud Familiar Le Fe, EI Paso, TX;
District Wide Instruction Using Technology, Charlotte County School District, Port Charlotte, FL;
Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy, Charter School Development Foundation, Las Vegas, NY;
Place to Be After Three Middle School Program, City of Fairfield, CA;
City Schools, City of Gadsden, AL;
Burbank Elementary School, City of Hayward, Hayward, CA;
Indianapolis Center for Education Entrepreneurship, City of Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN;
Newark Elementary School, City of Newark, Newark, CA for after-school programs;
Jacqueline Walsh School of the Performing and Visual Arts, City of Pawtucket School Department, Pawtucket, RI;
Pembroke Pines—Florida State University Charter School, City of Pembroke Pines, FL;

Early Start/Great Start School Readiness Initiative, City of San Jose, CA;
City of Springfield, MO for the Ready to Learn Program;
City of Whittier, Whittier, CA for after-school programs, which may include equipment;
City School District of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, NY for after-school learning centers;
Clark County School District, Las Vegas, NY for the Education Executive Leadership Program;
Newcomer Academy, Clark County School District, Las Vegas, NV;
Clovis Unified School District, Center for Advanced Research Technology, Clovis, CA;
College Summit, Inc., Washington, DC;
Communities in Schools—Northeast Texas, Mount Pleasant, TX;
Communities in Schools of Cochran and Bleckley County, Cochran, GA;
Communities in Schools of Coweta, Inc., Newnan, GA;
Communities in Schools of Fitzgerald—Ben Hill County, Fitzgerald, GA;
Communities in Schools of Tacoma, Tacoma, WA;
Communities in Schools, Austin, TX;
Communities in Schools, San Fernando Valley, Inc., North Hills, CA;
Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles, Monterey Park, CA;
Community Service Society, New York, NY;
Connecticut Technical High School System, Middletown, CT;
Contra Costa College, Bridges to the Future Program, San Pablo, CA;
Cooperative Educational Service Agency No. 11;
Cooperative Educational Service Agency No. 12, Ashland, WI;
Cooperative Educational Service Agency No. 5, Portage, WI;
Cooperative Educational Service Agency No. 9, Tomahawk, WI;
County of San Diego, San Pasqual Academy, Escondido, CA;
Cuyahoga County Board of County Commissioners, Cleveland, OH;
Starting Stronger Early Learning Initiative, Delaware Department of Education, Dover, DE;
Detroit Youth Foundation, Detroit, MI;
DNA EpiCenter, Inc., New London, CT;
Duval County Public Schools, Instructional Technology Program, Jacksonville, FL;
Edgar School District, Computer Technology center, Edgar, WI;
Edison and Ford Winter Estates Education Foundation;
Education Partnership, Providence, RI;
Education Service Center, Region 12, Hillsboro, TX;
Ennis Independent School District, Advanced Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program, Ennis, TX;
Metropolitan Arts and Technology High School, Envision Schools, San Francisco, CA;
Erskine College, Fine Arts Network for Assisting Rural Education, Due West, SC;
Exploratorium, San Francisco, CA;
Franklin Sherman Elementary School, Chesterbrook Elementary School Fairfax County Public Schools, Fairfax, VA;
Fairfax County Public Schools, Falls Church, emergency medical services (EMS) Academy, Fairfax, VA;
Fairhope Center for the Arts, Bay Minette, AL;
Families In Schools, Los Angeles, CA;
Fayetteville Technical Community College, Congressional Scholars Program, Fayetteville, NC;
Forward in the Fifth, Somerset, KY;
Friends of the Children National, Portland, OR;
George B. Thomas, Sr. Learning Academy, Inc., Bethesda, MD;
Girl Scouts of the USA, Fair Play Initiative, New York, NY;
Graham County Schools, Safford, AZ.;
Guam Public School System, Chamorro language instruction program, Hagatna, GU;
Hamilton Wings, Elgin, IL;
Harris County Department of Education, Cooperative for After-School Enrichment, Houston, TX;
Harvey Public School District 152, Harvey, IL;
Hawaii Department of Education, Honolulu, Assistance to Low-Performing Schools, HI;
Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, Kempton, PA;
Helen Keller International, New York, NY;
High Plains Regional Education Cooperative, Raton, NM;
Work-Scholarship Connection Youth Employment Training Academy, Hillside Family of Agencies, Rochester, NY;
Hoke County Schools, technology equipment, Raeford, NC;
Houston Independent School District, Houston, TX;
I KNOW I CAN, Columbus, OH;
In Tune Foundation Group, Washington, DC;
Independent School District 181, Brainerd Teacher Support System, Brainerd, MN;
Wyandanch High School, Institute for Student Achievement, Lake Success, NY;
Institute for Student Achievement, Lake Success, NY;
Iowa City Community School District, ICCDS Technology Based Early Literacy Program, Iowa City, IA;
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana—Southeast, Madison, IN;
Jacob Burns Film Center, Pleasantville, NY;
Jazz at Lincoln Center, New York, NY;
Jefferson County Public Schools, Technology Instruction, Golden, CO;
Jersey Shore Area School District, Jersey Shore, PA;
JFYNetWorks, Boston, MA;
Malden, Revere, and Framingham, MA;
Joplin School District, Joplin, MO;
Jumpstart for Young Children, Inc., Boston, MA;
Jumpstart for Young Children, San Francisco, CA;
Kelberman Center, Utica, NY;
KIPP Foundation, San Francisco, CA;
KIPP Delta College Preparatory School, Helena, AR;
21st Century Community Learning Center, Logan Middle School, La Crosse School District, La Crosse, WI;
Learning Point Associates/North Central Regional Education laboratory, Naperville, IL;
Lee Pesky Learning Center, Boise, ID;
Lemay Child & Family Center, St. Louis, MO;
Los Angeles Conservation Corps, Los Angeles, CA;
Louisiana Arts and Sciences Museum, Baton Rouge, LA;
Louisiana Tech University, IDEA Place and SciTEC Classroom, Ruston, LA;
Lower East Side Conservancy, New York, NY;
Madison County Schools, Computer Lab, Richmond, KY;
Mesa Unified School District, Making Every Student Accountable (MESA), Mesa, AZ;
Military Heritage Center Foundation, Carlisle, PA;
Miller County Development Authority, Colquit, GA;
Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, Washington, DC;
Milwaukee Public Schools, Community Learning Centers, Milwaukee, WI;
Minnesota Humanities Commission, St. Paul, MN;
Mississippi University for Women, Columbus, MS;
Missouri State University, Springfield, MO;
Monroe County School District, Technology Plan, Key West, FL;
Montgomery County Public Schools, Transition of Scientists from the Laboratory to the Classroom Project, Rockville, MD;
Mote Marine Laboratory, Sarasota, FL;
Mount Hood Community College, Child Development Center, Gresham, OR;
National Center for Electronically Mediated Learning, Inc., Milford, CT;
National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Oakland, CA;
National Cued Speech Association, Bethesda, MD;
National Flight Academy, Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL;
National Resource Center for Deafblindness, East Greenville, PA;
National Teacher's Hall of Fame, Emporia, KS;
Neighborhood Youth Association, Venice, CA;
New Mexico Public Education Department, Summer Reading and Math Institutes, Santa Fe, NM;
Newton Public Schools, Improvement of Education Program, Newton, KS;
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University, Suspension Intervention Program, Greensboro, NC;
North Carolina Central University, Academic Enrichment Saturday Academy, Durham, NC;
North Carolina Symphony, Raleigh, NC;
North Carolina Technology Association Education Foundation, Raleigh, NC;
North Philadelphia Youth Association, Philadelphia, PA;
Northeast Louisiana Family Literacy Interagency Consortium;
Northern Tier Industry & Education Consortium, Dimock, PA;
Norwich Public School System, limited English proficiency, Norwich, CT;
Oakland Unified School District, Technology Integration Project, Oakland, CA;
O'Neill Sea Odyssey, Santa Cruz, CA;
OneWorld Now!, Seattle, WA;
Ossining Union Free School District, Ossining, NY;
Parent Institute for Quality Education, San Diego, CA;
PE4life, Kansas City, MO for physical education programs in Titusville;
People for People, Philadelphia, PA;
Peru State College, Peru, Adopt-a-High School Program, NE;
Philadelphia Academies, Inc., Philadelphia, PA;
Pinal County Education Service Agency, Florence, AZ;
Polk County Public Schools, Augmentative and Assistive Technology Support Project, Bartow, FL;
Port Chester—Rye Union Free School District, Port Chester, NY;
Project GRAD USA, Philadelphia, PA;
Purdue University Calumet, Urban Academy, Hammond, IN;
Queens Theatre in the Park, Flushing, NY;
Renwick Public Schools, Technology Program, Andale, KS;
Rio Rancho Public Schools, Cyber Academy, Rio Ranch, NM;
Riverside Community College, School of Nursing/Middle College, Riverside, CA;
Riverside County Office of Education, Riverside, CA;

Rockdale County Public Schools, Conyers, GA;
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, Terre Haute, IN;
Salesian Boys and Girls Club of Los Angeles, CA;
San Bernardino City Unified School District, English and Academic Skills for English Learners program, San Bernardino, CA;
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools, San Bernardino, CA;
San Joaquin County, Stockton, CA for its San Joaquin A Plus tutoring program;
San Mateo County, Redwood City, CA;
School Board of Broward County, Fort Lauderdale, FL;
Schultz Center for Teaching and Leadership, Jacksonville, FL;
Selden/Centereach Youth Association, Selden, NY;
Silver Crescent Foundation, Charleston, SC;
Sociedad Latina, Roxbury, MA;
Southwestern University, Center for Hispanic Studies, Georgetown, TX;
Springboard for Improving Schools, San Francisco, CA;
Academy of Arts and Academics, Springfield Public School District No. 19, Springfield, OR;
St. Mary's County Public Schools, Science and Technology Academies, Leonardtown, MD;
Elko, Nye, Douglas, Lyon and Churchill school districts, State of Nevada Department of Education;
Summit Educational Resources, Getzville, NY;
Susannah Wesley Community Center, Honolulu, HI;
Tampa Metropolitan YMCA, Tampa, FL;
TSU Lab School, Texas Southern University, Houston, TX;
Tomas Rivera Policy Institute, Los Angeles, CA;
Mayor's Office of Children and Learning, Town of Cumberland, Cumberland, RI;
Towson University, Towson, MD for an education partnership with the City of Baltimore, Baltimore City Public School System and the Cherry Hill community;
Tracy Joint Unified School District, Tracy, CA;
Tri-County Educational Service, Wooster, OH;
Trumbull County Educational Service Center, Niles, OH;
Tulsa Public Schools, Academic Center, Tulsa, OK;
Union County Public Schools, classrooms and labs, Monroe, NC;
Union Free School District of the Tarrytowns, after-school and professional development programs, Sleepy Hollow, NY;
University of Akron, Akron, STEM2 Education and Career Pathways, OH;
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Manufacturing Engineering Education, AL;
USD 259, Wichita Public Schools, Wichita, KS;
Valle Undo School District, Critical Math Technology, South EI Monte, CA;
Venango Technology Center, Oil City, PA;
Vision Therapy Project, Casper, WY;
Visually Impaired Preschool Services, Louisville, KY;
Washington College, Chestertown, MD;
Center for Community Education, Enrichment and Urban Studies, Washington State University, Tacoma, WA;
WE CARE San Jacinto Valley, Inc., San Jacinto, CA;
West Contra Costa Unified School District, John F. Kennedy High School Mary Gaddis;
Architecture Construction and Engineering Academy, Richmond, CA;
White-Williams Scholars, Philadelphia, PA;
Widener University, school readiness programs, Chester, PA;
Wildlife Information Center, Inc., Slatington, PA;
Williamsburg County First Steps, Kingstree, SC;
Yonkers Public Schools, Yonkers, after school and summer academic enrichment programs, NY;
Youngstown City School District, pre-apprenticeship program, OH;
Youngstown State University, Rich Center for Autism Technology, Youngstown, OH;
YWCA of Gary, Gary, IN;
Adelante Development Center, Albuquerque. NM;
Agudath Israel of America Community Services. Inc., Brooklyn, NY;
Arc of Blackstone Valley, Pawtucket, RI;
Bellingham Technical College, Bellingham, WA;
Bismarck State College, Instrumentation and Control Program, Bismarck, ND;
Center for Excellence in Technology, Telecommunications and Economic Development,
Brookdale Community College, Center for Excellence in Technology, Telecommunitcationa and Economic Development, Lincroft, NJ;
Center for Employment Training, San Jose, CA;
Central Carolina Tech College, Central Allied Health Sciences Center, Sumter, SC;
Central Maine Community College, Precision Manufacturing Advantage, Auburn, ME;
Chinese-American Planning Council, New York, NY;
City College of San Francisco, Welcome Back Center, CA;
City of Alexandria, automotive industry workforce development and training initiative, VA;
City of Baltimore, MD for the Park Heights Partnership for Jobs;
City of Milwaukee, WI for a project to train youth in construction trades;
City of Palmdale, Palmdale, CA for a business resource network to enhance worker skills development;
Suffolk Workforce Development Center, City of Suffolk, VA;
Clarian Health Partners, Indianapolis, IN;
College of Southern Maryland, La Plata, MD;
Community Learning Center, Fort Worth, TX;
Des Moines Area Community College, Arkeny, IA;
Dillard University, New Orleans Workers Initiative, New Orleans, LA;
East Los Angeles Community Union, Los Angeles, CA;
Easter Seals Arc of Northeast Indiana, Inc., Fort Wayne, IN;
Edgar Campbell Foundation, Philadelphia, PA;
Employment & Economic Development Department of San Joaquin County, Stockton, CA;
Essex County Community Organization, Lynn, MA;
Foundation of the Delaware County Chamber, Media, PA;
Goodwill of Southern Nevada, North Las Vegas, NV;
Greater Akron Chamber, Akron, OH;
Groden Center, Providence, RI;
Guam Community College, Mangilao, Guam;
Hamilton County Government, Chattanooga, TN;
Home of Life Community Development Corp., Chicago, IL;
Homecare Workers Training Center, Los Angeles, CA;
International Fellowship of Chaplains, Inc., Saginaw, MI;
Iowa Valley Community College, Education and Training Center, Marshalltown, IA;
Center for Cybersecurity, Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana—Columbus Region, Indianapolis, IN;
Center for Health Information Technology, Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana Lafayette, Indianapolis, IN;
Kansas City Kansas Community College, Workforce Investment demonstration program, Kansas City, KS;
Northeast Ohio Advanced Manufacturing Institute, Kent State University Trumbuli County, Warren, OH;
Louisiana Delta Community College, Monroe, LA;
Louisiana National Guard, Carville, LA;
Manufacturing Association of Central New York, Syracuse, NY;
Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, Healthcare Professional Training Initiative, Manchester, NH;
McHenry County Community College, F.A.S.T. Solutions, Woodstock, IL;
Minot State University, Job Corp Fellowship Training Program, Minot, ND;
Neighborhood First Program, Inc., Bristol, PA;
Newlife Academy of Information Technology, East Liverpool, OH;
North West Pasadena Development Corp., Pasadena, CA;
Northcott Neighborhood House, Milwaukee, WI;
Oakland Community College, Emerging Sectors Educational Consortium, Bloomfield Hills, MI;
Opportunity, Inc., Highland Park, IL;
Our Piece of the Pie, Hartford, CT;
Parish of Rapides Career Solutions Center, Alexandria, LA;
Philadelphia Shipyard Development Corporation, Philadelphia, PA;
Residential Construction Academy, Piedmont Virginia Community College, Charlottesville, VA;
Poder Learning Center, Chicago, IL;
Precision Manufacturing Institute, Meadville, PA;
Project One Inc., Louisville, KY;
Project QUEST, Inc., San Antonio, TX;
PRONTO of Long Island, Inc., Bayshore, NY;
Schoenbaum Family Enrichment Center, Charleston, WV;
Schuylkill Intermediate Unit 29, Marlin, PA;
South Bay Workforce Investment Board, Hawthorne, CA;
Southeast Missouri State University, Economic Workforce Development Program, Cape Girardeau, MO;
Southern University at Shreveport, Allied Health Program, Shreveport, LA;
Southside Virginia Community College, Heavy Equipment training Center, Alberta, VA;
Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Western Oklahoma Business Commercialization Center, Weatherford, OK;
St. Louis Agency on Training and Employment, SI. Louis, MO;
Towson University, Towson, MD;
United Mine Workers of America, Career Center, Washington, PA;
University of West Florida, Hometown Heroes Teach Program, Pensacola. FL;
Veteran Community Initiatives. Inc., Johnstown, PA;
Vincennes University, Heavy Equipment Training program, Vincennes, IN;
Wayne County, NY Planning Department, Lyons, NY;
West Los Angeles College, Culver City, CA;
Women Work and Community, Augusta, ME;
A.O. Fox Memorial Hospital, Oneonta, NY;

Access Community Health Network, Chicago, IL;
Adirondack Medical Center, Saranac Lake, NY;
Adrian College, Nursing Program, Adrian, MI;
Adventist GlenOaks Hospital, Glendale Heights, FL;
Adventist Health, Roseville, CA;
Alamo Community College System, San Antonio, TX;
Alaska Addictions Rehabilitation Services, Inc., Wasilla, AK;
Alderson-Broaddus College, Philippi, WV;
Alice Hyde Medical Center, Malone, NY;
Alleghany Memorial Hospital, Sparta, NC;
Alle-Kiski Medical Center, Natrona Heights, PA;
Alliance for NanoHealth, Houston, TX;
AltaMed Health Services Corp., Los Angeles, CA;
American Oncologic Hospital, Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA;
LBJ Medical Center, American Samoa, Pago Pago, AQ;
Amite County Medical Services, Liberty, MS;
Arnold Palmer Hospital, Orlando, FL;
Ashland County Oral Health Services, Ashland, OH;
Asian Americans for Community Involvement, San Jose, CA;
Association for Utah Community Health, Salt Lake City, UT;
Atlantic Health Systems, Florham Park, NJ;
Avis Goodwin Community Health Center, Dover, NH;
Avista Adventist Hospital, Louisville, CO;
Bad River Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa, Odanah, WI;
Ball Memorial Hospital, Muncie, IN;
Baltimore City Health Department, Baltimore, MD;
Baltimore Medical System, Baltimore, MD;
Baptist Health Medical Center—Heber Springs, Heber Springs, AR;
Barnert Hospital, Paterson, NJ;
Barnes-Kasson County Hospital, Susquehanna, PA;
Barre Family Health Center, Barre, MA;
Bay Area Medical Clinic, Marinette, WI;
BayCare Health System, Clearwater, FL;
Baylor Research Institute, Dallas, TX;
Bayonne Medical Center, Bayonne, NJ;
Baystate Health Systems, Springfield, MA;
Beaumont Hospital, Royal Oak, MI;
Health Science Center, Belmont University, Nashville, TN;
Bemidji State University, nurse training program, Bemidji, MN;
Benedictine Hospital, Kingston, NY;
Benefis Healthcare, Great Falls, MT;
Berea Health Ministry Rural Health Clinic, Inc., Berea, KY;
Bloomington Hospital Foundation, Bloomington IN;
Bloomsburg Hospital, Bloomsburg, PA;
Blount Memorial Hospital, Maryville, TN;
Boone Hospital Center, Columbia, MO;
Boriken-Neighborhood Health Center, New York, NY;
Boscobel Area Health Care Boscobel, WI;
Boston Medical Center, Boston, MA;
Boston University Medical School, amyloidosis treatment, Boston, MA;
Bridge Community Health Clinic, Wausau, WI;
Bridgeport Hospital, Bridgeport, CT;
Brockton Neighborhood Health Center, Brockton, MA;
Brookside Community Health Center, San Pablo, CA;
Brunswick County, Bolivia, NC;
Bryan W. Whitfield Hospital, Demopolis, AL;
Bureau County Health Clinic, Princeton, IL;
Cactus Health Services, Inc., Sanderson, TX;
California Hospital Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA;
California State University, Department of Nursing, Bakersfield, CA;
Camillus House, Inc, Miami, FL;
Canonsburg General Hospital, Canonsburg, PA;
Cape Cod Free Clinic and Community Health Center, Mashpee, MA;
Capital Park Family Health Center, Columbus, OH;
Cardinal Stritch University, Agape Community Center, Milwaukee, WI;
Carolinas HealthCare System, Charlotte, NC;
Carroll County Regional Medical Center, Carrollton, KY;
Outpatient Mental Health Clinic, Carroll County Youth Service Bureau, Westminster, MD;
Center for Health Equity, Louisville, KY;
Virtual Medical Skills Center, Central Wyoming College, Riverton, WY;
CentroMed, San Antonio, TX;
Champlain Valley Physician's Hospital, Plattsburgh, NY;
Charles A. Dean Memorial Hospital, Greenville, ME;
Chatham County Safety Net Collaborative, Savannah, GA;
Cherry Street Health Services, Grand Rapids, MI;
Children's Friend and Family Services, Salem, MA;
Children's Home of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA;
Children's Hospital and Clinics of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN;
Children's Hospital and Health System, Milwaukee, WI;
Children's Hospital at Albany Medical Center, Albany, NY;
Children's Hospital Medical Center of Akron, Akron, OH;
Children's Hospital of Orange County, Mission Viejo, CA;
Children's Hospital of the King's Daughters, Norfolk, VA;
Children's Hospital, Denver, CO;
Mobile Pediatric Health Simulation Center, Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN;
Children's Medical Center, Dayton, OH;
Children's Memorial Hospital, Chicago, IL;
Children's National Medical Center, Washington, DC;
Children's Specialized Hospital, Mountainside, NJ;
Chippewa Valley Hospital, Durand, WI;
Chiricaua Community Health Centers, Inc., Elfrida, AZ;
Christian Health Care Center of New Jersey, Wyckoff, NJ;
Christian Sarkine Autism Treatment Center, Indianapolis, IN;
Christus Santa Rosa's Children's Hospital, San Antonio, TX;
Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, OH;
Citrus County Board of County Commissioners, Inverness, FL;
Travis County Hospital District, City of Austin, TX;
City of Chesapeake, Pilot Project Use of Technology for Targeted Public Health Intervention, VA;
Senior Citizens' Center, City of Hueytown, AL;
City of Oakland, Oakland Youth Center, CA;
City of Stockton, Community & Health Center/Airport Way, CA;
City of Stonewall, Stonewall Primary Care Clinic, OK;
Clarion Health Center, Clarion, PA;
Cleveland Clinic Huron Hospital, East Cleveland, OH;
Cobb County Government, Marietta Senior Health Center, GA;
Coffeyville Regional Medical Center, Coffeyville, KS;
Coles County Council on Aging, Mattoon, IL;
College Misericordia, Dallas, PA;
Collier County, Health Care Access for the Uninsured, Naples, FL;
Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO;
Columbia Memorial Hospital, Hudson, NY;
Columbus Children's Hospital, Columbus, OH;
Communi Care, Inc., Columbia, SC;
Community College of Aurora, Combined Position Emission Tomography (PET) and Computer Tomography (CT) Scanner, Aurora, CO;
Community Dental Services, Albuquerque, NM;
Community Health Care, Tacoma, WA;
Community Health Center of Franklin County, Turners Falls, MA;
Community Health Works, Forsyth, GA;
Community Hospital of Bremen, Bremen, IN;
Community Hospital TeleHealth Consortium, Lake Charles, LA;
Gleason House, Community Medical Centers, Stockton, CA;
Comprehensive Community Action Program (CCAP), Cranston, RI;
Connecticut Hospice, Inc., Branford, CT;
Cook Children's Medical Center, Fort Worth, TX;
Cooperative Education Service Agency 11 Rural Health Dental Clinic, Turtle Lake, WI;
County of Modoc, Modoc Medical Center, Alturas, CA;
County of Peoria, Bel-Wood Nursing Home, Peoria, FL;
County of San Diego, Public Health Services, CA;
Crousee Hospital, Syracuse, NY;
Moss Higher Education Center, Crowder College—Nevada Campus, Nevada, MO;
Crozer-Chester Medical Center, Upland, PA;
Cumberland Medical Center, Crossville, TN;
Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, Lebanon, NH;
Delaware Technical and Community College, Shaping the Future of Delaware Citizens program, Dover, DE;
Denver Health and Hospital Authority, Denver, CO;
Des Moines University and Broadlawns Medical Center, Des Moines, IA;
Detroit Primary Care Access, Detroit, MI;
Dixie County primary care facility, Cross City, FL;
Dodge County Hospital, Eastman, GA;
Drew County Memorial Hospital, Monticello, AR;
DuBois Regional Medical Center, DuBois, PA;
Metabolic Institute, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC;
East Tennessee Children's Hospital, Knoxville, TN;
East Tennessee State University College of Pharmacy, Johnson City, TN;
Easter Seals of Mahoning, Trumbull, and Columbiana Counties, Youngstown, OH;
Eddy County, Regional Substance Abuse Rehabilitation Center, Carlsbad, NM;
Edgemoor Hospital, Santee, CA;
Eisenhower Medical Center, Rancho Mirage, CA;
Azusa Health Center, EI Proyecto del Barrio, Arleta, CA;
EI Proyecto del Barrio, Winnetka, CA;
Elizabeth City State University, School of Mathematics, Elizabeth City, NC;
Emerson Hospital, Concord, MA;
Englewood Hospital and Medical Center, Englewood, NJ;

Excela Health, Mt. Pleasant, PA;
Fairfield Medical Center, Lancaster, OH;
Fairview Southdale Hospital, Edina, MN;
Harmony Center, Family and Children's Aid, Danbury, CT;
Family Behavioral Resources, Greensburg, PA;
Family Center of the Northern Neck, Inc; White Stone, VA;
Family Health Center of Southern Oklahoma, Tishomingo, OK;
Family HealthCare Network, Visalia, CA;
Family Medicine Spokane, Spokane, WA;
Florida Hospital College of Health Sciences, Orlando, FL;
Autism Research and Treatment Center, Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL;
Floyd Valley Hospital, Le Mars, IA;
Freeman Health System, Joplin, MO;
Fulton County Medical Center, McConnellsburg, PA;
Gardner Family Health Network, Inc., San Jose, CA;
Gaston College, Health Education Institute, Dallas, NC;
Gateway to Care, Houston, TX;
Autism Early Identification Diagnostic and Treatment Center, Gertrude A. Barber Center, Erie, PA;
Glen Rose Medical Center, Glen Rose, TX;
Glendale Adventist Medical Center, Glendale, CA;
Glens Falls Hospital, Glens Falls, NY;
Grady Health Systems, Atlanta, GA;
Grandview Hospital, Dayton, OH;
Greater Hudson Valley Family Health Center, Inc., Newburgh, NY;
Greater New Bedford Community Health Center, New Bedford, MA;
Griffin Hospital, Derby, CT;
Gritman Medical Center, Moscow, ID;
Gundersen Lutheran Health System, West Union, IA;
Gunderson Lutheran, Decorah, IA;
Halifax Regional Health System, South Boston, VA;
Hamilton Community Health Network, Flint, MI;
Hampton University, Cancer Treatment Initiative, Hampton, VA;
Harris County Hospital District, Houston, TX;
Harris Methodist Erath County Hospital, Stephenville, TX;
Hatzoloh EMS, Inc., Monsey, NY;
Hawkeye Community College, Health and Fitness Center, Waterloo, IA;
Healing Tree Addiction Treatment Solutions, Inc., Sterling, CO;
HEALS Dental Clinic, Huntsville, AL;
HealthCare Connection, Cincinnati, OH;
HealthEast Care System, St. Paul, MN;
Heartland Community Health Clinic, Peoria, IL;
Hekloen Institute for Medical Research Beloved Community Wellness Program, Chicago, IL;
Helen DeVos Children's Hospital, Grand Rapids, MI;
Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital, Valencia, CA;
Highland Community Hospital, Picayune, MS;
Highlands County, Veteran Services Building, Sebring, FL;
Holy Name Hospital, Teaneck, NJ;
Home Nursing Agency, Altoona, PA;
Hormel Foundation, Austin, MN;
Hospice of Northwest Ohio Toledo Center, Toledo, OH;
Hospice of the Western Reserve, Cleveland, OH;
Houston County Hospital District, Crockett, TX;
Howard Community College, Radiologic Technology Program, Columbia, MD;
Hudson Alpha Institute for Biotechnology, Huntsville, AL;
Hudson Headwaters Health Network, Inc., Glens Falls, NY;
Humility of Mary Health Partners, Youngstown, OH;
Humphreys County Memorial Hospital, Belzoni, MS;
Hunterdon Medical Center, Flemington, NJ;
Hunter's Hope Foundation, Orchard Park, NY;
Huntsville Hospital, Huntsville, AL;
Hurley Medical Center, Flint, MI;
Idaho Caring Foundation, Inc., Boise, ID;
Advanced Clinical Simulation Laboratory, Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID;
Illinois Masonic Medical Center, Chicago, IL;
Illinois Primary Health Care Association, Springfield, IL;
India Community Center, Milpitas, CA;
School of Nursing, Indiana University Bloomington, IN;
Northwest Indiana Health Research Institute, Indiana University School of Medicine, Gary, IN;
Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN;
School of Nursing, Indiana University Southeast, New Albany, IN;
Inland Behavioral Health Services, Inc., San Bernardino, CA;
Institute for Family Health, New Paltz, NY;
Institute for Research and Rehabilitation, Houston, TX;
INTEGRIS Health, Oklahoma City, OK;
Intermountain Healthcare, Salt Lake City, UT;
Jameson Hospital, New Castle, PA;
Jasper Memorial Hospital, Monticello, GA;
Jefferson Regional Medical Center Nursing School, Pine Bluff, AR;
Jenkins County GA;
Hospital, Millen, GA;
Bell Gardens Health Center, John Wesley Community Health Institute, Bell Gardens, CA;
Johnson Memorial Hospital, Stafford Springs, CT;
Johnston Memorial Hospital, Smithfield, NC;
Kalamazoo Valley Community College, Kalamazoo, MI;
International Center for Spinal Cord Injury facility, Kennedy Krieger Institute, Baltimore, MD;
Kent State University Stark Campus, Health Building, North Canton, OH;
Kent State University, Health and Science Building, Ashtabula, OH;
Kilmichael Hospital, Kilmichael, MS;
Kirkwood Community College, Advanced Medical Simulation Instructional Center, Cedar Rapids, IA;
Knox Community Hospital, Mount Vernon, OH;
San Antonio Neighborhood Health Center, La Clinic de la Raza, Oakland, CA;
La Rabida Children's Hospital, Chicago, IL;
Lakeland Community College, Regional Healthcare Workforce Development Project, Kirtland, OH;
Community and University Partnership Service, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX;
Lanai Women's Center, Lanai City, HI;
Laurens County Health Care System, Clinton, SC;
Lawrence Hospital Center, Bronxville, NY;
League Against Cancer, Miami, FL;
Liberty County, medical offices, FL;
Bristol, FL;
Liberty Regional Medical Center, Hinesville, GA;
Limestone Community Care, Inc. Medical Clinic, Elkmont, AL;
Lincoln Community Health Center, Durham, NC;
Lincoln Medical and Mental Health Center, Bronx, NY;
Lodi Memorial Hospital, Lodi, CA;
Loretto in Syracuse, elderly health care facilities, Syracuse, NY;
Los Angeles Orthopaedic Hospital, Los Angeles, CA;
Louisville Metro Department of Public Works, Louisville, KY;
Lourdes Medical Center of Burlington County, Willingboro, NJ;
Loyola University Health System, Maywood, IL;
Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Palo Alto, CA;
Madison Center, South Bend, IN;
Madison County Memorial Hospital, Rexburg, ID;
Madison County, Nursing Homes, Virginia City, MT;
Madison St. Joseph Health Center, Madisonville, TX;
Maine Center for Marine Biotechnology, Gulf of Maine Research Institute, Portland, ME;
Maine Primary Care Association, Augusta, ME;
Manchester Memorial Hospital, Manchester, CT;
Marana Health Center, Marana, AZ;
Marias Medical Center, Shelby, MT;
Marquette General Hospital, Marquette, MI;
Marshalltown Medical and Surgical Center, Marshalltown, IA;
Mary Scott Nursing Center, Dayton, OH;
Maryland State Dental Association, Columbia, MD;
Center for Science and Health Professions, Maryville University, St. Louis, MO;
Mason County Board of Health, Maysville, KY;
Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, Worcester, MA;
Maury Regional Hospital, Columbia, TN;
Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN;
Memorial Hermann Baptist Beaumont Hospital, Beaumont, TX;
Memorial Hermann Healthcare System, Houston, TX;
Memorial Hermann Southwest Hospital, Houston, TX;
Mendocino Coast District Hospital, Fort Bragg, CA;
Family Wellness Center, Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, Keshena, WI;
Mercy College of Northwest Ohio, Professional Education Division, Toledo, OH;
Mercy Health Foundation, Durango, CO;
Mercy Hospital Grayling, Grayting, MI;
Mercy Hospital, Buffalo, NY;
Mercy Medical Center, Redding, CA;
Mercy Medical Center—House of Mercy, Des Moines, IA;
Mercy Memorial Hospital, Monroe, MI;
Mercy Ministries Health Center, Laredo, TX;
Mercy Suburban Hospital, Norristown, PA;
Methodist Hospital of Southern California, Arcadia, CA;
Methodist Hospital, Houston, TX;
Metropolitan Hospital, New York, NY;
Metro West Medical Center Framingham Union Hospital, Framingham, MA;
Miami Beach Community Health Center, Miami Beach, FL;
Middle Tennessee State University, Center for Physical Activity, Murfreesboro, TN;
Middlesex Community College, Health Education Programs, Lowell, MA;
Middletown Regional Hospital, Middletown, OH;
Mid-Ohio FoodBank, Columbus, OH;
Miles Community College, Pathways to Careers in Healthcare, Miles City, MT;
Mission Hospitals, Asheville, NC;
Missouri Delta Medical Center, Sikeston, MO;
Monroe Clinic, Monroe, WI;
Monroe County Hospital, Forsyth, GA;

Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, NY;
Montgomery Area Nontraditional Equestrians, Pike Road, AL;
Morehead State University, Healthy Communities Outreach and Demonstration, Morehead, KY;
Morris Heights Health Center, Inc., Bronx, NY;
Morton Hospital and Medical Center, Taunton, MA;
Mount Nittany Medical Center, State College, PA;
Mount Vernon Hospital, Mount Vernon, NY;
Mount Wachusett Community College, Northern Tier Healthcare Simulated Instructional Mannequin System (SIMS), Gardner, MA;
Muhlenberg Community Hospital, Greenville, KY;
Naugatuck Valley Community College, Nursing Program, Waterbury, CT;
Nebraska Hospital Association Research and Education Foundation, Lincoln, NE;
New York College of Osteopathic Medicine, Old Westbury, NY;
New York Presbyterian Hospital, New York, NY;
Newark Beth Israel Medical Center, Newark, NJ;
Newark-Wayne Community Hospital, Newark, NY;
Newport Hospital Newport, RI;
Newton Memorial Hospital, Newton, NJ;
Niagara Falls Memorial Medical Center, Niagara Falls, NY;
Norman Regional Health System, Norman, OK;
NorthEast Ohio Neighborhood Health Services, Inc., Cleveland, OH;
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College, Green Bay, WI;
Northern Dutchess Hospital Rhinebeck, NY;
Northern Westchester Hospital, Mount Kisco, NY;
Northland Medical Center, Princeton, MN;
Northwest Community Health Care, Pascoag, RI;
Northwest Hospital Intermediate Care Unit, Randallstown, MD;
Northwest Kidney Centers, Seattle, WA;
Northwest Nazarene University, Nursing Facility, Nampa, ID;
Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Chicago, IL;
Oakland University School of Nursing, Rochester, MI;
Oaklawn Adult Group Home, Goshen, IN;
Oakwood Healthcare System Foundation, Dearborn. MI;
Ocean Beach Hospital, Ilwaco, WA;
James Cancer Survivorship Center, Ohio State University Comprehensive Cancer Center, Columbus, OH;
Ohio State University Medical Center, Columbus, OH;
Oklahoma University College of Medicine—Tulsa, Tulsa, OK;
Olympic Community Action Program, Port Angeles, WA;
Oregon Coast Community College, Nursing Program, Newport, OR;
Osceola County Health Department, Poinciana, FL;
Osceola Medical Center, Osceola, WI;
Our Lady of Lourdes Memorial Hospital, Binghamton, NY;
Palisades Medical Center, North Bergen, NJ;
Palmetto Health Foundation, Columbia, SC;
Parkland Health Center, Farmington, MO;
Passavant Area Hospital, Jacksonville, IL;
Pattie A. Clay Regional Medical Center, Richmond, KY;
Pee Dee Healthy Start, Florence, SC;
Peninsula Hospital Center, New York, NY;
People, Inc., Williamsville, NY;
Highland Hospital, Peralta Community College, Oakland, CA;
Person Memorial Hospital, Roxboro, NC;
Phoenix Children's Hospital, Phoenix, AZ;
Children's Health Center/Emergency Shelter, Placer County, Auburn, CA;
Pointe Coupee Better Access Community Health, New Roads, LA;
Ponce Center of Autism, Municipality of Ponce, PR;
Powell County Medical Center, Deer Lodge, MT;
Powell Valley Health Care, Powell, WY;
Prairie Star Health Center, Hutchinson, KS;
Preston Memorial Hospital, Kingwood, WV;
Project Access Spokane, Spokane, WA;
ProMedica Continuing Care Service Corporation, Adrian, MI;
Provena Saint Joseph Hospital, Elgin, IL;
Providence Health System, Anchorage, AK;
Putnam Hospital Center, Carmel, NY;
Quebrada Health Center, Municipality of Camuy, PR;
Quincy Valley Medical Center, Quincy, WA;
Rancho Santiago Community College District, Public-Private Medical Education Complex, Santa Ana, CA;
Reading Hospital School of Nursing, West Reading, PA;
Reformed Presbyterian Women's Association, Pittsburgh, PA;
Regional Children's Hospital, Johnson City, TN;
Rhode Island Quality Institute, Providence, RI;
Health Commons, Rio Arriba County, Espanola, NM;
Riverside County Regional Medical Center, Moreno Valley, CA;
Riverside Health System, Newport News, VA;
Roosevelt Hospital, New York, NY;
Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Rosebud, SD;
Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Buffalo, NY;
Rural Health Technology Consortium;
Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL;
Saginaw Valley State University, University Center, MI;
Saint Mary's Health Care, Grand Rapids, MI;
Sam Rogers Health Clinic, Kansas City, MO;
San Antonio Hospital Foundation, Upland, CA;
San Francisco Medical Center Outpatient Improvement Programs, Inc., San Francisco, CA;
San Mateo Medical Center Emergency Department, San Mateo County, Redwood City, CA;
San Ysidro Health Center, San Ysidro, CA;
Sandoval County, Telemedicine Project, Bernalillo, NM;
Santa Rosa Memorial Hospital, Orange, CA;
Schneck Medical Center, Seymour, IN;
Scotland Memorial Hospital, Laurinburg, NC;
Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, Seattle, WA;
Sharp Rehabilitation Services, San Diego, CA;
Shasta Community Health Center, Redding, CA;
Shawano County Rural Health Initiative, Shawano, WI;
Sidney Health Center, Sidney, MT;
Sierra Nevada Memorial Foundation, Grass Valley, CA;
Sistersville General Hospital, Sisterville, WV;
Skagit Valley Hospital Cancer Care Center, Mount Vernon, WA;
Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Hospital, Wellsboro, PA;
Somerset Medical Center, Somerville, NJ;
South Broward Hospital District, Hollywood, FL;
South Carolina HIV/AIDS Council, Columbia, SC;
South Nassau Communities Hospital, Oceanside, NY;
South Shore Hospital, South Weymouth, MA;
Southampton Hospital, Southampton, NY;
Southeast Alabama Medical Center, Dothan, AL;
Southeast Community College, Allied health training center, Cumberland, KY;
Southeast Missouri State University, Economic Workforce and Development program, Cape Girardeau, MO;
Southern Methodist University, Southwestern Consortium for Anti-Infective and Virological Research, Dallas, TX;
Southern Vermont Recreation Center Foundation, Springfield, VT;
Southwest Tennessee Community College, Nursing and Biotechnology Program, Memphis, TN;
St James Hospital and Health Centers, Chicago Heights, IL;
St. Agnes Hospital, Fresno, CA;
St. Ambrose University, Davenport, IA;
St. Anthony Community Hospital, Warwick, NY;
St. Anthony Hospital, Chicago, IL;
St. Anthony Memorial Health Centers, Hammond, IN;
St. Bernard Health Center, Inc., Chalmette, LA;
St. Bernardine Medical Center, San Bernardino, CA;
St. Camillus Health and Rehabilitation Center, Syracuse, NY;
St. Catharine College, Allied Health and Sciences Education Project, St. Catharine, KY;
St. Charles Parish, LaPlace, LA;
St. Clair Hospital, Pittsburgh, PA;
St. Claire Regional Medical Center, Morehead, KY;
St. Elizabeth Medical Center, Utica, NY;
St. Francis Hospital, Escanaba, MI;
St. Francis Medical Center, Trenton, NJ;
St. James Parish Hospital, Lutcher, LA;
St. John's North Shore Hospital, Harrison Township, MI;
St. Joseph of the Pines, Southern Pines, NC;
St. Joseph Regional Medical Center, South Bend, IN;
St. Joseph's Hospital Mercy Care Services, Atlanta, GA;
St. Joseph's Hospital, Buckhannon, WV;
St. Joseph's Hospital, Savannah, GA;
St. Joseph's Regional Medical Center, Paterson, NJ;
St. Joseph's/Candler Health System, Savannah, GA;
St. Luke's Quakertown Hospital, Quakertown, PA;
St. Luke's Regional Medical Center, Ltd., Boise, ID;
St. Mary Medical Center Foundation, Langhorne, PA;
St. Mary Medical Center, Apple Valley, CA;
St. Mary's Hospital Foundation, Grand Junction, CO;
St. Mary's Hospital, Madison, WI;
St. Mary's Medical Center, Huntington, WV;
St. Mary's Regional Medical Center, Reno, NY;
St. Patrick Hospital and Health Sciences Center, Missoula, MT;
St. Peter's Hospital Foundation, Albany, NY;
St. Petersburg College, Orthotics and Prosthetics building, St. Petersburg, FL;

St. Vincent Hospital, Billings, MT;
St. Vincent's Charity Hospital, Cleveland, OH;
St. Vincent's Medical Center, Bridgeport, CT;
St. Xavier University, Chicago, IL;
Stamford Hospital, Stamford, CT;
Stark Prescription Assistance Network, Canton, OH;
State Fair Community College, Science and Allied Health Center, Sedalia, MO;
Stewart-Marchman Center, Inc., Daytona Beach, FL;
Stony Point Ambulance Corps, Stony Point, NY;
Appalachian Regional Healthcare Hospital, Summers County Commission, Hinton, WV;
Swedish Covenant Hospital, Chicago, IL;
Sylvan Grove Hospital, Jackson, MS;
Tangipahoa Parish, Loranger, LA;
Rural Nursing Education Program, Tarleton State University, Stephenville, TX;
Tarrant County Infant Mortality Task Force, Ft. Worth, TX;
Taylor Regional Hospital, Hawkinsville, GA;
Temple Health and Bioscience Economic Development District, Temple, TX;
Teton Valley Hospital and Surgicenter, Driggs, ID;
Texas A&M University—Kingsville, Animal Research Facility, Kingsville, TX;
Texas Institute for Genomic Medicine, College Station, TX;
Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center, El Paso and Lubbock, TX;
Thomas Jefferson University Breast Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA;
Thomason General Hospital, El Paso, TX;
Thundermist Health Center, Woonsocket, RI;
Tohono O'odham Nation, Sells, AZ;
Toledo Children's Hospital, Toledo, OH;
Tomorrow's Child/Michigan SIDS, Lansing, MI;
Senior Citizens' Center for Health and Wellness, Town of Argo, AL;
Translational Genomics Research Institute, Phoenix, AZ;
Transylvania Community Hospital, Inc., Brevard, NC;
Tulare District Hospital, Tulare, CA;
Tuomey Healthcare System, Sumter, SC;
Twin City Hospital, Dennison, OH;
Union Hospital, Terre Haute, IN;
Uniontown Hospital, Uniontown, PA;
Unity Health Care, Washington, DC;
University Community Hospital/Pepin Heart Hospital, Tampa, FL;
University Health System, San Antonio, TX;
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL;
University of Arizona Medical Center, Tucson, AZ;
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, AR;
Antenatal and Neonatal Guidelines, Education, and Learning System, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, AR;
University of Arkansas Medical School Cancer Research Center, Little Rock, AR;
Center for Education, University of California, Davis Health System, Sacramento, CA;
University of Chicago Hospitals, Chicago, IL;
University of Illinois College of Medicine, Peoria, IL;
Public health research and education building, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA;
Advanced biomedical research institute, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA;
University of Kansas Research Center, Lawrence, KS;
University of Massachusetts Memorial Medical Center, Worcester, MA;
University of Memphis, Health Building, Memphis, TN;
Center for Research in Medical Education, University of Miami, Miami, FL;
C.S. Mott Children's and Women's Hospitals, University of Michigan Health System, Ann Arbor, MI;
University of North Alabama, Science and Health Facility, Florence, AL;
Center for Computational Epidemiology, University of North Texas, Denton, TX;
National Center for Nursing Education, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO;
University of South Florida, Cancer Clinical Trials Project, Tampa, FL;
University of Tennessee of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Low Birth Weight Study Project, TN;
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX;
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX;
University of Virginia Health System, Charlottesville, VA;
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Living Healthy Community Clinic, Oshkosh, WI;
Utah Navajo Health System, Inc., Montezuma Creek, UT;
Valley Cooperative Health Care, Hudson, WI;
Vanguard University Nursing Center, Costa Mesa, CA;
Village Network Boys' Village Campus, Wooster, OH;
Virtua Memorial Hospital Burlington County, Mount Holly, NJ;
Visiting Nurse Association Healthcare Partners of Ohio, Cleveland, OH;
Wadsworth Rittman Hospital Foundation, Wadsworth, OH;
Holly Hill Hospital, Wake County, Raleigh, NC;
Washington County, GA Regional Medical Center, Sandersville, GA;
Washington Hospital Center, Washington, DC;
Washington Parish, Bogalusa, LA;
Wayne Memorial Hospital. Jesup, GA;
West Jefferson Medical Center, Marrero, LA;
West Shore Medical Center, Manistee, MI;
West Side Community Health Services, St. Paul, MN;
West Virginia University Hospital, Morgantown, WV;
Western North Carolina Health System, Asheville, NC;
Whidden Memorial Hospital, Everett, MA;
White County Memorial Hospital, Monticello, IN;
White Memorial Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA;
White Plains Hospital Center, White Plains, NY;
Whiteside County Department of Health, Rock Falls, IL;
Whittemore Peterson Institute for Neuro-Immune Disease, Sparks, NV;
Wind River Community Health Center, Riverton, WY;
Wing Memorial Hospital, Palmer, MA Winneshiek Medical Center, Decorah, IA;
Wolfson Children's Hospital, Jacksonville, FL;
Woodhull Medical and Mental Health Center, Brooklyn, NY;
Woodruff County Nursing Home, McCrory, AR;
Wyoming County Community Hospital, Warsaw, NY;
YMCA of Central Stark County, Canton, OH;
York Memorial Hospital, York, PA;
Youth Crisis Center, Jacksonville, FL;
Zucker Hillside Hospital, Glen Oaks, NY;
Alma Family Services, Monterey Park, CA;
Bronx-Lebanon Hospital, New York, NY;
Community Health Partnership, Santa Clara, CA;
Hunterdon Medical Center, Flemington, NJ;
Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, Shreveport, LA;
Marymount University, Nurse Managed Health Center, Arlington, VA;
Nassau University Medical Centers, East Meadow, NY;
National Hispanic Medical Association, Washington, DC;
Prince George's County, Health Insurance Media Campaign, Upper Marlboro, MD;
St. Luke's Community Free Clinic, Front Royal, VA;
Thurston-Mason County Medical Society, Olympia, WA;
Alabama Institute of the Deaf and Blind, Talladega, AL;
Albany State University, African American Male Initiative, Albany, GA;
American Speech-Language-Hearing Foundation, Rockville, MD;
Anne Arundel Community College, Center for Health, Science, and Homeland Security, Arnold, MD;
Armstrong Atlantic State University, Cyber Security Research Initiative, Savannah, GA;
Asnuntuck Community College, Manufacturing Technology Center, Enfield, CT;
Azusa Pacific University, School of Nursing, San Bernardino, CA;
Bellevue Community College, Building Safer Information Technology project, Bellevue, WA;
Beloit College, Science Building, Beloit, WI;
Engineering technology center, Bemidji State University, Bemidji, MN;
Bennett College for Women, Suspension Intervention Program, Greensboro, NC;
Berkshire Community College, Access to Education Initiative, Pittsfield, MA;
Bluegrass Community and Technical College, Technology Equipment, Winchester, KY;
Broward Community College, Minority Center for Preparedness and Prevention, Broward County, FL;
Bucknell University, Environmental Initiative, Lewisburg, PA;
Buena Vista University, post secondary education online curriculum, Storm Lake, IA;
Butler Community College, technological worker training program, Andover, KS;
Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute, County Teaching Center, Hudson, NC;
California Baptist University, School of Engineering, Riverside, CA;
California Polytechnic State University, Animal Research, San Luis Obispo, CA;
California State University—Channel Islands, Regional Clinical Simulation Technology Laboratory, Camarillo, CA;
Ruby Gerontology Center, California State University—Fullerton, Fullerton, CA;
Campbell University, Advancement for Underrepresented Minority Pharmacists and Pharmaceutical Scientists Program, Buies Creek, NC;
Central Arizona College, Bilingual Nursing Program, Coolidge, AZ;
Central Florida Community College, Equine Studies Curriculum, Ocala, FL;
Central Methodist University, Novel Partnership, Fayette, MO;
Center for Integrated Emergency Response Training, Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, NC;
Central Washington University, Wine Quality Testing and Education Initiative, Ellensburg, WA;
Chemeketa Community College, Health Sciences Education Center, Salem, OR;
Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service, City College of New York, NY;

Clark State Community College, Green County Campus, Springfield, OH;

Clayton College and State University, archival graduate program, Morrow, GA;
Institute for Environmental Sustainability in the Workforce, Clover Park Technical College, Lakewood, WA;
College of Lake County, Family English as a Second Language Program, Grayslake, IL;
College of Southern Idaho, Pro-Tech Program, Twin Falls, ID;
College of Southern Maryland, Construction and Transportation Training, LaPlata, MD;
College of the Canyons, Medical Lab Technician Degree Program, Santa Clarita, CA;
College Success Foundation, Issaquah, WA;
Community College of Allegheny County, Technical Education, Pittsburgh, PA;
Community College of Beaver County, Aviation Sciences Center, Monaca, PA;
Consensus Organizing Center, San Diego, CA;
Coppin State University, School of Nursing, Baltimore, MD;
Darton College, Biomedical Technology Education, Albany, GA;
Delaware County Community College, Science, Engineering, and Technology Complex, Media, PA;
Jasper County Career Academy, Des Moines Area Community College, Des Moines, ID;
Digital Campus Initiative, DeSales University, Center Valley, PA;
Eastern Illinois University, Nursing Program, Charleston, IL;
Eastern Shore Community College Industrial Maintenance Program, Melfa, VA;
Eckerd College, educational technology initiative, St. Petersburg, FL;
Edison College, Nursing Program, Charlotte County Campus, Punta Gorda, FL;
El Camino College, Nursing Program, Torrance, CA;
Teacher Education Enhancement Program, Elmira College, Elmira, NY;
Florida Campus Compact, Tallahassee, FL;
Coastal Watershed Institute, Florida Gulf Coast University, Ft. Myers, FL;
Focus: HOPE, Detroit, MI;
Franklin Pierce College, Bachelor of Science Degree in Nursing Program Development, Rindge, NH;
Frontier Community College, utility lineman training program, Fairfield, IL;
Ft. Valley State University, Teacher Preparation and Research Center, Ft. Valley, GA;
Gadsden State Community College, fiber optic planning and development, Gadsden, AL;
Center for Advanced Manufacturing Competitiveness, Gateway Community and Technical College, Ft. Mitchell, KY;
Gateway Community College, advanced manufacturing center, New Haven, CT;
Gila County Community College, registered nurses program, Globe, AZ;
Grace College, Access to Education for All Program, Winona Lake, IN;
Greenfield Community College, art training and education, Greenfield, MA;
Harcum College, laboratory and teaching facilities, Bryn Mawr, PA;
Harrisburg Area Community College, health department equipment, Harrisburg, PA;
Harrisburg University of Science and Technology, Academic Development and Equipment, Harrisburg, PA;
Herkimer County Community College, Renovation of Science Laboratory, Herkimer, NY;
Hiwassee College, dental hygiene program, Madisonville, TN;
Holy Family University, Teaching with Technology for Nurses Initiative, Philadelphia, PA;
Huntington Junior College, Closed Captioning program, WV;
Huston-Tillotson University, math and science education initiative, Austin, TX;
Institute for Advanced Learning and Research, Danville, VA;
Ivy Tech Community College, equipment and curriculum, Evansville, IN;
Jackson State University, Osteopathic Medical School, Jackson, MS;
James Rumsey Technical Institute, Automotive Technology Martinsburg, WV;
Tuscarawas County campus, Kent State University, New Philadelphia, OH;
King's College, civic engagement and service learning, Wilkes-Barre, PA;
La Sierra University, Science Building, Riverside, CA;
Extension center, Susquehanna County, Lackawanna College, Scranton, PA;
Lake City Community College, Math Initiative, Lake City, FL;
Latino Institute, Inc., Newark, NJ;
National Great Rivers Research and Education Center, Lewis and Clark Community College, Godfrey, IL;
Lincoln College, training equipment and material, Lincoln, IL;
Lincoln Memorial University College of Osteopathic Medicine, Curriculum Development, Harrogate, TN;
Linn-Benton Community College, Science and Health Equipment, Albany, OR;
Lorain County Community College, Library and Community Resource Center, Elyria, OH;
Los Angeles Valley College, Solving the Math Achievement Gap Program, Valley Glen, CA;
Lyon College, emergency equipment, Batesville, AR;
MacMurray College, Technology Upgrades, Jacksonville, IL;
Madonna University, Curriculum Development and Disaster Relief, Livonia, MI;
Gateway Community College, Maricopa County Community College, Tempe, AZ;
Marymount Manhattan College, Minority Teacher Preparation, New York, NY;
Louisiana Academy for Innovative Teaching and Learning, McNeese State University, Lake Charles, LA;
Mesa Community College, Online Registered Nurses Recertification Program, Mesa, AZ;
Metropolitan State University, nursing education programs, St. Paul, MN;
Advanced Technology Center Midland College, Midland, TX;
Midwestern University Chicago College of Pharmacy, Downers Grove, IL;
Institute for Civic Leadership, Mills College, Oakland, CA;
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, Office of the Chancellor, St. Paul, MN;
Mira Costa Community College District, Nursing Education, Oceanside, CA;
Marine technology center and estuarine education center, Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, Gautier, MS;
Academic Support Center, Missouri State University-West Plains, West Plains, MO;
Monroe Community College, special needs preparedness training program, Rochester, NY;
Montgomery County Community College, Advanced Technologies Initiative, Blue Bell, PA;
Mount Ida College, Veterinary Technology Program, Newton, MA;
Veterinary Center, Murray State University, Hopkinsville, KY;
Nevada State College, Accelerated Nursing Program, Henderson, NY;
Jane Bancroft Cook Library, New College of Florida, Sarasota, FL;
Public Archaeology Laboratory, New College of Florida, Sarasota, FL;
Strategic Languages Resource Center, New College of Florida, Sarasota, FL;
New Hampshire Community Technical College-Manchester, Manchester, NH;
Niagara County Community College, Nursing Equipment, Sanborn, NY;
North Arkansas College, Center Campus (including the L.E. ''Gene'' Durand Conference and Workforce Development Center), Harrison, AR;
Center for Engineering Technologies, North Carolina Center for Engineering Technologies, Hickory, NC;
Center for Nanoscience Technology Training, North Dakota State College of Science, Wahpeton, ND;
College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL;
METS Center, Northern Kentucky University Research Foundation, Highland Heights, KY;
Northwest Shoals Community College, technology upgrades, Phil Campbell, AL;
Norwich University, Nursing Equipment and Technology, Northfield, VT;
Oakland Community College, International Education Programs, Bloomfield Hills, MI;
Oklahoma Panhandle State University, Water Testing Facility, Goodwell, OK;
Onondaga Community College, equipment and infrastructure upgrades, Syracuse, NY;
OGI School of Science and Engineering, Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, OR;
Owens Community College, First Responder Training Initiative, Toledo, OH;
Palm Beach Community College, technology enhancements, Lake Worth, FL;
Paula and Anthony Rich Center for the Study and Treatment of Autism, Youngstown, OH;
Philadelphia School District, CORE Philly Scholarship Program, Philadelphia, PA;
Center of Excellence for Homeland Security, Pierce College, Tacoma, WA;
Kansas Technology Center, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, KS;
Polk Community College, manufacturing and training programs, Winter Haven, FL;
Portland State University, Science Research Teaching, Portland, OR;
Prince George's Community College, Management Information Upgrade, Largo, MD;
Purchase College, State University of New York, Math and Science Programs, Purchase, NY;
Radford University, Medical Graduate School Feasibility Study, Radford, VA;
Rhode Island College, Portuguese and Lusophone Studies Program, Providence, RI;
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, Curriculum Development, Pomona, NJ;
Richland Community College, Industrial Training Center, Decatur, IL;
Industrial Training Center, Richmond Community College, Hamlet, NC;
Rockford College, technology and telecommunications equipment, Rockford, IL;
Round Rock Higher Education Center, Round Rock, TX;
Rutgers University School of Law-Camden, NJ;
San Jacinto College, Healthcare Education and Training Initiative, Pasadena, TX;
Santa Clara University, Learning Commons and Library, Santa Clara, CA;
Seton Hall University, Life Science and Technology Center, South Orange, NJ;
Siena Heights University, Nursing Program, Adrian, MI;
Silver Lake College, Nursing Program, Manitowoc, WI;
Simpson College, Blank Performing Arts Center, Indianola, IA;
Sparks College, Close Captioning Program, Shelbyville, IL;

St. Bonaventure University, Science Equipment Program, St. Bonaventure, NY;
St. Clair County Community College, Water Quality Technology Program, Port Huron, MI;
St. Francis College, Science, Technology, Engineering and Math Initiative, Brooklyn, NY;
St. Petersburg College, Long Distance Learning Program, St. Petersburg, FL;
State University of New York at Potsdam, Teacher Training Initiative, Potsdam, NY;
Sweetwater Education Foundation, Chula Vista, CA;
Texas Chiropractic College, Pasadena, TX;
Texas State Technical College, Manufacturing Workforce Training, Waco, TX;
Center for the Study of Addiction and Recovery, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX;
Tohono O'odham Community College, math and science equipment and instruction materials, Sells, AZ;
Tri-County Community College, Cherokee Center for Applied Technology, Murphy, NC;
Trident Technical College, Nursing Curriculum, Charleston, SC;
Trinity University, Educator's Technology Teaching Laboratories, San Antonio, TX;
University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ;
Matsui Center for Politics and Public Service, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA;
University of Central Arkansas, technology training initiative, Conway, AR;
Lou Frey Institute of Politics, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL;
College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL;
College of Pharmacy, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Monroe, LA;
University of Michigan Depression Center, Ann Arbor, MI;
Teacher Leadership Initiative for School Improvement, University of Montevallo, Montevallo, AL;
American Indian Language Policy Research and Teacher Training Center, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM;
Assistive technology center, University of North Carolina at Wilmington, Wilmington, NC;
University of North Florida, Virtual School Readiness Incubator, Jacksonville, FL;
University of Texas at Tyler, Keeping American Competitive: Consortium for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM), Tyler, TX;
University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, Galveston, TX;
University of Virginia Center for Politics, Charlottesville, VA;
University of Wisconsin-Marshfield, Marshfield, WI;
Utah Valley State College, Center for the Study of Ethics, Orem, UT;
Vanguard University Nursing Center, Costa Mesa, CA;
Waldorf College, science equipment and library resources, Forest City, IA;
Weber State University, Teaching Assistant Pathway to Teaching (TAPT) Program, Ogden, UT;
West Central Technical College, workforce development and technical training, Waco, GA;
West Chester University, Nursing Program Development, West Chester, PA;
Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, Madison, WI;
Wittenberg University, Teacher Training Initiative, Springfield OH;
York College City University of New York, York College Aviation Institute, Jamaica, NY;
Aerospace Museum of California Foundation, McClellan, CA;
Alabama School of Math and Science, Mobile, AL;
America's Black Holocaust Museum, Milwaukee, WI;
American Airpower Museum, Farmingdale, NY;
American Jazz Museum, Kansas City, MO;
American West Heritage Center, Wellsville, UT;
Anne Arundel County Trust for Preservation, Inc., Annapolis, MD;
Armory Center for the Arts, Pasadena, CA;
Bandera County, Bandera, TX;
Bellevue Arts Museum, Bellevue, WA;
Boyle County Public library, Danville, KY;
Burpee Museum, Rockford, IL;
Charlotte County, FL, Archival System, Port Charlotte, FL;
Children's Museum of Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN;
Children's Museum of Los Angeles, Van Nuys, CA;
Cincinnati Museum Center, Cincinnati, OH;
City of Chino Hills, Chino Hills, CA;
College Park Aviation Museum, College Park, MD;
Connecticut Historical Society Museum, Hartford, CT;
Juvenile Hall Library, Contra Costa County, Martinez, CA;
Corporation for Jefferson's Poplar Forest, Forest, VA;
County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, CA;
Discovery Center of Idaho, Boise, ID;
Everson Museum of Art of Syracuse, Syracuse, NY;
Florida Holocaust Museum, St. Petersburg, FL;
Florida Southern College, Frank Lloyd Wright Preservation Achieve Wing, Lakeland, FL;
George and Eleanor McGovern Library, Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, SD;
George C. Marshall Foundation, Lexington, VA;
George Washington University, Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project, Washington, DC;
Heard Museum, Phoenix, AZ;
Heckscher Museum of Art, Huntington, NY;
Historic Hudson Valley, Tarrytown, NY;
History Museum of East Ottertail County, Perham, MN;
Impression 5 Science Center, Lansing, MI;
Lola Public Library, Lola, KS;
James A. Michener Art Museum, Doylestown, PA;
Jefferson Barracks Heritage Foundation Museum St. Louis, MO;
Kansas Regional Prisons Museum, Lansing, KS;
Massie Heritage Center, Savannah, GA;
Metropolitan Library System, Chicago, IL;
Monterey Bay Aquarium, Monterey, CA;
Morris Museum, Morristown, NJ;
Museum of Aviation Foundation, Warner Robins, GA;
Museum of Science and Technology, Syracuse, NY;
Onondaga County Public Library, Syracuse, NY;
Overton County Library, Livingston, TN;
Pennsylvania State Police Historical, Educational and Memorial Museum, Hershey, PA;
Pico Rivera Library, Pico Rivera, CA;
Portfolio Gallery and Education Center, St. Louis, MO;
Ralph Mark Gilbert Civil Rights Museum, Savannah, GA;
Rust College, Archival Equipment, Holly Springs, MS;
Samuel Dorsky Museum of Art, State University of New York at New Paltz, NY;
San Gabriel Library, San Gabriel, CA;
Shedd Aquarium, Chicago, IL;
South Carolina Aquarium, Charleston, SC;
South Florida Science Museum, West Palm Beach, FL;
Texas Tech University, Virtual Vietnam Achieve, Lubbock, TX;

Tubman African American Museum, Macon, GA;
Twin Cities Public Television, St. Paul, MN;
James R. Slater Museum of Natural History, University of Puget Sound, Tacoma, WA;
Yolo County Library, Woodland, CA;
Young At Art Children's Museum, Davie, FL;
Advocating Change Together, Inc. St. Paul, MN;
City of North Miami Beach, FL, North Miami Beach, FL;
Jewish Vocational and Career Counseling Service, San Francisco, CA;
Vocational Guidance Services, Cleveland, OH;
Access Community Health Center, Bloomingdale, IL;
Advocate Health Care, Oak Brook, IL;
Alfred University, Powell Institute for Children and Families, Alfred, NY;
American Red Cross, Lower Bucks County Chapter, Levittown, PA;
City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco, CA;
City of Los Angeles, supportive housing services, CA;
Community Rehabilitation Center, Inc., Jacksonville, FL;
Family Services of Greater Waterbury, Waterbury, CT;
Family Support Systems Unlimited, Inc., Bronx, NY;
Fulton County Department of Mental Health, Atlanta, GA;
Heartland Health Outreach, Inc., Chicago, IL;
Helen Wheeler Center for Community Mental Health, Kankakee, IL;
Holy Spirit Hospital, Camp Hill, PA;
Institute of Training in Addiction Studies, Indiana Wesleyan University, Marion, IN;
Jewish Association for Residential Care, Farmington Hills, MI;
Kids Hope United, Waukegan, IL;
New Image Homeless Shelter, Los Angeles, CA;
Pacific Clinics, Arcadia, CA;
Prime Time House, Inc., Torrington, CT;
Ruth Rales Jewish Family Service, Boca Raton, FL;
Ventura County Probation Office, Ventura, CA;
Ventura County Sheriffs Department, Thousand Oaks, CA;
Adoption and trauma resource center, Youthville, Wichita, KS;
Community Foundation for Greater New Haven, New Haven, CT;
Fighting Back Partnership, Vallejo, CA;
Institute for the Advanced Study of Black Families, Oakland, CA;
Operation Safe House, Riverside, CA;
Partnership for a Drug-Free America, New York, NY;
Shiloh Economic Development Center, Bryan, TX;
South Boston Community Health Center, South Boston, MA;
YMCA of the East Bay, Richmond, CA;
City of Las Vegas, EVOLVE program, NV;
City of Oxford, Oxford, substance abuse treatment program, MS;
Fulton County government, Atlanta, Project Excell, CA;
Gavin Foundation, South Boston. MA;
Glide Foundation, San Francisco, CA;
Metro Homeless Youth Services of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA;
Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center, Minneapolis, MN;
Nassau University Medical Center, East Meadow, NY;

Sandhills Teen Challenge, Carthage, NC;
Sheriffs Youth Program of Minnesota, Inver Grove Heights, MN;
Talbert House, Cincinnati, OH;
Trumbull County Lifelines, Warren, OH;
Union Station Foundation, Pasadena, CA;
United Way of Treasure Valley, Boise, ID;
Wayne County Academy, Alpha, KY;
WestCare Kentucky, Ashcamp, KY;

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 41: Page 58, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $8,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 42: Page 58, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 43: Page 58, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $32,700,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 44: Page 62, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $21,400,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 45: Page 77, lines 6 and 7, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $99,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 46: Page 80, line 2, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $272,250,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 47: Page 80, line 2, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $33,907,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 48: Page 80, line 2, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,596,000)''.

Page 80, lines 17, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,596,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 49: Page 82, line 6 after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,695,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 50: Page 82, line 6 after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,533,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 51: Page 82, line 6 after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $14,731,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 52: Page 83, lines 14 and 15, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $72,674,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 53: Page 90, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $11,785,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 54: Page 90, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $40,590,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 55: Page 97, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $255,625,000)''.

Page 97, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $255,625,000)''.

Page 98, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $55,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 56: Page 103, strike line 7 and all that follows through the comma on page 104, line 12.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 57: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Twin Cities Public Television, St. Paul, MN.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 58: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

None of funds made available in this Act for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may be used for the Entertainment Education Program.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 59: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the On Location Entertainment Industry Craft and Technician Training project, West Los Angeles College, Culver city, CA.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 60: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Read with Me/Lea Conmigo family literacy program, Families In Schools, Los Angeles, CA.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 61: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 62: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service, City College of New York, NY.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 63: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.25 percent.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 64: Page 87, line 1, strike the comma and insert ''and''.

Page 87, line 3, strike ''and'' and all that follows through the first comma on line 5.

Page 87, line 5, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $93,531,000)''.

Page 88, line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through page 89, line 3, and insert a period.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 65: Page 89, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $64,987,000)''.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 17, 2007 No. 114

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JON TESTER, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Judge, deliver the Members of this body from the pressures of daily duties, the tension of our times, and the confusion of many voices filled with certainty. Help our Senators to pause and reflect, enabling them to hear again Your ''still, small voice'' summoning them to profound thoughts and high endeavors. May they discipline themselves to follow truth wherever it leads, to stand for justice, even though they might stand alone; to champion the right, even when it appears unpopular. Give them courage to engage in an introspection that will strip their soul to its bare essence, leaving them only with the desire to do Your will.

With respect for other faiths, I pray in Jesus's Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JON TESTER led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD.)

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JON TESTER, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TESTER thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY WHIP

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this morning after morning business, we will resume consideration of the Defense authorization bill. This is an annual bill that comes before us relating to the Department of Defense and the conduct of America's national defense. It is an important bill made more important this year because the focus of debate at this moment is on the war in Iraq.

We understand this is an issue that is on the minds of most Americans. We also understand that this is a body, the Senate, where we represent the people of this country. I believe the debate should be an open debate, one that gives opportunity for both points of view to be expressed. I also believe that at the end of the debate on the central issue of the war in Iraq, we should take a majority vote and decide what the Senate stands for when it comes to our policy.

Those who stand for the President's position can oppose the Levin-Reed amendment, which is pending and is going to be considered soon. It is an amendment which establishes a timetable for American troops to start coming home. It is a timetable for ending this war responsibly, ending our combat role by the spring of next year. It is the only amendment pending which is specific and will change the policy and direction in Iraq.

Unfortunately, the procedural issues ahead of us are very complicated. The Senate Republican leader, Mr. MCCONNELL of Kentucky, has insisted that instead of a majority vote on the war in Iraq, it will be necessary to have 60 votes. I think that is unfortunate.

Last year, during the course of debating the Defense authorization bill, there were two major amendments related to the war in Iraq. Both of those amendments were considered and held to a majority vote standard. Earlier this year, on the supplemental appropriations bill for the war in Iraq, another question came up about change in policy—again, a majority vote. But things have changed. Since that time, at least three Republican Senators have stepped forward and said they disagree with the President's policy and will vote to change the direction of this war. Because of that, it is clear we have a majority supporting this change in direction.

Now the Republican leader insists on 60 votes, insists on filibustering the amendment that is before the Senate. He is trying to stop the debate on whether we will change direction in Iraq. As a result, we are going to have an unusual session of this Senate which will commence shortly and run around the clock until tomorrow morning, when we will face a cloture vote. A cloture vote is an opportunity for Senators to step forward and say whether they truly want a change in the policy of this war. The Republican minority has insisted on this 60-vote threshold, knowing it is more difficult to reach, but we haven't given up. We believe that with the three Republican Senators who have already expressed their dissatisfaction with the President's policy, others may join. We know that Republican Senators back in their

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

home States have said publicly and repeatedly they want to vote to change policy. They will have that chance on the Levin-Reed amendment, which will be brought up for a cloture vote tomorrow morning.

This session, which we will now commence, is not likely to end during the next 24 hours. During that period of time, it is an opportunity and an invitation for Members of the Senate to come to the floor and express their feelings about this war in Iraq. For those who support the President's position and want to continue along this present course, they have their chance. For those on both sides of the aisle who believe we ought to bring this war to an end, they also have their opportunity.

It is unfortunate the Republican minority has insisted on this procedural obstacle, has insisted on filibustering this amendment, and is trying to stop us from getting to the heart of the issue about changing this policy in Iraq. But the American people know this, and they know that those who are doing their best to protect the President, protect him politically, protect his position, are going to be well known across this country at the end of this debate.

I hope those who agree with us on the Democratic side and the three Republicans who join us will come together with us and dramatically change this policy, change this war in Iraq, and bring it to an end responsibly.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

DEBATE TIME ON IRAQ WAR POLICY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, listening to my good friend from Illinois, the majority whip, discussing the 60-vote threshold reminds me of what the majority leader said back on January 30, 2007:

> Sixty votes are required for just about everything. I have talked with Senator MCCONNELL about this. You know we have to come up with a number of resolutions that require 60 votes because, as you know in the Senate, a lot of times 60 votes are required for just about everything.

Now, that is life in the Senate. On the Defense authorization bill, we had two amendments last year, the Kennedy and Enzi amendments, and both required 60 votes. We are happy to have this debate tonight. It is my understanding the other side last evening agreed to accept the Cornyn amendment to the Defense authorization bill. As we indicated, we have a request for a rollcall vote on that amendment. However, we will be happy to schedule that vote at a reasonable time today. I am told—and we heard again—that we plan to be here this evening leading up to the cloture vote on the Levin amendment, and we would be happy to have that vote today. There is no particular reason to have the Levin-Reed vote tomorrow; we could have it today.

But look, it is perfectly fine with us to stay here today and this evening to discuss this very important issue. I couldn't agree with my friend from Illinois more that it is the significant issue in the country at this particular juncture. We will be prepared to work with the majority whip and the majority leader to work out a floor schedule that allows us to rotate back and forth on a regular basis throughout the afternoon and the evening, and we look forward to working that out in a way that is fair to both sides and gives us ample opportunity for a vigorous debate about this extremely important issue.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pursuant to the statement made by the Republican leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Cornyn amendment be scheduled for a vote at 2:15 and that it be a majority vote and that Senator MCCONNELL can withdraw his amendment, which is currently pending.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, Senator CORNYN is in a hearing this morning, so we would want to provide a little bit of time for him this afternoon, but I think we should be able to work this out shortly. We would pursue a discussion with the floor staff and see if we can't lock this in. There is no particular reason why we couldn't work this out. For the moment, I object. Maybe the vote could occur at 2:45. Would that be acceptable?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I amend my unanimous consent request to 2:45, with the time equally divided between 2:15 and 2:45, and that the Cornyn amendment will then be called for a vote, with the standard of the majority as to whether it passes or fails.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. And no second-degree amendments, I might add, and the McConnell amendment withdrawn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, could we state the consent request again?

Mr. DURBIN. I can try. It is that the debate will commence at 2:15 on the Cornyn amendment, with the time equally divided for 30 minutes; at 2:45 the Cornyn amendment will be called for consideration—for a vote—with no second-degree amendments; that the vote standard for passage of the Cornyn amendment will be a majority vote; and that Senator MCCONNELL will withdraw his pending amendment. I think that is the sum and substance of it. The McConnell cloture motion would be withdrawn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALL-NIGHT SESSION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to say in response to the Republican minority leader, he found two amendments where we required a 60-vote margin on the last Defense authorization bill. Those two amendments did not relate to the Defense authorization bill. They were minimum-wage amendments. They required budget points of order. The Senator from Kentucky has been unable to find an Iraq amendment raised in the Defense authorization bill nor in the supplemental appropriations bill which required this extraordinary majority.

Now the Republican leader has agreed to a majority vote on the Cornyn amendment, something we offered yesterday. Now we are asking that during the course of this debate, I hope he will reconsider his position on the Levin-Reed amendment. This too should be a majority vote, an up-or-down vote. What is so frightening on the Republican side of the aisle to face a majority vote?

We know an overwhelming majority of the American people want to change this policy in Iraq. Yet the Republicans have insisted that when it comes to the key amendment—the Levin-Reed amendment, which will actually bring our troops home and end this war responsibly—in that situation, they want an exceptional majority, 60 votes, to be considered. Well, we are going to debate that and we are going to debate it long and hard between now and 24 hours from now. The Senate will be in a rare all-night session. Some of the critics of this all-night session have said that it is an effort to get some publicity. Well, if they are arguing that it is an effort to get the attention of the American people, they are right because the American people want us to debate this honestly and openly.

I happen to believe as well that the Senate spending a sleepless night is no great sacrifice. Soldiers and the families who pray for them spend many sleepless nights. It is time for the Senate to do the same. It is time for us to come to the floor and express what is in our hearts about this war—a war that has claimed over 3,611 American lives; a war which has cost us 30,000 injuries, 10,000 of them severe injuries, including amputations, traumatic brain injuries, and severe burns; a war that has cost this Nation over $500 billion and costs us more than $12 billion a month. Is it worth one night of lost sleep to discuss and debate that? You bet it is. That is why we are here. That is what the Senate is all about.

I hope the Republican minority leader, Mr. MCCONNELL of Kentucky, having agreed to a majority vote on the

Cornyn amendment—a Republican amendment—will now give us a majority vote, an up-or-down vote, on the Levin-Reed amendment. I don't understand why he would agree to one standard for one Iraq amendment and then insist on a higher standard for a Democratic Iraq amendment. I think most Americans can see through that.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business for 60 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the first half of the time under the control of the Republicans and the second half under the control of the majority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

BROADCAST FREEDOM ACT

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Broadcast Freedom Act, which I offered along with my friends from Minnesota and South Dakota, Senators COLEMAN and THUNE. Some would say that the fairness doctrine is the perfect example of a regulation whose time has past. Others would say it is a regulation that was never necessary to begin with. In any event, it is certainly not a regulation that we need today. I think it is worth a brief recap of history of American mass media to show how utterly silly this doctrine would be if reinstated in today's environment.

In 1949, the year the fairness doctrine was created, there were 51 television stations in the United States. In 1985, when the doctrine was repealed by the FCC, there were 1,200. Today, there are nearly 1,800 television stations. The radio industry tells a similar story. In 1949, there were about 2,500 radio stations in the United States. In 1985, the number had grown to 9,800. Today, there are almost 14,000. There was significant growth of these numbers between 1985 and today. We need to understand why it is happening.

You see, it was in 1985 that the FCC said the following when it repealed the fairness doctrine:

> We believe that the interest of the public and viewpoint diversity is fully served by the multiplicity of voices in the marketplace today.

That was when we had far fewer radio and television stations. That statement was made over 20 years ago. The number of voices in the market was plentiful then. In the last two decades, those numbers have grown even larger—by 50 percent in television and over 40 percent in radio.

Keep in mind, too, that there was no Internet in 1985, and there was no satellite radio offering hundreds of channels nationwide. There was no digital television or radio allowing for multicasting. There were not even wireless phones, much less ones that could go on line and even carry video. Of course, nobody had yet heard of the podcast, blogging, or YouTube. All of this has now changed. It is easy to see that if the fairness doctrine was unnecessary in 1985 because of the multiplicity of voices, it is downright laughable today.

I also wish to speak to the fact that this doctrine, if reinstated, would have the opposite effect that its opponents tell us they seek. They say they want both sides of important issues presented with equal time. Well, what happens if nobody is available or willing to offer an opposing viewpoint? The answer, clearly, is that the discussion will not take place at all. And all the bureaucracy that is required to keep track of what someone said and what has to be responded to would cause most of these stations not to deal with important issues at all.

Commercial radio and television are businesses. They are on the air only as long as someone is willing to pay for advertising. Advertising is only attractive when someone is watching or listening. People watch or listen to things they find worth their time. If a radio or television station is prevented from airing programming on public issues or is forced to carry programming that may not suit their audience, they will have a very difficult time retaining listeners, advertisers, and ultimately their businesses. It is not in the public interest for the Government to force content on or prevent content from reaching the American people. The FCC recognized that in 1985, and we should all recognize it today.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to support the Broadcast Freedom Act, which prevents the FCC, now or in the future, from reinstating the arcane and damaging so-called fairness doctrine.

EARMARK TRANSPARENCY

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I would like to speak now about the ongoing efforts in the Senate to block the earmark transparency rules.

It has now been 180 days since they were unanimously adopted by the Senate. Yet they still have not been formally enacted. Even worse, the majority wants to take them behind closed doors, where a conference committee can kill them in secret. They tried to kill these reforms on the Senate floor but failed. Now they are falling back to their plan B, which is to gut them in conference.

That is not how we should write a bill about openness, honesty, and transparency. I hope my friends on the other side will change their minds. These are Senate rules I am talking about, and there is no reason why we need to negotiate with the House. The House already has their earmark transparency rules. My friends on the other side should stop blocking earmark reform and stop trying to change these rules in secret so we can move on.

Americans have seen the ethical problems associated with earmarks. They have watched what happened to Duke Cunningham, and they have seen a number of Members of Congress forfeit their seats on appropriations committees due to conflicts of interest. Americans understand that lobbying and ethics reform will not be complete—in fact, it would be meaningless—if we don't do something to shine the light on earmarks. Let me repeat this because I think it is very important. Americans do understand that ethics reform is not complete without meaningful earmark reform.

Many of the reforms in the ethics bill address what people outside of Congress can do, but earmark reform addresses what we here in Congress can do. That is the difference. Americans want, more than anything else, Congress to be restrained and open about what we do. They want us to reform the way we spend their money and shut down the secret congressional favor factory. Nothing would do more to restore America's faith in their Government than enacting reforms that ensure their elected officials are not going to use their ability to spend Federal dollars to enrich their friends and supporters.

Mr. President, I wish to draw the Senate's attention to an article that ran this morning in The Hill newspaper about earmarks—earmarks that have not been properly disclosed. The majority likes to say they are complying with the rules, but that doesn't appear to be the case. This story says:

> As a proposal to require full disclosure of all Senate earmarks languishes, Senators have not claimed responsibility for at least $7.5 billion worth of projects approved by the Appropriations Committee, according to an analysis by a budget watchdog group.

Obviously, the piecemeal approach being used by the Democrats is not working. We cannot allow appropriators and other committees to police themselves. They are not doing it now, and they never will. We need a single enforcement rule for the whole Senate that doesn't keep loopholes for secret earmarking. Let me repeat: $7.5 billion in earmarks already this year are undisclosed. This is business as usual in the Senate.

I wish to point out that the Defense authorization bill we are debating now violates the rules. It discloses the earmark sponsors, but the committee failed to post on the Internet the letters from these sponsors certifying that they do not have a financial interest in the earmark they have requested.

Before I conclude, I want to update the Senate on some progress we are making on earmark reform.

First, we have added several cosponsors to S. Res. 123, which is the earmark disclosure rule. They are Senators ENSIGN, ENZI, MARTINEZ, COBURN, MCCASKILL, and CORNYN. I thank them for their support. Some of these Senators request earmarks, while others do not. But they all support earmark disclosure, and they all support this rule as it is written right now.

We have also added a couple cosponsors to S. Res. 260, the rule that would stop the adding of earmarks in secret conference committees. They are Senators ALLARD and CORNYN. I thank them for their support. A select few Members of Congress and their staffs should not be adding hidden earmarks to bills in the middle of the night when no one has the opportunity to review them and debate their merits. That is very bad practice, and it must end.

There was also an important editorial last Tuesday in the Roll Call newspaper that supports our efforts to protect earmark reform. I will read a couple of excerpts:

> Senate Democratic leaders are resisting [Senator DEMINT's] move and are insisting on going to conference on the ethics bill, although they have yet to explain why already agreed-upon earmark rules can't be adopted immediately.
>
> We don't oppose earmarks in principle. . . . But as events last year amply demonstrated, earmarks can be a source of rotten corruption. Full disclosure is crucial, and the Senate ought to institute it forthwith.
>
> We think that on the merits Senate leaders should accede to DeMint so disclosure of spending requests is not delayed until President Bush signs an ethics reform measure that still has not even gone to a House-Senate conference.

Mr. President, the blogging community is watching what we are doing here. Countless bloggers, including The Corner on National Review Online, Instapundit.com, MichelleMalkin.com, the Sunlight Foundation, Porkbusters.com, RedState.com, and many others, have weighed in on the need for the Senate to implement these earmark transparency rules now. I thank them for paying attention to this debate and working to hold us all accountable.

Finally, we have received letters of support from several important taxpayer watchdog groups, including Americans for Prosperity and Citizens Against Government Waste. These groups know how important earmark reform is, and they believe it should be implemented immediately.

These rules need to be adopted immediately. They should not be allowed to go to conference with the House where they can be changed at will. They need to be enacted now before a single appropriations bill comes to the Senate floor.

It has been 180 days since they were unanimously adopted by the Senate. I have asked consent to enact these rules four times, but the other side has blocked them each and every time. Today needs to be the day that this obstruction stops. Today needs to be the day we end the earmark business as usual in the Senate.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 123, S. RES. 260, AND H.R. 2316

Mr. DEMINT. With that, I will now propound a unanimous-consent request that would enact the earmark transparency rules and request that we go to conference with the House on the total ethics bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 123 and S. Res. 260, the earmark disclosure resolutions, all en bloc; that the resolutions be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

I further ask that the Senate then proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2316, the House-passed ethics and lobbying reform bill; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1, as passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read the third time, passed, and the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees at a ratio of 4 to 3.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership, I do object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, obviously, I am very disappointed that we continue to obstruct ethics reform and earmark reform.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—S. 163

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 139, S. 163; that the committee-reported amendment be withdrawn, and I have a substitute amendment at the desk; that the Bond amendment to the substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, the substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that the bill, as amended, be read the third time; that the Senate then proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1361, the House companion, which is at the desk; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 163, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read the third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees, with the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship appointed as conferees; that S. 163 be returned to the calendar, and the above occurring without intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DEMINT. On behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me speak for a minute about this legislation. I understand Senator DEMINT's need to object on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma. This is legislation that has broad—I do mean broad—bipartisan support. It was passed out of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee on a unanimous vote. It now represents a very broad compromise worked on with the administration and with all of the members of the committee, both Republican and Democrat.

I will review very quickly what this bill does. As everybody knows, when Katrina hit, we had a terrible time getting small business assistance to the countless thousands of small businesses that were impacted, not only in New Orleans but in Baton Rouge and across into Mississippi, Alabama, and elsewhere, where there were many services being provided by other folks. A lot of small businesses were impacted.

We learned there was not an adequate capacity within the Small Business Administration to deliver this kind of assistance in a rapid way. So we have worked now, after a series of hearings and over the course of 2 years, to pull together the Small Business Disaster Response and Loan Improvement Act. It does a number of things.

It creates a new elevated level of disaster declaration, referred to as catastrophic national disaster. That triggers nationwide economic injury disaster loans for adversely affected small businesses.

In addition, it requires the SBA to create an expedited disaster assistance business loan program to provide businesses with expedited access to short-term money.

A lot of the businesses in New Orleans could have survived and might have survived or chosen to try to if there had been some bridge money or available working capital. But the absence of it forced a lot of them to close their doors. If we can provide assistance in a timely fashion, obviously subject to the administration's approval—and there is discretion in the bill—we would have the ability to do a better job.

In addition, there are improvements to the existing loan program which have been written in the bill. There is improved agency coordination and marketing. It directs the SBA to coordinate with FEMA in a more effective way. It directs the SBA to create a proactive marketing plan to make the public aware of the disaster response services.

In addition, it provides improved planning and oversight and directs the SBA to update the hurricane response plan to address all future disasters.

This is, as I say, with bipartisan support. I have a letter from the Administrator of the SBA, Steve Preston. He writes saying:

> I am writing to express my thanks for the efforts you and your colleagues have made to work with the Small Business Administration and to address the administration's concerns with some of the provisions in S. 163, the Small Business Disaster Response and Loan Improvement Act of 2007. At this point, if amended by the Bond amendment—

And that is what we just sought to do—

> the administration has no objections to Senate passage of S. 163. However, the administration would consider a longer extension of the authorization language in section 3 to avoid the need for concern over unintended expiration of programs and activities.

We would obviously love to do that. It appears there is one person in the Senate, the Senator from Oklahoma, who is opposed to moving forward with this legislation. As I say, there was a unanimous vote by our committee, which wants to see if we could achieve this disaster assistance. Nobody understands how critical this is more than the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, who has been fighting from the moment Katrina hit to try to get this kind of disaster assistance.

I wish to ask the Senator if she would share with us her observations as to why this legislation is so critical and what specifically we have done to address some of the concerns of those who had previously expressed those concerns in order now to have a consensus about this legislation. I ask the Senator from Louisiana if she would explain the situation in New Orleans, not just then but now, and why this legislation is so critical.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I begin by saying that his leadership has been on point and so focused for the last 2 years in trying to help lead his committee, with the support and cooperation of his ranking member, the Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE, to move Congress to adopt this important legislation.

The Senator is absolutely correct that the SBA was one of several important Federal agencies that was caught flatfooted when Katrina and Rita hit the gulf coast and subsequently when the Federal levee system failed in multiple places, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows because he has walked through neighborhood after neighborhood, mile after mile, having visited with business owners and homeowners who lost everything they had, that took them generations to build. The Senator knows very well that this particular administration was anemic and very slow in its response. In fact, the gentleman leading it at the time was not the appropriate leader. To the President's credit, they have nominated and we have confirmed a new leader for the SBA.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts will agree with me that the Director, Steve Preston, is making some very good and fundamental changes. But there is just so much this administrator can do without Congress doing its job to give him the tools he needs to get the job done.

Why this legislation is being held up by the Republican side I am not sure. It is very disappointing, not just to me but to the millions of people who are affected and are still struggling, having lost everything or having at risk everything they own because we cannot seem to get legislation passed because of obstructionist tactics.

I repeat, this bill is supported not only by the Chair but by the ranking member. In addition, both Senators from Louisiana are cosponsoring this bill, Senator BILL NELSON from Florida, who has experienced the disasters of hurricanes in Florida, and Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON from Georgia, who also has experienced disasters. This is not a Democratic bill being rammed down the Republican side of the aisle. This is a good Government efficiency, effective measure to try to reform the SBA. But because of bureaucratic delays, because of the inadequacy of the current law, we were not able to help the 18,000 businesses that were destroyed, many of them—I would say 97 percent of them—small businesses.

The Senator from Massachusetts and I together visited a cleaning business for hospital bedding and other items that was—I cannot think of the name of the business, but the Senator from Massachusetts and I walked throughout New Orleans East. This is one of hundreds of businesses that not only found themselves flooded, but when the waters receded, the hospitals they had serviced had closed. So basically through no fault of their own, they were struggling as well. This legislation will help them.

This is not only important to the gulf coast and to the 18,000 businesses, many of them small businesses, that need help and assistance, but it is for the future. The Senator from Massachusetts is saying let this Federal Government do better. If we believe business is important, and we do, and if we believe small business is important, and it is, then let's at least have our response honed and tuned to the point where if, God forbid, another huge disaster happens, we will be much more prepared than we were last time.

Our constituents depend on us to be responsive. I say to the Senator from Massachusetts, that is exactly what this bill does. I again thank him for his leadership and express truly my outrage that this is being held up for no apparent good reason at the expense of thousands of business owners who are looking to us for help and support.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. She has been not only a terrific member of the committee but has represented to the whole Senate countless numbers of times on the floor the plight of those folks down in New Orleans and in the immediate surrounding area.

I wish to emphasize what she has said and what I said previously, and that is this has been worked on now for 2 years in a bipartisan way. Senator SNOWE, the ranking member, who was, incidentally, the Chair when we first began working on this legislation, has supported the efforts to try to make certain that we address these concerns. Other Republican members of the committee have contributed significantly to this effort. Senator BOND had concerns about the energy program. We have addressed those concerns.

I hope we can move forward. We tried actually to reach out to whatever opposition there is with respect to this bill. We are happy to sit down and address any legitimate concerns. But at this point, this is long overdue. We are into the hurricane season now, about a month and a half into it. Our predictors have been pretty accurate in these past years, and they are suggesting we are going to have a very significant number of named storms and maybe as many as 10 projected full-blown hurricanes this year, with 13 to 17 named storms.

Last year, they hit the number of named storms and hurricanes, but we were very lucky; they didn't blow into the shore and we didn't get hit. Obviously, we cannot sit around and be lucky all the time. We cannot afford another Katrina-like response. There are specific actions this legislation empowers the SBA to do to take steps proactively, to be in a position to address the concerns of small businesses rapidly. In addition, this bill helps private lenders get in early on and be immediately on the scene and assist in the process of providing those loans. So it streamlines that process.

I wish to comment on Senator LANDRIEU's reference to that cleaning place we visited in East New Orleans. We made arrangements to go down and see that place because we knew it needed help. We had talked with the CEO before going there. About a week and a half later, when we got there, we went into this cleaning facility, which had been completely flooded, as the Senator said. They cleaned it out themselves. They worked diligently to get the equipment up and working, what they could. Much of it was ruined and was going to have to be disposed of. But these folks were working this place.

Since they were dependent on the services of hotels and others for the work they did, they were at the time mostly doing the hospitals that had reopened, and that was it. But the CEO was so despairing in the span of that week and a half or so between our making the appointment and getting there that when we arrived, the CEO had left with his family, taken off; that was it, he had enough, and left in charge was one of the workers who was the ''acting CEO'' who was desperately trying to hold onto this business.

When people are working like that and run into that kind of desperation, we have to be able to look them in the eye and say we have done everything possible. We put in place the mechanisms they pay for and that they have a right to expect will be there to assist in that kind of an emergency. That is what we are trying to do here, in a bipartisan way, to make certain we don't lose CEOs, lose jobs, lose workers, and lose hope as a consequence of our inaction in the Senate. So I hope we are going to be able to come back to this in short order. As I say, I think we have worked in good faith with every legitimate question that has been raised with respect to this legislation. We will happily sit down if another Senator still has a concern, but we certainly will not tolerate—and at some point I hope the leader will allow us to take the time in the Senate to continue on the floor with this legislation. There is one Senator who is opposing it, without any rationale whatsoever.

Ms. LANDRIEU. May I add something, if the Senator will yield?

Mr. KERRY. I will yield to the Senator.

Ms. LANDRIEU. We have all learned many things since this disaster happened, and one of the things we have learned, I guess rather painfully, is that it is not only the geographic area that is struck by the high wind, the high waters or the flood waters that is impacted by a catastrophic disaster, but it is also the perimeter of the area, the towns that absorb people fleeing to higher ground and trying to settle where they can find work and schools for their children, and businesses that might not have been directly impacted but have lost half or 75 percent of their customer base.

Right now, without Senator KERRY's bill, there is virtually no authorization on the Federal books to allow loans to be made to these kinds of businesses. So because we don't have that authorization, we are, right now, basically making the disaster worse. I hope people can understand this. We, by our inaction, by our hardheadedness—and it is not me, although I can be hardheaded but not on this issue—because of some leadership decision on the Republican side, we are literally, right now, making this matter worse. Businesses are continuing to go out of business; businesses that didn't have a drop of water, businesses that didn't have one shingle let loose from the high wind continue to file bankruptcy and put up out-of-business signs because there is no provision to allow low-interest loans to them if they weren't directly impacted. Unfortunately, they are directly impacted in terms of loss of customers, et cetera.

In addition, it is going to bring in the private sector. We heard a lot from the other side about Government can't do everything; let the private sector be engaged. Well, your bill allows for more private-sector involvement; does it not? It allows the banks that know these small businesses to be a part of helping them. This is what the business community wants, this is what the banks want, and this is what we recognized was a problem initially.

Yet we are being blocked, I understand, by the Senator from Oklahoma, who has not made his specific objections clear to us. So I hope they can be made clear, and if we can fix it, fine. If not, then the leadership on the Republican side, I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts, has a decision: Do they want to be part of the nonsensical opposition by a Senator who is in Oklahoma, who is never going to have a hurricane or do they want to stand with the people in America from New York to Texas who are threatened every 9 months with a hurricane season.

That is the decision the Republican leader from Kentucky is going to have to answer. Is he going to support a bipartisan piece of legislation that aids businesses that are literally threatened from New York to Texas or is he going to stand with some nonsensical opposition coming from the middle of the country that will never be hit by a hurricane.

I hate to be so pointed about it, but that is basically where it is. This is 2 years after the storm. This isn't 2 months or 6 months after. This is a bill that Senator SNOWE herself started and Senator KERRY is finishing, and the people of the gulf coast are still waiting. So this is a real leadership question, and I hope that as the day goes by and the week goes by, we can make some progress, and I thank the Senator for his leadership.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. As I said previously, she has been tireless on this. Louisiana has been lucky to have her intervention every step of the way. The billions of dollars that have gone down there is a consequence of the hard work she has done.

Let me summarize what is being obstructed. First, expedited assistance from the SBA to small businesses injured by a disaster; second, private disaster loans. Private disaster loans. The ability of private-sector lenders to become involved in the process quickly, extending credit to the folks who need it as a consequence of that disaster, which, incidentally, can only occur when the President of the United States has legitimately declared a disaster; third, improvements to the existing program; why we wouldn't want to improve the existing program after we saw how it was incapable of meeting the problems of Katrina is beyond me. That is what we are doing here in a complete and total bipartisan, unanimous committee vote that suggests these improvements are important and will make a difference; improved agency coordination in marketing. These are the things that make a difference. When you can get the bureaucracy out of the way, when you can streamline, you are getting better production for the taxpayers' dollars, and that is exactly what we are doing; improved planning and oversight and disaster assistance staffing, necessary to be able to deliver the services because we didn't have sufficient personnel to be able to process the loan requests that came in.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Small Business Administrator, Steve Preston.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2007.

Hon. JOHN F. KERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my thanks for the efforts you and your colleagues have made to work with the U.S. Small Business Administration and to address the Administration's concerns with some of the provisions in S. 163, ''The Small Business Disaster Response and Loan Improvements Act of 2007''.

At this point, if amended by the Bond Amendment, the Administration has no objections to Senate passage of S. 163. However, the Administration would request a longer extension of the authorization language in section 3 to avoid the need for concern over unintended expiration of programs and activities. We would also recommend clarifying that the Administrator would have flexibility under section 205 to designate portions of a declared catastrophic national disaster area as a HUBZone area, without extending this designation to an entire disaster area.

We look forward to working with you when the bill goes into conference discussions with the U.S. House of Representatives. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me directly.

Sincerely yours,
STEVEN C. PRESTON.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 20 minutes as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the next Democratic Speaker be Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts; with the understanding that if a Republican Member wishes to speak, they would be permitted to do so between any majority speakers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. I object. My understanding is that at 11 a.m., we were

supposed to go to the bill. We are now, at 11:15, going to go to the bill, and then we want the regular procedure as we consider legislation, which would be whoever has the right of recognition and any unanimous consent agreements.

So I object to the second unanimous consent request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

IRAQ WITHDRAWAL AMENDMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I had hoped to offer an amendment today to this year's Defense authorization bill regarding Iraq. I understand the leadership has decided to act on the Levin-Reed amendment before considering other amendments to this legislation. Given the existing parliamentary situation, I am not confident there will be an opportunity to get an up-or-down vote on my amendment or, for that matter, any other amendments that meaningfully mandates a change of course with respect to the administration's policy in Iraq.

It is deeply troubling and it saddens me that in the Senate, on the most critical issue of our day, we cannot consider, debate or vote on amendments affecting the lives and well-being of our servicemen and women and the conduct of U.S. foreign policy in the most troubled spot in the world today. I believe those who refuse to allow this Senate to vote on this critical issue do a grave disservice to the American people by enabling the President to continue with his failed strategy in Iraq.

Every additional day we ''stay the course'' in Iraq, our Nation is less safe and the people of Iraq get further away from coming together to fashion a political and diplomatic solution to their civil conflict. Our men and women in uniform have served this Nation valiantly in Iraq and Afghanistan, and they will continue to do so, I am confident, until our political leaders see the error of their judgment in this case and begin the process of drawing down U.S. troops in Iraq.

It is imperative, I believe, we change course in Iraq immediately. I think this is vitally important for our country and the well-being of that part of the world. Sadly, the President and his allies stand in the way of that goal. Support for the President's policy erodes as each passing day unfolds with more violence and chaos in Iraq.

I predict the day will come when Congress will have the courage to say enough is enough, but, sadly, it would not be before more American lives are lost or more wanton destruction occurs in the beleaguered nation of Iraq.

Let me speak briefly about the amendment I had hoped to offer—still hope to offer—and which I would like to offer at the earliest opportunity if, in fact, this logjam breaks. My amendment seeks to accomplish two critical tasks. First, to bring the Iraq war to a close by ending the financing of combat operations, mandating a phased redeployment of combat forces from Iraq, and ensuring the administration actually carries out that redeployment.

Second, the amendment proposes to redirect any savings realized from a reduced military presence in Iraq, to restore the readiness of our very war-battered National Guard and armed services. I strongly believe we must not wait any longer to achieve either task.

Now is the time for us to make difficult choices. Now is the time for the Senate to enact legislation that, I believe, will hold this administration accountable to this policy.

I support the Levin-Reed amendment, and I thank both our colleagues, the authors of that amendment, for demonstrating leadership in trying to move this body one step closer to bringing this disastrous war to a close. It is my hope that their amendment will do that, but I remain concerned about some aspects of that amendment—the extended delay in commencing redeployment and the absence of any funding linkage to redeployment. Based on past experiences with this administration, my concern is the President will simply ignore the legislation proposed by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

It has been quite difficult to track the ever-changing justifications for continuing our combat operations in Iraq, including the surge, and there appears to be no end in sight.

First, the administration simply refused to admit there was no military solution in Iraq or that Iraq was in a State of civil war.

Then, instead of acting upon a unique chance to implement the bipartisan Baker-Hamilton Commission, which Congress supported, Secretary Rice explained that the administration was implementing a surge tactic, but assured us that it was an Iraqi plan. ''Most importantly,'' she claimed, ''the Iraqis have devised their own strategy, and our efforts will support theirs.''

Our country was told that despite the catastrophic policy failures of this administration up until that point, that the surge would take time to work and that we couldn't judge its success until U.S. forces had ''surged'' to their maximum levels—and that would take up to 6 months.

But that the surge is at full force, and we are told yet again that the time isn't right to make a judgment about the success or failure of the administration's policy. Now we are told we must wait until September to determine the success of the surge. I strongly suspect, as I stand here in July, that as September draws near the administration will once again come up with some additional arguments to delay the day of reckoning on the policy in Iraq.

I do not need any more time, or any more reports and briefings to confirm what most of us already know. The American people and the Iraqi people don't need any more time to realize that the administration's Iraq policy, including the surge, has been a failure. With the exception of a handful in this body, I have not said anything that most of my colleagues do not believe themselves. Why, then, are we waiting? As we wait yet another 2 or 3 months to decide what most of us here have already concluded, while disagreeing about how best to achieve this result, there is a consensus that has emerged that I think is probably more than a supermajority. After all the time waiting here, our servicemen and women and the beleaguered people of Iraq will pay an awful price indeed, as we fool around and dicker while deciding to come to the conclusion we have all basically reached already.

The highly respected International Crisis Group recently released a report on Iraq which examined the complex reasons for the current political violence in Iraq, and concluded that any surge based on a purely military operation with a simplistic view of the bloodshed's origins was destined for failure.

We mustn't sacrifice any more lives, we shouldn't countenance any more bloodshed, and we shouldn't support the continuation of the failed escalation of a disastrous policy. The April–May American death toll is a new 2-month record. The civilian casualty rate in Iraq is at an all-time high. Overall violence in Iraq is up and, according to the Iraqi Red Crescent, the number of internally displaced Iraqis has quadrupled since January. In fact, the Iraqi Red Crescent warns that there is currently a human tragedy unprecedented in Iraq's history.''

As recent GAO reports have highlighted what we all intuitively have concluded—that there has been little progress on the key detailed provisions of Iraq's hydrocarbon law, let alone on reforming the Iraqi constitution, on debaathification, or on a host of other essential political components to a functioning Iraqi government, focused on reconciliation. In fact, Foreign Policy magazine recently released their ''failed state index'' and Iraq rose to No. 2 on that index, closely behind Sudan.

The President told the American people that the surge of troops into key cities in Iraq was being executed in order to provide the Iraqis with some political breathing space to start the reconciliation process. Secretary Rice explained that ''the most urgent task now is to help the Iraqi government establish the confidence that it can and will protect all of its citizens, regardless of their sectarian identity, and that it will reinforce security with political reconciliation and economic support.''

But none of that has happened—and falsely claiming that it has, won't make us safer, won't secure Iraq, won't secure our interests in the region, and won't rebuild our military.

As my friend Senator LUGAR, the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said recently

In my judgment, the current surge strategy is not an effective means of protecting these interests. Its prospects for success are too dependent on the actions of others who do not share our agenda. It relies on military power to achieve goals that it cannot achieve. It distances allies that we will need for any regional diplomatic effort. Its failure, without a careful transition to a backup policy would intensify our loss of credibility. It uses tremendous amounts of resources that cannot be employed in other ways to secure our objectives.

I fully agree with my friend and colleague from Indiana.

That is why my amendment also calls on the administration to appoint a high-level special envoy to Iraq to engage in a new diplomatic offensive—exactly what the Baker Hamilton Commission called for over 6 months ago. It is imperative that we engage Iraqi leaders, regional leaders and international organizations such as the United Nations and the Arab League to promote reconciliation and stability in Iraq. I know of no other way this is likely to occur.

This administration has long neglected the key diplomatic and political aspects of the conflict in Iraq, despite the calls of many of us, including my good friend Senator HAGEL, who recently outlined a plan to ''internationalize'' our efforts to help Iraqis reach political reconciliation, including appointing a U.N. Security Council-backed international mediator.

The amendment offered by Senators LEVIN and REED also calls for such a mediator, which I fully support.

But, despite the fact that there is no military solution to this conflict, which we have said for now almost 3½ years, this administration and too many in the Congress are still wedded to only military solutions. In fact, these defenders of the Iraq war continue claim that we are in Iraq to fight al-Qaida, just like they continue to falsely claim that al-Qaida had links to Saddam Hussein.

But according to a recent article by Michael Gordon, the coauthor of Cobra II:

al-Qaida in Mesopotamia [the action of al-Qaida currently in Iraq] did not exist before the Sept. 11 attacks. This Sunni group has thrived as a magnet for recruiting and a force for violence largely because of the American invasion of Iraq in 2003, which brought an American occupying force of more than 100,000 troops to the heart of the Middle East, and led to a Shiite-dominated government in Baghdad.

Moreover, according to recent media accounts, it is the Mahdi Army, a Shiite militia led by the radical cleric Moqtada al-Sadr, not al-Qaida in Mesopotamia that poses the greatest risk to American troops in Baghdad. Yesterday, the Washington Post reported that the Mahdi Army's frequent and brazen attacks on U.S. soldiers also appear to challenge the idea that the Mahdi Army has been lying low to avoid confrontations with Americans.

Perhaps most frustrating of all, while feverishly attempting to find linkages between Osama bin Laden and Iraqi insurgents, the administration has taken its eye off the ball of the bigger threats posed by looming terrorists having little or nothing to do with Iraq.

The GAO recently slammed the administration's anti-terrorism efforts in a report entitled ''Law Enforcement Agencies Lack Directives to Assist Foreign Nations to Identify, Disrupt and Prosecute Terrorists.'' The report found that there is a tremendous deficit of communication and coordination among key U.S. agencies, which in turn severely hampers our efforts at fighting international terrorism and aiding foreign governments in doing so.

Six years after 9/11, this administration has singularly focused on Iraq, while failing to effectively fight international terrorism. It may be true that for the Bush administration that Iraq is the central front in their ''war on terror'', but this misplaced focus has made America less secure as a result.

Simply put, we must stop the downward spiral in Iraq, and refocus our efforts at effectively and robustly combating extremism and terrorism around the world—and my amendment would begin to do just that. Why is that the case?

Because my amendment sets clear timelines for the phased redeployment of our troops out of Iraq, with three specific exceptions for activities that are critical to our national security interests and the interests of Iraq: First, conducting counterrorism operations in Iraq, targeted at al-Qaida in Mesopotamia; second, training and equipping Iraqi forces; and third, force protection for U.S. personnel and infrastructure.

This amendment also provides a specific timeline for all combat forces to redeploy out of Iraq, aside from the three exceptions I just mentioned, by April 30, 2008.

To ensure that this process gets underway without any stonewalling by the administration or anyone in his administration, my amendment sets an interim deadline of December 31, 2007, at which point at least 50,000 troops must have been redeployed out of Iraq.

Failure to meet this initial milestone will result in a funding penalty. The amendment would withhold 25 percent of the fiscal year 2008 military budget for Iraq-related activities until the President certifies that he can meet the overall April 30, 2008, deadline.

Ultimately, this amendment calls for the redeployment of approximately 90,000 combat troops within the next 9 months, leaving about 70,000 to complete the three non-combat missions that I have already outlined.

The redeployed forces would be comprised of a majority of the deployed Army brigade combat teams and the Marine Expeditionary Force currently in theater.

Now, some may say that such redeployment is not logistically achievable within the timeframes laid out in the amendment.

However, I want to remind my colleagues that in the ramp up to the first gulf war, the Department of Defense coordinated the movement of over 500,000 troops and 10 million tons of cargo and fuel in the same timeframe that this amendment grants to redeploy a force one-fifth the size.

In January 1991, alone, the Transportation Command moved approximately 132,000 troops, 1 million tons of cargo, and over 1 million tons of fuel. If it is possible to coordinate the logistics to go to war, it is certainly possible, in my view, to get our troops out of harm's way and bring our military involvement in this civil war to a close.

Of course, there is always a concern about the cost of conducting a redeployment. Senator CONRAD, now chairman of the Budget Committee, asked this very question to the Congressional Budget Office in 2002, requesting an assessment of the costs of the Iraq war; including the eventual redeployment of our forces. The CBO concluded that the redeployment of our forces to their home bases would cost approximately $7 billion, less than the cost of 1 month of ongoing operations in Iraq.

Can we trust this figure? The very same report notes that monthly costs for the war would run between $6 billion and $9 billion per month—that was in 2002; which is exactly what we saw until the incursion of additional surge related costs.

Up until now, the cost of the war in Iraq has been mainly measured in the number of lives lost and U.S. Treasury spent—and rightly so. Mr. President, 3,600 brave American servicemembers have been killed, tens of thousands of Iraqis have lost their lives, and Congress has approved approximately $450 billion.

But there is yet another cost of war—our military's readiness.

While long, arduous deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan are testing the morale of our troops in the field and their families, they are also taxing critical stocks of aircraft, vehicles and equipment that our military needs to prepare for other challenges in the 21st century.

According to recent military reports, two-thirds of the U.S. Army is unable to report for combat duty, and the Army's top generals have said that if the administration continues to fail to meet these needs, the situation could further deteriorate.

The situation for our National Guard is even worse. According to National Guard Bureau Chief, LTG Steven Blum, ''88 percent of the force that are back here in the United States are very poorly equipped today in the Army National Guard.'' Such a statistic is unconscionable to me—and it affects the National Guard units in every State of every last Senator in this Chamber.

My amendment will take steps to remedy this dire situation and begin to rebuild our military. This debate is

about priorities. Will we continue to fund a failed strategy, in my view, in Iraq that is leaving us less secure and that is hollowing out our military?

Or will we meet our commitments to our service members and our Nation, by restoring the readiness of our forces which have been severely damaged by this administration's policies?

In my view, the answer is simple. Our military's top generals and admirals have submitted to Congress lists of critical military priorities that would not be funded under the President's fiscal year 2008 budget proposal.

Billions of dollars a week are being squandered in Iraq, while our Nation's military is calling out for additional resources to repair the damage caused by the administration's policies.

My amendment therefore reprioritizes our defense budget to rebuild our military. It stops financing combat missions in Iraq and redirects funding to meeting priorities for the armed services.

Savings made available by downsizing our force in Iraq would be invested in items identified by each of our military's Service Chiefs. Funding levels for these items would not exceed the amounts specified in their official fiscal year 2008 unfunded requirements lists submitted to Congress earlier this year.

The Army Chief of Staff has found over $10 billion in critical shortfalls, including funding for specially armored trucks known as MRAPs or mine resistant ambush protected vehicles; night vision goggles, and bomb disposal gear.

The Marine Corps' ''unfunded requirement list'' submitted by the Commandant includes over $3 billion for similar priorities as well as new helicopters; communications gear and training equipment.

The Navy's list totals over $5.6 billion, including helicopters, sailor housing, and aircraft maintenance.

The Air Force's unfunded priorities, totaling over $16 billion, includes much needed resources to modernize radar systems and restore our fleet of cargo aircraft to help redeploy our troops and their equipment.

The National Guard Bureau Chief has identified over a billion dollars needed to begin rebuilding Guard forces across the United States—to replace and repair vehicles, aircraft, and personal gear, necessary for homeland security missions.

The amendment I would like to offer would allow for funding to restore National Guard equipment readiness. Due to the administration's mismanagement, the National Guard is facing a $38 billion equipment shortfall, according to General Blum.

A recent report by the U.S. Commission on the National Guard and Reserves disclosed that the administration's policies have actually endangered the Guard's abilities to perform both their overseas and homeland defense missions. Under orders by the administration, the National Guard troops have been forced to leave their State's equipment in Iraq and Afghanistan for our troops rotating into combat theaters. Many of their military vehicles and aircraft are being worn down or destroyed in battle, but any critical equipment that may have survived is simply being transferred to other units coming into Iraq and Afghanistan.

In my home State of Connecticut, the adjutant general, MG Thaddeus Martin, recently reported that equipment shortages exceed $200 million in my State. This includes more than 200 humvees, 21 large support vehicles and tankers and heavy-cargo vehicles, over 600 personnel and crew-served weapons systems, over 1,500 night-vision devices, and even one medium-lift helicopter.

What does all of this mean? It means that we are short of equipment to respond to natural or manmade disasters here at home, short of equipment for training, short of equipment to maintain the standard of maintenance rotation for equipment currently in the field, short of equipment for units deploying into harm's way—short of equipment to protect the American people themselves.

The Government Accountability Office highlighted this very important point in testimony released on October 20, 2005, and I quote it. It stated:

> The cumulative effect of these personnel and equipment transfers has been a decline in the readiness of Army National Guard forces for future missions, both overseas and at home.

This data alone should demonstrate to everyone unequivocally that each of us has to fulfill our obligations to our warfighters. Now is the time to begin the rebuilding process. In my view, the sooner we redeploy out of Iraq, get our military out of that situation, the sooner we can redirect these vital funds to rebuild our forces here at home.

None of our choices are easy. I don't suggest by my remarks here that they are. But they are clear choices. It is about time we made them. To govern is to choose the policy that is best for our Nation, even in the face of extreme difficulty. So I call on my colleagues here today to make those choices which experience, commonsense, and overwhelming data compel; that is, to force the President to redeploy, to rebuild our Armed Forces, and to end this disastrous involvement in the civil war.

The last several months have been a story of squandered chances. We have paid for them in American lives. Again, to delay another 2 or 3 months to arrive at a conclusion most of us have already arrived at is something I think is unacceptable. And that lives which may be lost or damaged because we waited 2 or 3 months to arrive at a conclusion that most here already believe to be the case, is certainly a sad day for this body. We cannot even have votes, we cannot even consider the various ideas we bring to the Chamber that might bring this war and our involvement in it to a close.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1585, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

> A bill (H.R. 1585) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

> Nelson (NE) (for Levin) amendment No. 2011, in the nature of a substitute.
>
> Levin amendment No. 2087 (to amendment No. 2011), to provide for a reduction and transition of U.S. forces in Iraq.
>
> Reed amendment No. 2088 (to amendment No. 2087), to change the enactment date.
>
> Cornyn amendment No. 2100 (to amendment No. 2011), to express the sense of the Senate that it is in the national security interest of the United States that Iraq not become a failed state and a safe haven for terrorists.
>
> McConnell amendment No. 2241 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2011), relative to a sense of the Senate on the consequences of a failed state in Iraq.
>
> Durbin amendment No. 2252 (to amendment No. 2241), to change the enactment date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2274 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2011

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], for Mr. LEVIN, for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. SMITH, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. KERRY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. OBAMA, and Mrs. CLINTON, proposes an amendment numbered 2274 to amendment No. 2011.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for a reduction and transition of Untied States forces in Iraq)

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 1535. REDUCTION AND TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES FORCES IN IRAQ.

(a) DEADLINE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF REDUCTION.—The Secretary of Defense shall commence the reduction of the number of United States forces in Iraq not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF REDUCTION AS PART OF COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY.—The reduction of forces required by this section shall be implemented as part of a comprehensive diplomatic, political, and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement with Iraq's neighbors and the international community for the purpose of working collectively to bring stability to Iraq. As part of this effort, the President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to seek the appointment of an international mediator in Iraq, under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council, who has the authority of the international community to engage political, religious, ethnic, and tribal leaders in Iraq in an inclusive political process.

(c) LIMITED PRESENCE AFTER REDUCTION AND TRANSITION.—After the conclusion of the reduction and transition of United States forces to a limited presence as required by this section, the Secretary of Defense may deploy or maintain members of the Armed Forces in Iraq only for the following missions:

(1) Protecting United States and Coalition personnel and infrastructure.

(2) Training, equipping, and providing logistic support to the Iraqi Security Forces.

(3) Engaging in targeted counterterrorism operations against al Qaeda, al Qaeda affiliated groups, and other international terrorist organizations.

(d) COMPLETION OF TRANSITION.—The Secretary of Defense shall complete the transition of United States forces to a limited presence and missions as described in subsection (c) by April 30, 2008.

AMENDMENT NO. 2275 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2274

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. SMITH, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. KERRY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. OBAMA, and Mrs. CLINTON, proposes an amendment numbered 2275 to amendment No. 2274.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for a reduction and transition of United States forces in Iraq)

In lieu of the language to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. 1535. REDUCTION AND TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES FORCES IN IRAQ.

(a) DEADLINE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF REDUCTION.—The Secretary of Defense shall commence the reduction of the number of United States forces in Iraq not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF REDUCTION AS PART OF COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY.—The reduction of forces required by this section shall be implemented as part of a comprehensive diplomatic, political, and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement with Iraq's neighbors and the international community for the purpose of working collectively to bring stability to Iraq. As part of this effort, the President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to seek the appointment of an international mediator in Iraq, under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council, who has the authority of the international community to engage political, religious, ethnic, and tribal leaders in Iraq in an inclusive political process.

(c) LIMITED PRESENCE AFTER REDUCTION AND TRANSITION.—After the conclusion of the reduction and transition of United States forces to a limited presence as required by this section, the Secretary of Defense may deploy or maintain members of the Armed Forces in Iraq only for the following missions:

(1) Protecting United States and Coalition personnel and infrastructure.

(2) Training, equipping, and providing logistic support to the Iraqi Security Forces.

(3) Engaging in targeted counterterrorism operations against al Qaeda, al Qaeda affiliated groups, and other international terrorist organizations.

(d) COMPLETION OF TRANSITION.—The Secretary of Defense shall complete the transition of United States forces to a limited presence and missions as described in subsection (c) by April 30, 2008.

This Section shall take effect one day after the date of this bill's enactment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Arizona is now going to be making some remarks. I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Arizona finishes his remarks, Senator KENNEDY be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would ask Senator LEVIN, for the benefit of all, what our plans for the day are and what we can expect. I understand that the Senate intends to stay in throughout the evening and debate this issue. I will not object, but I reserve the right to object. Perhaps the Senator from Michigan would illuminate me and the other Members as to what we can expect throughout the day and the evening.

Mr. LEVIN. Well, I think on our side there will be many speeches supporting this amendment, perhaps some opposing the amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. We will be debating the Reed-Levin amendment throughout the day?

Mr. LEVIN. I hope so. And I hope people will want to speak, will come and speak on the amendment, because hopefully we can get to enough votes tomorrow so that we can actually have a vote on Levin-Reed, that we can get to 60 votes, to achieve cloture. We would then be able to have a vote on the pending amendment. Other than that, we would be thwarted. There would be a procedural roadblock in reaching a vote on Levin-Reed.

So that is the goal, if everyone is given a chance to speak on Levin-Reed, whatever side they are on, so that we can then, hopefully, end the debate on Levin-Reed and actually get to a vote on it.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I do not object, but I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Michigan about our plans for the day. For example, I understand there is a Cornyn amendment which may be voted on as well?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, there is indeed, as I understand it, a consent which has been already reached that there be a vote on the Cornyn amendment at 2:45. There was an offer yesterday, as a matter of fact, to, I believe, simply accept that amendment, but someone wanted to have a rollcall vote on it. That is their right.

Mr. MCCAIN. If I could ask my colleague further, I understand we also have well over 100 pending amendments on the bill as well. I would hope that at some point, Senator LEVIN and I can sit down and maybe start sorting through those if we have any hope whatsoever of completing this bill.

I would remind all of my colleagues that this body has passed—and has been signed into law—a Defense authorization bill for the last 45 years. There are aspects of this bill, as the Senator well knows as the distinguished chairman, that we worked very hard on, such as pay raises and other authorizations for much needed equipment, training, et cetera. I would hope the Senator from Michigan and I can start working on those aspects of the bill, if we have any hopes of passing an authorization bill this year.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator would yield, it is my fervent hope that we have a bill this year. It is not only my intent to try to work out amendments, it has been our intent for many days to work out those amendments. I understand there is some kind of a procedure that some Members on your side have insisted upon which has slowed down that process significantly. So our staffs and I, and I know the Senator from Arizona, the ranking member on the committee, are more than ready to work out these amendments, as many as possible. Usually, we can work out as many as 100 on an authorization bill. I think there are 190 amendments filed. We are up to the task. Our staffs are up to the task. We have to be allowed to proceed. I understand there is some kind of roadblock that perhaps the Senator from Arizona could identify and help to remove.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank Senator LEVIN. As I understand it, we will be debating the amendment of the chairman and the Senator from Rhode Island throughout the day and through tonight, and perhaps a cloture vote sometime tomorrow. Is that your understanding?

Mr. LEVIN. I believe it is set for 1 hour after the Senate convenes.

Mr. MCCAIN. What is the parliamentary procedure, I would ask?

Mr. LEVIN. There is no time for that yet, for the Senate to come in tomorrow. We have to await that.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank Senator LEVIN. This is the second week, as we know, we are on this bill. We have not gotten to many of the amendments that have anything to do with other aspects of defending this Nation besides the issue of Iraq. I look forward to working with him as we can try to not break a 45-year custom here that we provide the much needed authorization for the men and women in our defense establishment and provide for our Nation's security, which I think we all agree is our highest priority.

So, if I may continue the colloquy for just one moment, I know that there are—now we will be beginning, and I will give a statement after the chairman, if it is his desire, and then we will have speakers coming all day long on either side of this issue. I know many want to speak, and I hope they will be prepared to do so.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator would yield further, last week, we did accomplish a major achievement in terms of the wounded warrior legislation, which is now on this bill, and I believe, on Friday, there were speakers on the Iraq issue, on Levin-Reed and other amendments, and there were yesterday as well. So the debate on the Iraq amendments has taken place, and it is now going to continue today and into the night. Hopefully, we can get to a vote on Levin-Reed and not be thwarted by this 60-vote procedural roadblock.

Again, I want to say something that has been the case before. We had a number of votes on Iraq in the last authorization bill, and those were 50-vote votes. There was not a threat of a filibuster that deprived the Senate of voting on those amendments in the last authorization bill. For instance, there was a Levin-Reed amendment in the last authorization bill which I believe received 39 or 40 votes. There was also a Kerry amendment on Iraq which was voted up or down without that procedural roadblock.

I would hope that on this bill, given the absolute importance of this issue and the expression of opinion of the American people last November about this issue, that we would be allowed to vote up or down and to remove that 60-vote filibuster threat, the roadblock that has now been put in the way, and will determine tomorrow whether cloture will be invoked and that roadblock can be removed. But the Senator is correct, there is ample opportunity for people to come down today to continue the debate on the Iraq amendment should they choose.

Mr. MCCAIN. Finally, I thank Senator LEVIN for all the great work we have been able to do together and the wounded warrior legislation, which Senator LEVIN, under his leadership, we have now adopted as part of the bill.

There is another compelling argument to complete the bill. If we are going to take care of our wounded veterans and we are going to take care of the men and women who have served, I think it is a compelling argument that we get this legislation passed.

Finally, we have been back and forth on this issue. I do not like to get into the process and go back and forth. But 60 votes was not invented on this side, nor was it invented on the other side. The 60-vote procedure has been employed by the minority in recent years—in my view, all too often. But the fact is, to somehow say it was invented here on this side of the aisle obviously is not the case. There were many times, when the Democratic Party was in the minority in this body, where I saw 60 votes invoked, the procedure invoked, because it was felt, appropriately, because that is the way the Senate works, as the criteria for moving forward because of the urgency or the importance of the pending legislation.

So what is missing here, I would say to my friend from Michigan—and I think he agrees with me—is what we have seen is the erosion, over the past 20 years I have been here, of an ability to sit down and discuss and agree and move forward. That is what is the missing ingredient here, and it has been missing for some years.

I regret it. I may be a little optimistic, but I think if it were only between the Senator from Michigan and me, we could dispose of most of these issues rather readily and establish a procedure for moving forward. We are now at the point—let's have some straight talk—that this entire bill is in jeopardy because of the imbroglio of the war in Iraq being added to an authorization bill which was not intended to be a national security piece of legislation. It was intended to be a bill to authorize the necessary funding, training, and equipping of the men and women in the military, and care for our wounded veterans has been added. I regret the situation as it is, but that is the way it is. We will spend today debating this issue and discussing it. I hope at some point we will realize the war is going to be going on. This bill, if it is passed with the Reed-Levin amendment on it, would be vetoed by the President. That would be a bad thing to happen. The war will be discussed in September again—we all know that—when General Petraeus is ready to report to the Senate. At some point I would hope we could move forward on the authorization bill and do the things that are necessary to help equip and train and ready the men and women serving in the military and preserving our national security.

Again, I appreciate the efforts the Senator from Michigan, distinguished chairman of the committee, is making in this direction.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend for his willingness to always sit down and try to work things out. The roadblock here to our proceeding will be either kept in place or removed tomorrow with the vote on whether to allow Levin-Reed to come to a vote. The Senator is right that there have been times when people have filibustered matters. There have been times when they have decided not to. On the Iraq issue, on the last authorization bill, there were votes up or down without a 60-vote procedural roadblock being put in place to the then Levin-Reed and Kerry amendments. So that is the precedent we established last year that I would hope the Republican leader would allow to be followed, because—one other comment—I can't think of a more appropriate place to be debating Iraq policy, frankly, than on an authorization bill. Whether I am right or wrong, that is what happened last year. I hope it will again be followed this year.

I thank my good friend. My remarks will be coming this afternoon.

Senator KENNEDY will be following the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). Without objection, the foregoing request to have the Senator from Massachusetts follow the Senator from Arizona is agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the chairman and the Senator from Rhode Island. Let's be very clear what this amendment would do. It would mandate a withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq. The debate that has taken place on this floor for some months now comes down to a simple choice. The sponsors of this amendment would have us legislate a withdrawal of U.S. combat forces from Iraq within 120 days of enactment, leaving in place only forces authorized to carry out specific, narrow missions. That is one choice, to force an end to the war in Iraq and accept thereby all the terrible consequences that follow. The other is to defeat this amendment, to give General Petraeus and the troops under his command the time and support they have requested to carry out their mission, to allow them to safeguard vital American interests and an Iraqi population at risk of genocide. That is the choice.

Though politics and popular opinion may be pushing us in one direction, to take the easy course, we, as elected leaders, have a greater responsibility. A measure of courage is required, not the great courage exhibited by the brave men and women fighting today in Iraq and Afghanistan, but a smaller measure, the courage necessary to put our country's interests before every personal or political consideration.

I wish to spend a few moments reviewing the state of affairs in Iraq today. The final reinforcements needed to implement General Petraeus's new counterinsurgency strategy arrived several weeks ago. From what I saw and heard on my recent trips and from briefings and reports since then, I believe our military, in cooperation with Iraqi security forces, is making progress in a number of areas. The areas where they are operating have

not suddenly become safe, but they do illustrate the progress that our military has achieved under General Petraeus's new strategy. The most dramatic advances have been made in Anbar Province, a region that last year was widely believed to be lost to al-Qaida. After an offensive by U.S. and Iraqi troops cleaned al-Qaida fighters off of Ramadi and other areas of western Anbar Province, tribal sheikhs broke formally with the terrorists and joined the coalition side.

Ramadi, which just months ago stood as Iraq's most dangerous city, is now one of its safest. In February, attacks in Ramadi averaged between 30 and 35. Now many days see no attacks at all—no gunfire, no IEDs, and no suicide bombings.

In Fallujah, Iraqi police have established numerous stations and have divided the city into gated districts, leading to a decline in violence. Local intelligence tips have proliferated in the province. Thousands of men are signing up for the police and the army, and the locals are taking the fight to al-Qaida. U.S. commanders in Anbar attest that all 18 major tribes in the province are now on board with the security plan. They expect that a year from now, the Iraqi Army and police could have total control of security in Ramadi. At that point, they project, we could safely draw down American forces in the area.

The Anbar model is one our military is attempting to replicate in other parts of Iraq with some real successes. A brigade of the 10th Mountain Division is operating in areas south of Baghdad, the belts around the capital which have been havens for al-Qaida and other insurgents. All soldiers in I brigades are living forward and commanders report that local sheikhs are increasingly siding with the coalition against al-Qaida, the main enemy in that area of operations.

Southeast of Baghdad the military is targeting al-Qaida in safe havens they maintain along the Tigris River, and MG Rick Lynch, commander of operations there, recently reported that attacks on civilians in his area of operations were down 20 percent since April and civilian deaths have declined by 55 percent. These and other efforts are part of Operation Phantom Thunder, a military operation intended to stop insurgents present in the Baghdad belts from originating attacks in the capital itself.

In Baghdad, the military, in cooperation with Iraqi security forces, continues to establish joint security stations and deploy throughout the city in order to get violence under control. These efforts have produced positive results. Sectarian violence has fallen since January. The total number of car bombings and suicide attacks declined in May and June, and the number of locals coming forward with intelligence tips has risen. Make no mistake: Violence in Baghdad remains at unacceptably high levels. Suicide bombers and other threats pose formidable challenges, and other difficulties abound. Nevertheless, there appears to be overall movement in the right direction.

North of Baghdad, Iraqi and American troops have surged into Diyala Province and are fighting to deny al-Qaida sanctuary in the city of Baquba. For the first time since the war began, Americans showed up in force and did not quickly withdraw from the area. In response, locals have formed a new alliance with the coalition to counter al-Qaida. Diyala, which was the center of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi's Islamic caliphate finally has a chance to turn aside the forces of extremism.

I offer these observations not in order to present a rosy scenario of the challenges we continue to face in Iraq. As the horrific bombing in Salah ad-Din Province illustrates so graphically, the threats to Iraqi stability have not gone away, nor are they likely to go away in the near future. Our brave men and women in Iraq will continue to face great challenges. What I do believe, however, is that while the mission to bring a degree of security to Iraq and Baghdad and its environs in particular, in order to establish the necessary precondition for political and economic process, is still in its early stages, the progress our military has made should encourage all of us.

It is also clear that the overall strategy General Petraeus has put into place, a traditional counterinsurgency strategy that emphasizes protecting the population and gets our troops off of bases and into the areas they are trying to protect, is the correct one.

Some of my colleagues argue we should return troops to forward operating bases and confine their activities to training in targeted counterterrorism operations. That is precisely what we did for 3½ years, which I, time after time, said was doomed to failure. The situation in Iraq only got worse. I am, frankly, surprised that my colleagues would advocate a return to the failed Rumsfeld-Casey strategy. No one can be certain whether this new strategy, which remains in the early stages, can bring about ever greater stability. We can be sure, however, that should the Senate seek to legislate an end to the strategy as it is just commencing, then we will fail for certain.

Now that the military effort in Iraq is showing some signs of progress, space is opening for political progress. Yet rather than seizing the opportunity, the government of Prime Minister Maliki is not functioning as it must. We see little evidence of reconciliation, and none of the 18 benchmarks has yet been met. Progress is not enough. We need to see results. Today. I am sorry to report the results are not there. The Iraqi Government can function. The question is whether it will. If there is to be hope of a sustainable end to the violence that so plagues that country, Iraqi political leaders must seize this opportunity. It will not come around again.

To encourage political progress, I believe we can find wisdom in several suggestions put forward recently by Henry Kissinger. An intensified negotiation among the Iraqi parties could limit violence, promote reconciliation, and put the political system on a more stable footing. At the same time we should promote a dialog between the Iraqi Government and its Sunni Arab neighbors, specifically Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, in order to build broader international acceptance for the Iraqi central Government in exchange for that Government meeting specific obligations with respect to the protection and political participation of the Sunni minority. These countries should cease their efforts to handpick new Iraqi leaders and instead contribute to stabilizing Iraq, an effort that would directly serve their national interests.

Finally, we should begin a broader effort to establish a basis for aid and even peacekeeping efforts by the international community key to political progress in Iraq. In taking such steps, we must recognize that no lasting political settlement can grow out of a U.S. withdrawal. On the contrary, a withdrawal must grow out of a political solution, a solution made possible by the imposition of security by coalition and Iraqi forces.

Secretary Kissinger is absolutely correct when he states ''precipitate withdrawal would produce a disaster'' and one that ''would not end the war but shift it to other areas, like Lebanon or Jordan or Saudi Arabia,'' produce greater violence among Iraqi factions, and embolden radical Islamists around the world.

Let us keep in the front of our minds the likely consequences of premature withdrawal from Iraq. Many of my colleagues would like to believe that should the withdrawal amendment we are currently debating become law, it would mark the end of this long effort. They are wrong. Should the Congress force a precipitous withdrawal from Iraq, it would mark a new beginning, the start of a new, more dangerous, and more arduous effort to contain the forces unleashed by our disengagement.

No matter where my colleagues came down in 2003 about the centrality of Iraq to the war on terror, there can simply be no debate that our efforts in Iraq today are critical to the wider struggle against violent Islamic extremism. Already, the terrorists are emboldened, excited that America is talking about not winning in Iraq but is, rather, debating when we should lose. Last week, Ayman al-Zawahiri, al-Qaida's deputy chief, said the United States is merely delaying our inevitable defeat in Iraq and that the Mujahedin of Islam in Iraq of the caliphate and Jihad are advancing with steady steps toward victory. He called on Muslims to travel to Iraq to fight Americans and appealed for Muslims to support the Islamic State in Iraq, a group established by al-Qaida.

General Petraeus has called al-Qaida ''the principal short-term threat to Iraq.'' What do the supporters of this amendment believe to be the consequences of our leaving the battlefield with al-Qaida in place? If we leave Iraq prematurely, jihadists around the world will interpret the withdrawal as their great victory against our great power. Their movement thrives in an atmosphere of perceived victory. We saw this in the surge of men and money flowing to al-Qaida following the Soviet Union withdrawal from Afghanistan. If they defeat the United States in Iraq, they will believe that anything is possible, that history is on their side, that they can bring their terrible rule to lands the world over. Recall the plan laid out in a letter from Zawahiri to Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi before his death. That plan is to take shape in four stages: Establish a caliphate in Iraq, extend the ''jihad wave'' to the secular countries neighboring Iraq, clash with Israel—none of which will commence until the completion of stage one: Expel the Americans from Iraq. The terrorists are in this war to win it. The question is, Are we?

The supporters of this amendment respond that they do not, by any means, intend to cede the battlefield to al-Qaida. On the contrary, the legislation would allow U.S. forces, presumably holed up in forward-operating bases, to carry out targeted counterterrorism operations. But our own military commanders say this approach will not succeed and that moving in with search and destroy missions to kill and capture terrorists, only to immediately cede the territory to the enemy, is the failed strategy of the last 3½ years.

MG Rick Lynch, who is directing a major part of the Baghdad offensive, said over the weekend that an early American withdrawal would clear the way for the enemy to come back to areas now being cleared of insurgents. ''When we go out there,'' he said, ''the first question they ask is: 'Are you staying?' And the second is: 'How can we help?' ''

General Lynch added that should U.S. forces pull back before the job is complete, we risk ''an environment where the enemy could come back and fill the void.''

On Monday, last Monday, Lieutenant General Odierno, the No. 2 commander in Iraq said:

> My assessment right now is I need more time. I'm seeing some progress now here in Iraq. We have really just started what the Iraqis term ''liberating'' them from al-Qaida.

Withdrawing before there is a stable and legitimate Iraqi authority would turn Iraq into a failed State and a terrorist sanctuary in the heart of the Middle East. We have seen a failed State emerge after U.S. disengagement once before, and it cost us terribly. In pre-9/11 Afghanistan, terrorists found sanctuary to train and plan attacks with impunity. We know that today there are terrorists in Iraq who are planning attacks against Americans. We cannot make this fatal mistake twice.

As my friend, GEN Brent Scowcroft, has said recently, one of the men I respect more than most any in America:

> The costs of staying are visible. The costs of getting out are almost never discussed. If we get out before Iraq is stable, the entire Middle East region might start to resemble Iraq today. Getting out is not a solution.

Natan Sharansky has recently written:

> A precipitous withdrawal of U.S. forces could lead to a bloodbath that would make the current carnage pale by comparison.

Should we leave Iraq before there is a basic level of stability, we will invite further Iranian influence at a time when Iranian operatives are already moving weapons, training fighters, providing resources, and helping plan operations to kill American soldiers and damage our efforts to bring stability to Iraq. Iran will comfortably step into the power vacuum left by a U.S. withdrawal, and such an aggrandizement of fundamentalist power has great potential to spark greater Sunni-Shia conflicts across the region.

Leaving prematurely would induce Iraq's neighbors, including Saudi Arabia and Jordan, Egypt to Israel, Turkey and others, to feel their own security eroding and may well induce them to act in ways that prompt wider instability. The potential for genocide, wider war, spiraling oil prices, and the perception of strategic American defeat is real, and no vote on this floor will change that.

Don't take my word for it. Consult, perhaps, the Iraq Study Group, which says:

> A chaotic Iraq could provide a still stronger base of operations for terrorists who seek to act regionally or even globally. Al-Qaida will portray any failure by the United States in Iraq as a sinificant victory that will be featured prominently as they recruit for their cause in the region and in the world.

The report goes on to say that:

> A premature American departure from Iraq would almost certainly produce greater sectarian violence and further deterioration of conditions. The near-term results would be a significant power vacuum, greater human suffering, regional destabilization, and a threat to the global economy. Al-Qaida would depict our withdrawal as a historic victory.

Or perhaps ask the Iraqis. BG Qassim Attam, the chief Iraqi spokesman for the Baghdad security plan, said last Sunday the Iraqi military and police force need more time before they are capable of assuming control of the country's security.

Or maybe our intelligence agencies which in the January National Intelligence Estimate concluded:

> If coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this estimate, we judge this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq, intensify Sunni resistance to the Iraqi government, and have adverse consequences for national reconciliation. The ISF would be unlikely to survive as a nonsectarian national institution; neighboring countries might intervene openly in the conflict; massive civilian casualties and forced population displacement would be probable; AQI outside Iraq would attempt to use parts of the country to plan increased attacks in and out of Iraq, and spiraling violence and political disarray in Iraq, along with Kurdish moves to control Kirkuk and strengthen autonomy, could prompt Turkey to launch a military incursion.

These are the likely consequences of a precipitous withdrawal. I hope the supporters of such a move will tell us what they believe to be the likely consequences of this course of action. Should their amendment become law and U.S. troops begin withdrawing, do they believe that Iraq will become more or less stable? That al-Qaida will find it easier to gather, plan, and carry out attacks from Iraqi soil or that our withdrawal will somehow make this less likely? That the Iraqi people become more or less safe? That genocide becomes a more remote possibility or ever likelier?

This fight is about Iraq but not about Iraq alone. It is greater than that and, more important still, about whether America still has the political courage to fight for victory or whether we will settle for defeat with all the terrible things that accompany it. We cannot walk away gracefully from defeat in this war.

How we leave Iraq is very important. As the Iraq Study Group found:

> If we leave and Iraq descends into chaos, the long-range consequences could eventually require the United States to return.

General Petraeus and his commanders believe they have a strategy that can, over time, lead to success in Iraq. General Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker will come to Washington in September to report on the status of their efforts and those of the Iraqis. They request two things of us: the time necessary to see whether their efforts can succeed and the political courage to support them in their work. I believe we must give them both.

Right now, as we continue our debate on the war in Iraq, American soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen are fighting bravely and tenaciously in battles that are as dangerous, difficult, and consequential as the great battles of our armed forces' storied past. Americans who fought in France's hedgerow country; those who bled in the sands and jungles of the Pacific Islands, who braved the onslaught of the Chinese Army in the frozen terrain of Korea and who fought a desperate battle to retake Hue from the enemy during the Tet Offensive and against numerically superior forces in an isolated Marine base at Khe San, will recognize and honor the sacrifice of Americans who now fight with such valor, determination, and skill to defend the security interests and the honor of our country in desperate battles in Iraq.

The hour is indeed late in Iraq. How we have arrived at this critical and

desperate moment has been well chronicled, and history's judgment about the long catalog of mistakes in the prosecution of this war will be stern and unforgiving. But history will revere the honor and the sacrifice of those Americans who, despite the mistakes and the failures of both civilian and military leaders, shouldered a rifle and risked everything—everything—so the country they love so well might not suffer the many dangerous consequences of defeat.

We read in our leading newspapers about those veterans of the Iraq war who have organized to oppose its continuation. They have fought for America's freedom, and they have every right to exercise their freedom, to oppose their Government's policies. I wish, though, that the press would pay at least equal attention to the many veterans—many more veterans, many more veterans—who have fought, suffered, and witnessed the ultimate sacrifice, the loss of their dearest friends, and yet are still committed to America's success in Iraq, and to those who have served multiple tours in this terrible war and yet reenlist because they remain steadfast in the belief that they can achieve the mission they have already risked so much to achieve. The American public, those who still support our effort in Iraq and those who desire a quick end to it, should be daily reminded that although our country is deeply divided about this war, most of the many thousands of Americans who have suffered its worst miseries are still resolved—still resolved—that it not end in an American defeat.

Our new counterinsurgency strategy is succeeding where our previous tactics failed us. We are taking from the enemy and holding territory that was once given up for lost. Those who have falsely described General Petraeus's efforts as ''staying the course'' are the real advocates of continuing on the course of failure. Many of those who decry the way we got into this war and the way we fought it are now advocating a way out of it that suffers from more willful refusal to face facts than they accuse the administration of exhibiting. Although we all seem to be united in recognizing the mistakes and failures of the past, the proponents of reducing our forces in Iraq and keeping them in secure bases from which they could occasionally launch search and destroy missions are proposing to return to the very tactics that have brought us to the point of trying to salvage from the wreckage of those mistakes a last best hope for success.

That is what General Petraeus and the Americans he has the honor to command are trying to do—to fight smarter and better, in a way that addresses and doesn't strengthen the tactics of the enemy and to give the Iraqis the security and opportunity to make the necessary political decisions to save their country from the abyss of genocide and a permanent and spreading war. So far, the Maliki Government has not risen to that challenge, and it must do so. It is obvious that America is losing our resolve to continue sacrificing its sons and daughters, while the Iraqi Government will not take the political risks to do what is plainly in the best interests of the Iraqi people.

But we do not fight only for the interest of Iraqis, Mr. President, we fight for ours as well.

We, too, we Members of Congress, must face our responsibilities honestly and bravely. What is asked of us is so less onerous than what we have asked from our servicemen and women, but no less consequential. We need not risk our lives, nor our health, but only our political advantages so that General Petraeus has the time and resources he has asked for to follow up on his recent successes and help save Iraq and America from the catastrophe that would be an American defeat. That is not much to risk compared to the sacrifices made by Americans fighting in Iraq or the terrible consequences of our defeat. For if we withdraw from Iraq, if we choose to lose there, there is no doubt in my mind, no doubt at all, that we will be back—in Iraq and elsewhere—in many more desperate fights to protect our security and at an even greater cost in American lives and treasure.

Little is asked of us to help prevent this catastrophe, but so much depends on our willingness to do so, on the sincerity of our pledge to serve America's interests before our own. The Americans who must make the greatest sacrifices have earned the right to insist that we do our duty, as best as we can see it, and accept willingly and graciously whatever small sacrifice we must make with our own personal and partisan ambitions. Ours is a noisy, restive, and contentious profession. It has always been thus, and it always will be. But in this moment of serious peril for America, we must all of us remember to whom and what we owe our first allegiance—to the security of the American people and to the ideals upon which we our Nation was founded. That responsibility is our dearest privilege and to be judged by history to have discharged it honorably will, in the end, matter so much more to all of us than any fleeting glory of popular acclaim, electoral advantage or office. The history of this country, after all, is not merely a chronicle of political winners and losers, it is a judgment of who has and who has not contributed to the continued success of America, the greatest political experiment in human history.

It is my sincere wish that all of us, Republicans and Democrats, should know in our hearts whatever mistakes we have made in our lives, personally or politically, whatever acclaim we have achieved or disappointment we have suffered, that we have, in the end, earned history's favor. I hope we might all have good reason to expect a kinder judgment of our flaws and follies because when it mattered most we chose to put the interests of this great and good Nation before our own, and helped, in our own small way, preserve for all humanity the magnificent and inspiring example of an assured, successful and ever advancing America and the ideals that make us still the greatest Nation on Earth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, these are very difficult days in our history, and I welcome the comments of my friend and colleague from Arizona and his views about the position of the United States and its policy with regard to Iraq. He reminds us that we ought to free ourselves from these political considerations. This situation is too demanding. The value of our involvement in terms of American service men and women is too dear. The resources of this country are too important to squander them.

A number of us had serious reservations about involving the United States in military engagement, a war with Iraq. A number of us still remember being on the Armed Services Committee and listening to the combat commanders—the first panel in the Armed Services Committee on that particular day. We listened to General Hoar, from Hyde Park, MA, a highly decorated marine. We saw a number of decorations for bravery and courage in Vietnam. We listened to General Nash, who had been in the first gulf war and had been our Commander in Bosnia. We read through General Zinni's comments at that time. We listened to General Clark as well. They are a group of combat commanders, and all urged that the United States keep its focus and attention on those who brought the tragedy to the United States on 9/11.

Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida were the real danger and threat to the United States. They were located in Afghanistan. They said that is where our focus and attention should be and that involvement in Iraq would be clearly not in our interest. I remember those extraordinary words of General Hoar, who said if we become involved in Iraq, the battle in Baghdad that he foresaw would make the first fifteen minutes of ''Private Ryan'' look like a church picnic. ''Private Ryan'' was that extraordinary film by Steven Spielberg. That made a very profound impression upon me. That impression was enhanced when we listened to the statements that were made by Defense Secretary Rumsfeld when they talked about the weapons of mass destruction being on the north, south, east, and west of Baghdad.

The ranking member of our committee, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Carl Levin, had suggested that we give information to the inspectors. The response was that we cannot give it to the inspectors because Saddam Hussein will move them. Senator LEVIN said: Well, why don't we then watch where they are being

moved to, to be able to convince the world community about these weapons of mass destruction?

At least it was assumed by the response that was given at that time that we were going to make available to the inspection teams the locations of those weapons of mass destruction. We found out, historically, that never happened because there weren't any. So there was important debate and discussion within the administration.

Should we follow the precedent of President Bush 1, which said this is a very important issue about going to war in Iraq, and rather than attaining it in the course of an election, let's have an election and then have the Congress make a judgment and decision. The decision said public opinion at that time was overwhelmingly to go to war, and we were going to have that vote just prior to the election. I hope we are going to spare ourselves this idea that those of us who are supporting the Levin-Reed amendment are looking at the politics of it. We saw the realities of it when we made the mistake in going to war.

Secondly, we are very mindful that Iraq is a country with 26 million or 27 million people. It basically has an extraordinary history and incredible culture, amazing oil reserves, many different kinds of assets. But it was defeated 10 years ago by the United States of America in a war—defeated. We had the air space, controlling that over Iraq. We have the best fighting force in the world over there now for in excess of 4 years fighting.

As many of us have said, the military has done everything they were called to do. Does anybody doubt the finest military force which swept through western Europe and Africa and Italy, went through the Pacific in less time in World War II? We have had them over there bogged down in this country of 27 million people. Has anybody doubted that we need more than a military resolution and solution, and the fact that we continue to keep the American service men and women in harm's way, that we are somehow protecting them? Is that what we are being asked to believe after they have been over there for 4 years, when they are able and capable of doing everything which they have done, and done so bravely, I say it is time to bring them home. I say it is time to support the Levin amendment.

I hope during this debate we are not going to have the continued references on the issues of patriotism. We have worn out that argument, and we heard it all. It didn't work in the last election, where many of us who were strongly opposed to the war faced those kinds of drum beats.

Secondly, our Founding Fathers had a very important view about what the Senate of the United States should be and the importance of protecting minority views in this body. This was going to be the institution that was going to be able to permit individuals who represented minority views, differing views, to be able to express themselves. As we have learned historically so often, those expressed by a small group often become the majority accepted views in future years. The Founding Fathers understood that. They wanted to make sure those ideas and concepts were going to be protected.

What the Founding Fathers never anticipated was that rules were going to be used to abuse the American people's right to be able to express themselves, particularly on issues of war and peace. That is what we are seeing now—delay for delay's sake, not delay so that we can have greater information about what is happening over in Iraq. That is not the issue. It is delay for delay's sake, a refusal to permit the Senate to express itself.

The House has expressed itself. Permit the Senate to express itself. Let's have a debate and discussion. The American people have made up their minds on this issue. We don't have to doubt that. The American people have made up their minds. They want their elected representatives to speak. I understand why the Republicans don't want their name on that rollcall as supporting this President, this war, at this time. I understand it. That, my colleagues, is really what this is about. People just refuse, don't want it.

Let's have some process or procedure, some way to avoid calling the roll and taking a stand on an issue of war and peace. That is what this debate, at least for the next several hours, is going to be about.

Are we going to be able to permit this institution to function in the way it was intended to function; that is, at a time when the American people have made a judgment and a decision on a particular issue, to be able to call the roll and have accountability, or whether we are going to be denied that. After all of the rhetoric about the role in history and the importance of this issue, that is where it comes down.

So, Mr. President, this is an extremely important debate. What is so important to understand is this is not an issue that is going away. Those of us who were opposed to the war continue to be opposed to it. Listen to the argument about what the consequences are going to be. What are the consequences going to be now, what are they going to be in 3 years, what are they going to be in 5 years, what are they going to be in 7 years? Many of us are sufficiently uncertain about this issue that we voted ''no'' in terms of giving to this President the authority to move this country and commit it in a way we have done so.

America is paying an enormous cost for a war we never should have fought, and it is time to bring it to an end. The war has divided us at home. It has made us more isolated in the world. Never before, even in the Vietnam war, has America taken such massive military action with so little international support.

As the intelligence community confirmed yet again today, the war has become a significant recruitment tool for al-Qaida. What was the surge intended to accomplish? The surge was meant to reduce violence; it has not. To permit reconstruction; it has not. To promote reconciliation; it has not. All we have to do is read the Administration's own reports.

As the intelligence community confirmed yet again today, the war has become a significant recruitment tool for al-Qaida. The NIE says:

> We assess that Al Qaeda's association with Al Qaeda Iraq helps Al Qaeda to energize the broader Sunni extremist community, raise resources, and recruit and indoctrinate operatives, including for homeland attacks.

This has obviously made the war on terrorism harder, not easier, to win. Nevertheless, the administration still continues to turn a deaf ear to all the voices calling for change. It continues to plead for more and more time to pursue its failed course in Iraq. Republicans in the Senate continue to filibuster any effort to outline a clear timetable for the withdrawal of American troops.

The disastrous consequences of our policy could have been avoided if the President and his advisers had asked the right questions before rushing headlong into an unnecessary and unjust war.

In my church, there are six principles which guide the determination of just war. They were developed by Saint Augustine in the 5th century and expanded by Saint Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century. To be just, a war must have a just cause, confronting a danger that is beyond question. It must be declared by a legitimate authority acting on behalf of the people. It must be driven by the right intention, not ulterior, self-interested motives. It must be a last resort. It must be proportional so that the harm inflicted does not outweigh the good achieved. And it must have a reasonable chance of success.

These are the sound criteria by which the President should have judged our war in Iraq, but he failed our men and women in uniform by refusing to seek honest answers to these important questions before recklessly plunging the Nation into war.

We now know with crystal clarity that the war in Iraq did not meet these criteria. Saddam did not pose the kind of threat that justified this war, but we went to war anyway without legitimate support from the international community. The administration was wrong to allow the anti-Iraq zealots in its ranks to exploit the 9/11 tragedy to make war against Iraq a higher priority than the war against terrorism in Afghanistan.

War with Iraq was most certainly not the last resort. All options were not pursued. We should have given inspectors more time to reveal that there were, in fact, no weapons of mass destruction.

The human cost of this war has been unacceptable. More than 3,600 Americans have been killed and nearly 27,000 wounded. Tens of thousands of Iraqis have been killed and Iraq has descended into civil war.

The administration's incompetence in waging this misguided war has left no reasonable chance for success. Americans have spoken clearly and urgently about the need to end the war, and it is time for the President to listen to their pleas. We should end this war with a scaled-back mission for our troops and a clear timetable for withdrawal specified in the Levin-Reed amendment.

America has been sadly diminished in the world because of this colossal blunder. Anti-Americanism is on the rise. We have seemed to have lost our way, our vision, and our confidence in the future.

In his farewell address to the Nation in January 1989, Ronald Reagan described one of the singular triumphs of his Presidency: the recovery of America's standing and morale. I believe he was right when he said:

> America is respected again in the world and looked to for leadership.

Other nations understood that the best guarantee of peace and stability was for the United States to live up to its ideals as a beacon of hope for the rest of the planet. We were admired for our democracy and respected for our economic strength.

Today, others have stopped listening to us the way they once did. At the end of June, the Pew Global Attitudes Project reported that since 2002, the image of the United States has plummeted throughout the world. Our image is abysmal in most Muslim countries and continues to decline among the people of many of America's oldest allies. We have strained the extraordinary alliances that advance our ideals, as well as our interests.

At the root of much of the anti-Americanism that has surfaced in recent years is the perception of American unilateralism in international affairs. I am astonished when some say it does not matter that so many in the world no longer respect the United States. Of course, it matters. It matters to our security, as it has mattered since the first days of our Republic.

The opening paragraph of the Declaration of Independence acknowledges the importance of a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. That respect is as important today as it was when our Founders signed the Declaration, affirming it on the first Fourth of July.

To restore America's standing and strength, we must end the war in Iraq and recapture that combination of realism and idealism that has inspired Americans for generations. Ending this unacceptable war is essential to our security and to regaining our respect in the world.

The great challenges facing our fragile planet require an abundance of hope that only a united and a determined America can provide. America has to lead. America has to inspire. But we cannot do so if we remain bogged down in Iraq's civil war. Might alone cannot make America right. By prescribing our own rules for the modern world, we have deprived our great Nation of the moral claim that is the basis of our being, the purpose of our power, and we are paying an exorbitant price.

We can and sometimes must defend democracy by force, but we cannot impose it by force. Democratic principles are universal, but democracy must find its champions within each country's culture and traditions. We need to end the war and regain a time when America is able to seek common ground with our friends. We need to renew the alliances that kept the world safe for human rights and human survival when the threat for nuclear war was a clear and present danger.

We will always defend our interests, but we put them at grave risk when we act unilaterally in an independent world. We live in a time of enormous possibility and enormous risk. No nation is guaranteed a limitless future of prosperity or security. We have to work for it. We have to sacrifice for it. The sacrifices we are making in Iraq are no longer worth the immense cost in human lives or the immense cost to our national prestige and interest.

President Bush has squandered every opportunity to stabilize Iraq. Any honest assessment can realistically lead to only one conclusion: America's interest will best be served when our military disengages from Iraq. Certainly, there will be violence when our combat troops leave, but there will be far more violence if we continue to police Iraq's civil war indefinitely, as the President proposes.

Last week President Bush said, ''There is war fatigue in America. It's affecting our psychology.'' For once the President is right. There is fatigue in America. Americans are tired of an administration whose ill-conceived notion of a preventive war plunged this Nation into Iraq's bloody civil war. Americans are tired of an administration that told us the mission was accomplished when the tally of American dead was only beginning to mount. Americans are tired of an administration that continues to promise that hope is just around the corner and begs for time for a policy that stands no chance of succeeding now, in September, or ever.

Years ago, one of the giants of the Senate said:

> Partisanship should stop at the water's edge.

Arthur Vandenberg, a Republican from Michigan, who was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, worked closely with President Truman to lay the foundation for the foreign policy of the United States that could guide us through the Cold War. Senator Vandenberg set the bar high for us in the Senate. We can aspire to that idea, but it is hard to achieve it in this Congress, as it has been in other Congresses.

Over the past few weeks, a shift has begun to take place, not as quickly as many of us feel is necessary, but nonetheless a change. Two weeks ago, in a speech on this floor, one of the successors of Arthur Vandenberg as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, our distinguished colleague from Indiana who was himself chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, reminded us that we do not owe the President our unquestioning agreement, but we do owe him and the American people our constructive engagement.

Last Friday, Senator LUGAR was joined by the senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, in offering an amendment that would require the administration to review our Iraq strategy and outline plans for an orderly redeployment of our troops.

Two weeks ago in a statement on this floor, Senator LUGAR said:

> The United States has violated some basic national security precepts during our military engagement in Iraq. We have overestimated what the military can achieve, we have set goals that are unrealistic, and we have inadequately factored in the broader regional consequences of our actions. Perhaps more critically, our focus on Iraq has diverted us from opportunities to change the world in directions that strengthen our national security.

I agree with that judgment, although I believe the Warner-Lugar amendment does not go far enough in bringing this war to an end. It is undeniable that the American people have turned against this war, and it is imperative for the President to understand and accept that basic fact. We call for the President to end the war, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans who are deeply concerned about the perilous path on which the Nation is moving.

The American people understand there are no easy options, but they also understand that the President's strategy simply does not protect U.S. interests. They understand it is wrong to buy time, to hand off the mess in Iraq to the next President, and to keep our troops in harm's way with a policy that is not worthy of their sacrifice.

The overarching question is not whether we leave Iraq but how we leave Iraq. Disastrous choices and disastrous leadership have brought us to this dangerous point. We need to redefine our strategic goal in Iraq and the region and have a realistic policy that supports that objective. Whatever we do, it is going to be difficult, but we need to move forward and begin the process, and soon.

We need to work with Iraq's neighbors to mitigate the damage the President's policies have created and minimize outside intervention, but we cannot allow the fear of instability to put the brakes on the process of military disengagement.

Majorities in free countries bordering Iraq—Turkey, Jordan, and Kuwait—say

our troops should be removed. In Turkey, one of our most important allies in the region bordering Iraq, only 9 percent support our position. Even in Iraq, just a few months ago, tens of thousands marched demanding an end to what they call the ''American occupation.''

Each country in the region has an interest in Iraq's stability, and we need to work with them diplomatically to find common ground and mitigate the damage caused by the President's failed policy. They need to come forward and work with our Nation and play a constructive role. Part of that effort needs to address the growing needs of the millions who have fled the violence in Iraq.

More than 2 million Iraqis have fled to neighboring Jordan and Syria, and they are a destabilizing force in the region. The toll of suffering is immense. The danger these tragic circumstances pose for our national security and the countries in the region hosting these vulnerable people is real. The anger, the desperation, the hopelessness that envelope these refugees is a breeding ground for terrorists and will undoubtedly be exploited by our enemies.

America has a fundamental moral obligation to help, especially those who have supported America in Iraq. There is no doubt that Iraqis who have worked in positions in direct support of the United States have been killed or injured in reprisals for that support. Many more Iraqis associated with the United States have fled in fear and lost all they had. We must keep faith with those who now have a bull's-eye on their back because of their ties with our country.

At a hearing by the Senate Judiciary Committee earlier this year, Iraqis offered chilling testimony about the dangers they face because of their association with America. A translator for U.S. and coalition forces told of seeing his name posted on death lists and said his friends turned on him because they believed he was a traitor. An Iraqi truck driver who delivered water to American forces said that terrorist groups had targeted him, his wife, and their six children because of his support for our soldiers.

Not only do we have an obligation to help those who have helped us, we have a precedent for action. As the war in Vietnam drew to a close, President Ford emphasized America's duty to rescue those who had helped and assisted us. He called our response to that refugee crisis a reaffirmation of America's awareness of the roots and ideals of our society, and he personally greeted Vietnamese refugees on their arrival here.

But, sadly, there are many Iraqis working with our Armed Forces, our diplomatic mission, and our reconstruction teams in Iraq who have performed valiantly but have been abandoned by our Government in their hour of need. Because of this support, insurgents have threatened and attacked their family members. Many have lost their lives, and many more have lost their houses, property, and livelihood. For some, it will be too dangerous to ever return.

America cannot resettle all of Iraq's refugees, but we must show leadership by accepting far greater numbers of refugees closely associated with our military operation. Keeping our troops in Iraq indefinitely, as the President proposes, is simply not the solution to the humanitarian and refugee crisis.

The consequences of the decisions we make here in Congress profoundly affect our military, their families, and the communities they have left. We have an obligation to our soldiers to make sensible decisions that will not place them needlessly in harm's way. In February, I spoke about the 65 soldiers from Massachusetts who had died in Iraq. Since then, Massachusetts has lost 10 more. We in Massachusetts feel especially deeply the loss of these sons and daughters killed in Iraq:

PVT John Landry, SGT Adam Kennedy, CPT Anthony Palermo, SSG William Callahan, 1LT Ryan P. Jones, SPC Kyl Little, LCpl Walter O'Haire, LT Andrew Bacevich, SGT Daniel Newsome, and SSG Robb Rolfing.

We salute them, we pray for their families, we honor their sacrifice today and every day. We must insist on a policy worthy of their sacrifice.

The choice is clear: We can continue on the same failed course as those who are leading this filibuster in the Senate are proposing or we can adopt the Levin-Reed amendment and begin to bring our troops home to the hero's welcome they have earned and so obviously deserve.

For the sake of our men and women in uniform and our national security, I hope we will change course and approve the Levin-Reed amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I will respond very briefly to the comments of the Senator from Massachusetts on several points in his thoughtful statement.

He talks about indefinite—indefinitely the United States Armed Forces in Iraq. I think that is a far cry from what we are seeking here. What we are seeking here is an opportunity for the surge strategy to have a chance to succeed, the last part of which was put in place a few weeks ago. In fact, as the Washington Post points out:

> Generals have devised a new strategy, believing they are making fitful progress in calming Baghdad, training the Iraqi army, and encouraging anti-al-Qaeda coalitions. Before Congress begins managing rotation schedules and ordering withdrawals, it should at least give those generals the months they asked for to see whether their strategy can offer some new hope.

It is not about indefinite presence, it is about giving a new strategy a chance to succeed. I find it ironic, in a way, that I was one of the greatest critics of the Rumsfeld-Casey strategy—which was doomed to failure—which was a replica of the old search and destroy, where we went in and tried to kill people and left. This new strategy, this new general, I think, is showing some signs of success, and—not leaving our forces there ''indefinitely''—allowing this strategy a chance to succeed is important.

There are very few people in the world I admire more than Natan Sharansky, a man who knows the meaning of oppression, imprisonment, and suffering, and he lives in the region. Natan Sharansky says:

> A precipitous withdrawal—

Which is what we are talking about here, Mr. President, not an indefinite U.S. presence.

> A precipitous withdrawal of U.S. forces could lead to a bloodbath that would make the current carnage pale by comparison. Without U.S. troops in place to quell some of the violence, Iranian-backed Shiite militias would dramatically increase their attacks on Sunnis. Sunni militias backed by the Saudis or others would retaliate in kind, drawing Iraq more and more into a vicious cycle of violence. If Iraq descended into a full-blown civil war, the chaos could trigger similar clashes throughout the region as Sunni-Shiite tensions spill across Iraq's borders. The death toll and displacement of civilians could climb exponentially.

I am quoting from a piece Natan Sharansky wrote entitled ''Leave Iraq and Brace for a Bigger Bloodbath.''

We are not seeking an indefinite presence of the United States of America in Iraq. We are seeking the opportunity for this surge to have a chance to succeed. As General Lynch was quoted as saying:

> Surge forces are giving us the capability we have now to take the fight to the enemy. The enemy only responds to force, and we now have that force. We can conduct detailed kinetic strikes, we can do coordinate searches, and deny the enemy sanctuaries. If those surge forces go away, that capability goes away, and the security forces aren't ready yet to do that mission.

I am not asking us to blindly follow the lead of our military leaders, but I am asking us to give the person whom we unanimously voted to confirm as our military commander in Iraq, knowing full well what his strategy and surge was, a chance to succeed.

Time after time we hear General Lynch, the 3rd ID commander, say:

> Pulling out before the mission was accomplished would be a mess. You would find the enemy regularly gaining ground, reestablishing sanctuaries, building more IEDs, and the violence would escalate.

I share the frustration that all Americans do. This war has been mishandled. We have paid an enormous sacrifice, both the sacrifice of American blood and treasure, but I believe, as the Washington Post said:

> Before Congress begins managing rotation schedules and ordering withdrawals, it should at least give these generals the months they asked for to see whether their strategy can offer some new hope.

I hope we understand what this debate is about, whether we will set a timetable for troop withdrawals within

120 days or whether we will give General Petraeus and his able commanders and the brave young men and women who are serving an opportunity to see if this new strategy can succeed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I had made arrangements with the managers to speak between 12 and 12:30 on another matter, the pending nomination of Judge Leslie Southwick for the Fifth Circuit. Others have spoken longer, so I would ask unanimous consent that at this time I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes. I will try to make it a little shorter.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators SPECTER, KLOBUCHAR, and HARKIN, in that order, each be recognized for up to 10 minutes as in morning business, and that at the conclusion of those remarks the Senate stand in recess, as previously ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I need a little more time than that. I will try to be shorter, but I would like the leeway of up to 15 minutes, as I had asked a few moments ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WEBB. I so modify my request, unless there is objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE LESLIE H. SOUTHWICK

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as stated a moment ago, I have sought recognition to speak about the nomination of a Mississippi appellate court judge, Leslie H. Southwick, to be a Federal judge on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. I have asked for this time because Judge Southwick has been before the Judiciary Committee on several occasions and, because there is not much known about his record, there have been certain objections raised. I have talked to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and when they hear about his record, they are surprised that he is not moving through expeditiously. I thought it would be important to take a few moments to acquaint Senators with his record and, beyond that, to acquaint the public with the pending nomination.

This Chamber has seen some very contentious moments, going back over the past two decades, of partisanship on judicial nominations and extensive filibusters in 2004. Judges of both sides have been held up, with Republican Presidential nominees held up by a Democratic-controlled Senate, and the same thing with President Clinton's nominees being held up by a Republican Senate. I moved and supported President Clinton's nominees when they were qualified, and broke ranks. It seems to me that we ought to be looking at the merits of these nominees and not engaging in partisanship to block nominations when courts such as the Fifth Circuit are urgently in need of additional judicial manpower.

Judge Southwick has a very outstanding record, which I will detail briefly. I also want to deal with the objections which have been raised against him, which I do not think are substantial—not disqualifiers by any sense. Judge Southwick is 57 years old—a perfect age to come to the court of appeals, considering his background. He is a cum laude graduate of Rice University in 1972 and has a law degree from the University of Texas. He served as a law clerk on the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, and then he was a law clerk to Judge Charles Clark on the Fifth Circuit. So he has had experience in a clerk's capacity on the court to which he has now been nominated. He practiced law for 12 years, with a distinguished practice first as an associate and then as a partner at a respected Mississippi law firm. He was Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the United States Department of Justice for 4 years between 1989 and 1993.

He is an adjunct professor at the Mississippi School of Law. He has been a volunteer for Habitat for Humanity doing community service. He was the recipient of the Judicial Excellence Award from the Mississippi State Bar and was rated by the American Bar Association as unanimously well qualified.

When he was 42 years old, in 1992, he obtained an age waiver in order to join the Army Reserve. Then, in 2002, he volunteered, at the age of 53, to transfer to a line combat unit, and he served on forward-operating bases near Najaf in Iraq.

Major General Harold Cross characterized Judge Southwick's volunteering for duty in Iraq as follows:

> This was a courageous move; as it was widely known at the time that the 155th was nearly certain to mobilize for overseas duties in the near future.

He is a man with an outstanding background and a courageous man who stepped forward at an advanced age to volunteer for service in Iraq, something that doesn't happen very often. It is a very rare occurrence.

On the Mississippi Court of Appeals, Judge Southwick has participated in between 6,000 and 7,000 cases—it is hard to be precise because many of them are unreported. He has written 985 opinions himself in the course of some 12 years.

The objections to Judge Southwick have focused on two cases. I wish to discuss very briefly these cases because I think, on their face, they show there is not any reason this man should not be confirmed. I discussed these cases with him. I met with him at length and talked with him about his judicial career and his service in Iraq. He is a mild-mannered professional who is a confident man—not flamboyant and not overstated. We talked about legal issues. He is a solid lawyer and has been a solid judge.

But the objections to him have focused on two cases. In one, a case captioned Richmond v. Mississippi Department of Human Services, the case involved a State social worker, Ms. Bonnie Richmond, who used, admittedly, an outrageous racial slur. The administrative board reviewing the matter to determine whether she should be dismissed or censured made the determination that she should not be dismissed based on the evidence before it: the racial slur was an isolated comment made outside the target's presence, it was followed by an apology which was accepted, and it did not result in significant disruption of the workplace. Under these circumstances, the review board concluded the dismissal of a public employee was not warranted.

Under Mississippi law, the board's ruling could be reversed only if it was arbitrary and capricious. That is the general standard for reversing an administrative decision. The Mississippi Court of Appeals applied that standard, which is deferential to the fact finder, to determine if there was sufficient evidence to support it, and the court decided that there was sufficient evidence.

This is a case where Judge Southwick did not write the opinion, only concurred in the opinion. The Mississippi Supreme Court, while finding that the administrative board needed to give more detailed reasons for its conclusions, nonetheless concluded that dismissal was not warranted—agreeing with the appellate court on which Judge Southwick sat.

In the hearing before the Judiciary Committee, Judge Southwick was asked about the case, and he said the slur was ''always offensive,'' ''inherently and highly derogatory,'' and said there was ''no worse word.''

In the face of his overwhelmingly good record, how can a man be denied confirmation on the basis of that situation?

There was another case about which Judge Southwick has been questioned, S.B. v. L.W., a custody case where the chancellor awarded the father custody of a child instead of the child's bisexual mother.

There were numerous factors leading to the award for the father, all of which were considered and weighed in favor of the father—steady job, higher income, owner of a large residence, and roots in the community.

The objection came because the majority and concurring opinions—again, not Judge Southwick's opinions, but ones that he joined—made reference to ''homosexual lifestyle.'' But, that is the same phrase used in Mississippi Supreme Court precedent. It is also a phrase which was used by the majority in the Lawrence case, Lawrence v. Texas, and has been used by many people, including President Clinton. So, there is hardly a basis for objecting to that kind of a reference, it seems to me.

My record on civil rights and on rights for people regardless of lifestyle is well accepted. I can't see how this man can be pilloried on this basis. Moreover, he wrote an opinion, in a case called Hughey v. State of Mississippi, where he affirmed the trial court's decision to disallowed cross-examination as to the victim's sexual preference, saying he recognized the victim was homosexual, but that was not relevant to the defense and that such a line of inquiry would produce undue prejudice.

If there is a case where lifestyle is not involved, the trial court would not allow a party to try to smear someone with a reference to his or her being a homosexual. Judge Southwick affirmed it, as anybody would. But it shows his own sensitivity on this matter.

There are a couple of comments by some individuals who are very supportive—one a woman named La'Verne Edney, a distinguished African-American lawyer who is a partner in a prominent Jackson, Mississippi firm. She had some very complimentary things to say about Judge Southwick. He hired her as a clerk at a time when few others would hire a young African-American woman. Similarly, a practicing attorney named Patrick Beasley, also African American, wrote about Judge Southwick's sensitivity on racial matters. Because of limited time, I ask unanimous consent their statements be printed in the RECORD without my going into them.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 6, 2007.

Re letter of Endorsement for Leslie Southwick's appointment to the United States Court of Appeals.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: Judge Leslie Southwick has received a nomination to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. I feel Judge Southwick would make an outstanding addition to the Court of Appeals. I write to support his application. My name is Patrick Earl Beasley. I am a licensed attorney in Mississippi and Georgia and have had the pleasure of knowing Judge Southwick for nearly a decade; I was also employed as his law clerk while he served as Presiding Judge on the Mississippi Court of Appeals. Additionally, we have both served as members of the Mississippi Army National Guard. From these contacts, I believe I can comment knowledgeably about his intelligence, his character, and his commitment to excellence at large.

During my tenure as Judge Southwick's law clerk, I was impressed by the constraint Judge Southwick exhibited as a jurist on the appellate court. His most notable quality was his commitment to following established precedent. This often required him to put aside his personal convictions to uphold his role on the Court. In my opinion, this is a quality more jurists should emulate. His intellect is unsurpassed and be approached his job as a public servant with the same vigor and dedication that one would expect from a partner at a major law firm.

Lastly, on the issue of fairness to minorities, I speak from personal experience that Leslie Southwick is a good man who has been kind to me for no ulterior reason. I am not from an affluent family and have no political ties. While I graduated in the top third of my law school class, there were many individuals in my class with higher grade point averages and with family ''pedigrees'' to match. Yet, despite all of typical requirements for the clerkship that I lacked, Judge Southwick gave me an opportunity. Despite all the press to the contrary, Judge Southwick is a fair man and this is one of the qualities that makes him an excellent choice for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

I would be pleased to provide any additional information in support of Judge Leslie Southwick's appointment to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. If you need any additional information, please contact me at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

PATRICK E. BEASLEY.

BRUNINI, GRANTHAM, GROWER & HEWES, PLLC,
Jackson, Mississippi, June 5, 2007.

Re Judge Leslie Southwick Nomination.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: I am an African-American partner at the law firm of Brunini, Grantham, Grower & Hewes, PLLC, where Judge Southwick was once a member. I believe in fairness for all people and salute our leaders for giving their lives to assure that fairness. While I share the sentiments of other African-Americans that the federal judiciary needs to be more diverse, I believe that Judge Southwick is imminently qualified for the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and write in support of his nomination.

I met Judge Southwick during my third year of law school when I interned with the Court of Appeals of Mississippi. That internship allowed me an opportunity to work with most of the Judges on the bench at that time. I was most impressed with Judge Southwick because of his work ethic and his serene personality. When I finished law school in 1996. I believed that my chances for landing a clerkship were slim because there was only one African-American Court of Appeals judge on the bench at the time and there were very few Caucasian judges during the history of the Mississippi Supreme Court or the Court of Appeals (which was fairly new) who had ever hired African-American law clerks. In spite of the odds, I applied for a clerkship. Judge Southwick granted me an interview and hired me that same day. While Judge Southwick had many applicants to choose from, he saw that I was qualified for the position and granted me the opportunity.

During my tenure as clerk with the Court, Judge Southwick thought through every issue and took every case seriously. He earned a reputation for his well thought out opinions and his ability to produce the highest number of opinions in a term. It did not matter the parties' affiliation, color, or stature—what mattered was what the law said and Judge Southwick worked very hard to apply it fairly. Judge Southwick valued my opinions and included me in all of the discussions of issues presented for decision. Having worked closely with Judge Southwick, I have no doubt that he is fair, impartial, and has all of the other qualities necessary to be an excellent addition to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

In addition to serving our State, Judge Southwick has also honorably served our country. During his mission to Iraq in 2005, Southwick found the time to write me often to let me know about his experiences there. Upon his return to the United States, Judge Southwick shared with others his humbling experience serving our country. It is clear from his writings and speaking that he served with pride and dignity.

Over the years, Judge Southwick has earned the reputation of being a person of high morals, dignity, and fairness. It is unfortunate that there are some who have made him the chosen sacrifice to promote agendas and have set out to taint all that Judge Southwick has worked so hard to accomplish. I am prayerful that those efforts will not preclude Judge Southwick from serving as our next Judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

If additional information is needed, please feel free to contact me.

Yours truly,

A. LA'VERNE EDNEY.

Mr. SPECTER. I also ask unanimous consent that the following statement highlighting praise for Judge Southwick be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORT FOR LESLIE SOUTHWICK

Simply listening to those who know Judge Southwick best makes it easy to understand why the American Bar Association unanimously concluded that he is ''Well Qualified'' to serve on the Circuit Court. Judge Southwick is free from bias and committed to equal justice under the law.

La'Verne Edney, a distinguished African-American woman who is a partner at a prominent Jackson, Mississippi law firm, a member of the Magnolia Bar Association, the Mississippi Women Lawyers' Association and a member of the Mississippi Task Force for Gender Fairness, has shared her compelling story of Judge Southwick giving her an opportunity when few would:

''When I finished law school . . . I believed that my chances for landing a clerkship were slim because there was only one African-American Court of Appeals judge on the bench at the time and there were very few Caucasian judges during the history of the Mississippi Supreme Court or the Court of Appeals . . . who had ever hired African-American law clerks. . . . While Judge Southwick had many applicants to choose from, he saw that I was qualified for the position and granted me the opportunity.''

As a clerk, Ms. Edney observed, ''It did not matter the parties' affiliation, color or stature—what mattered was what the law said and Judge Southwick worked very hard to apply it fairly. Judge Southwick valued my opinions and included me in all of the discussions of issues presented for discussion. Having worked closely with Judge Southwick, I have no doubt that he is fair, impartial, and has all of the other qualities necessary to be an excellent addition to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.''

Patrick E. Beasley, a practicing attorney in Jackson, Mississippi, who also happens to be African American, endorsed Judge Southwick for, among other qualities, his fairness to minorities. Beasley wrote, ''I speak from personal experience that Leslie Southwick is a good man who has been kind to me for no ulterior reason. I am not from an affluent family and have no political ties. While I graduated in the top third of my law school class, there were many individuals in my class with higher grade point averages and with family 'pedigrees' to match. Yet, despite all of the typical requirements for the clerkship that I lacked, Judge Southwick gave me an opportunity. Despite all the press to the contrary, Judge Southwick is a fair man and this is one of the qualities that

makes him an excellent choice for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.''

Jose Alberto Cantu, a self-described lifelong Democrat, expressed outrage over what he considered to be the unfair characterization of his friend from Edinburg, Texas. After reading an article in the Houston Chronicle, he wrote, ''I was shocked to read about the opposition to his nomination on this basis [race]. I was a classmate of Judge Southwick in high school and knew him very well. I always found him to be extremely polite and absolutely fair with everyone. What the paper and the political activist referenced in the article imply is that Judge Southwick is a racist because of the ruling on the Court. This is absolutely ridiculous and totally unfair. The Valley has a large Hispanic population, and Leslie never showed the type of discriminatory attitudes that were implied in the article. To the contrary, I remember him as treating everyone fairly and with respect.''

John C. Hengan, a lifelong Democrat and former Chief of Staff to a Democratic Governor of Mississippi strongly refutes the mischaracterizations of Judge Southwick's character. ''I cannot disagree more strongly with the personal attacks that are being made against his character, integrity, or fitness for office, or about his commitment to civil rights for all people regardless of their race, color, sex, creed, religion, or national origin. It is an abomination that he should have to experience these unfair and unjust personal attacks because they are quite simply untrue and cannot be made by anyone who has had the opportunity to meet, work, or be around Leslie for even an abbreviated period of time.''

Former Mississippi Supreme Court Justice James L. Robertson, who has known Judge Southwick for 20 years, attests to the judge's commitment to fairness. He observed, ''Importantly, there is not a hint of racism in Judge Southwick's being. I am certain that Chief Judge Leslie D. King, and Judge Tyree Irving, his two African-American colleagues on the Court of Appeals with whom Judge Southwick served for many years, would be the first to tell you this, were they not prohibited [by judicial ethics canons] from such endorsements. . . . It is common knowledge in this area that I do not support President Bush on very many of his policy initiatives. I voted for Vice President Gore in 2000, and I voted for Senator Kerry in 2004. But even a blind hog will root up an acorn every once in a while. Judge Leslie Southwick just might turn out to be a golden nugget.''

Phillip L. McIntosh, Associate Dean at the Mississippi College School of Law, noted that Judge Southwick was unanimously approved for a faculty position by ''a politically and racially diverse faculty'' and that ''not one note of concern about Judge Southwick's integrity, fairness, or impartiality was sounded.''

Robert H Canizaro, a self-described ''Liberal Democrat,'' expressed his ''strong[] support'' for Judge Southwick as ''an intelligent, dedicated, hard working, moderate judge who respects the rights of all.'' Canizaro stated that the New York Times's suggestion to the contrary is ''ludicrous.''

Judge Southwick's temperament is what we hope for in a federal judge.

Justice Kay B. Cobb, former Presiding Justice of the Supreme Court of Mississippi, has written, ''Judge Southwick's scholarship and character are stellar. The opinions he wrote during his ten years on the Mississippi Court of Appeals reflect his thoroughness and fairness as well as the depth of his knowledge and the quality and clarity of his reasoning and writing. . . . His awareness and attention to promoting fairness and equality with regard to race and gender are exemplary. Our country needs conscientious and independent judges of impeccable integrity and I cannot think of anyone who better qualifies for this appointment!''

Jim Rosenblatt, Dean of the Mississippi College of Law, wrote, ''In all my dealings with Leslie Southwick he has shown himself to be respectful of others no matter their station in life, their religious convictions, or their ethnic background. He takes a genuine interest in people and spends a great deal of time listening to others and little time talking about himself. He is modest and self-effacing . . .''

Bronson E. Newburger, who worked with Judge Southwick on the Board of the Jackson Servant Leadership Corps, an organization that places recent college graduates in a communal home where they can devote themselves full time to serving the underprivileged in the inner city, came to know Judge Southwick well. ''I found him to be levelheaded, sensitive, and compassionate . . . He is a decent, fair, and compassionate public servant dedicated to equal rights and protections for all.

David J. Anderson, a retired career civil servant who worked with Judge Southwick at the Justice Department, was similarly impressed with Judge Southwick's character. Mr. Anderson, who describes himself as ''a Democrat'' who is ''moderate to liberal'' in his politics, wrote ''I have to say that Leslie Southwick was an outstanding public servant, head and shoulders above most political appointees I served with during my 35 years in government. He was intelligent, thoughtful, fair minded, and devoted to the rule of law. He was no ideologue. I never saw him make a decision on any basis other than the merits of a particular issue or problem.''

Mr. SPECTER. How much time remains, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A little more than 3 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. In conclusion, in the last 3½ minutes I have, I wish to point out what has happened in this matter.

Chairman LEAHY advised me this nomination would go through the Judiciary Committee on a voice vote. Then, when that effort was made, Senator FEINGOLD objected and any member of the Judiciary Committee has the right to hold over a nominee for 1 week. So, it did not go through on a voice vote, notwithstanding the fact that Senator LEAHY, the chairman, said that was his plan.

Senator MCCONNELL has advised that the majority leader, Senator REID, had said the nomination would be confirmed before the Memorial Day recess, which is some time ago now. So, this nomination was on the brink of confirmation, according to the chairman's statement that it would go through committee on a voice vote. He didn't expect someone to raise an objection, and he was powerless to move it on a voice vote once an objection was raised, but that was his expectation and mine.

And, as I said, the majority leader told the Republican leader there would be a confirmation before the Memorial Day recess.

It is my hope we will not allow partisanship to once again grip this body. This Senate, under Republican control, wouldn't give hearings to President Clinton's nominees and wouldn't bring them up for floor votes. I objected to that, bucking my party, crossing party lines, and voting for Clinton nominees.

We had protracted filibusters in 2004 and threats of the Constitutional—or ''nuclear''—option. I hope we do not go back to that. This body, as we all know, works on unanimous consent. Any Senator can raise an objection to dispensing with a reading of an amendment or a reading of the record, as we saw during the immigration debate, and can tie up this Senate endlessly if someone wants to impede the work of the Senate. It is my hope we will not descend to that.

We have very important matters to take up—Iraq, the Department of Defense reauthorization bill, the override of the President's veto on stem cells, and many appropriations bills. This man, Judge Southwick—I have gone through his record in detail. My own record on the Judiciary Committee is one of nonpartisanship. If I have found nominees submitted by Republican Presidents to be objectionable, I have not hesitated to say so. But this man has an impeccable record, an outstanding record, with 985 authored opinions. The two opinions that have been called into question are opinions which he didn't write, but merely joined, on matters which—while they might have been articulated differently, might have been more sensitive—certainly are not disqualifiers. This man ought to be confirmed. I have taken the time to go into some detail on his record because I have told my colleagues about his record and many people have been surprised there is controversy.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for sitting overtime and my colleague from Minnesota for her patience—I think she has been patient—and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the Senate is in its second week of debate on the future of U.S. military engagement in Iraq. It is a very timely and momentous debate which reflects the American people's concerns with events in Iraq, and I am hopeful more of my colleagues will join those of us who have voted over and over again to limit the U.S. engagement in Iraq.

I opposed this war from the start, and I have long advocated for responsible change of course in the administration's policy. I believe the best that we can do for our troops, for our national interests, and for the Iraqis themselves is to begin transitioning to Iraqi authority and to begin bringing our troops home in a responsible way, to remove the bulk of U.S. combat forces by the spring of next year.

I remember being at the funeral for one of our brave, fallen soldiers in Minnesota and hearing a priest say—he noted that this young man was a strong, strapping boy. He was over 6 feet tall. He said the kids we are sending over there may be over 6 feet tall,

but they are still our children. If they are over 6 feet tall, then our leaders must be 8 feet tall in making these difficult decisions. I hope this week this Congress stands tall, this Senate stands tall and makes the right decision.

POOL SAFETY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about another subject, and that is an accident that happened in Minnesota over the Fourth of July break. It brought home to me and many people in my State that there are many ways that Government must act to protect its citizens. Some of them are larger than life—the debate over the strategy in Iraq. Others are smaller and quieter, a little girl lying maimed in a hospital bed after an accident that a simple law could have prevented.

We are in the midst of the summer swimming season in our State and all over the country, a time when children of all ages take to the swimming pools—as they should. Today, I wish to speak about the terrible injury suffered by a young girl in my State only weeks ago. That is why I feel such a sense of urgency about moving the legislation that is currently pending in the Senate—it is going to be considered by the Commerce Committee this week—which would help prevent serious injury or death for other children in the future.

Abigail Taylor, known as Abby, is a 6-year-old girl from suburban Minnesota, a girl with big brown eyes and a dazzling smile who loved to swim. Last month Abby went swimming at a local pool. She was in the shallow wading pool when she sat over an open drain hole and had most of her intestines torn out by the drain's powerful suction.

Somehow this little 6-year-old girl managed to stand up and take a few steps before collapsing along the side of the wading pool. Now, nearly 3 weeks later, she remains hospitalized after undergoing several surgeries. She will survive, thanks to a miracle, her parents believe, but it is expected that she will need a feeding tube for the rest of her life. All of this, simply because she spent a sunny summer day at a pool.

What happened to this little 6-year-old girl is horrific. My own daughter's name is Abigail, and hearing about this incident brings chills to any parent. When I first saw this story about this in our local newspaper, I had to stop reading because the details of it were so disturbing. They would be for any parent.

I look at this first as a mother. Your daughter is enjoying a beautiful summer day having fun playing at the local pool. It is not even a deep pool. It is just a kiddy pool. But suddenly something terrible happens, and your life is changed forever.

When it was first reported, like everyone else, I thought this was some kind of freak, one-of-a-kind incident. I never thought I would be spending time talking about it on the Senate floor. But then I learned that, unfortunately, this is not the first time this has happened. As it turns out, although most pools are safe and well maintained, this type of incident has happened too many times before, resulting in the deaths of several dozen children over the past 15 years.

It even has a name: pool entrapment. It occurs when a child becomes stuck on a drain and is unable to escape due to the high velocity and pressure of the water being sucked into the drain.

Another scenario occurs when hair or jewelry gets sucked into the drain, making it difficult for a child to pull free. According to the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the pressure on some pool drains can be as strong as 300 pounds per inch. In fact, several years ago, the Commission produced an educational video on this danger.

It showed a muscular man trying to pull an inflatable ball off a swimming pool drain. Using both arms and all of his might, he couldn't do it; the suction force was just too powerful.

Two years ago the Consumer Product Safety Commission issued a report saying it was aware of at least 27 deaths and many more emergency room visits and hospitalizations due to this entrapment. Most of these victims were children. It is unclear how many actual entrapment incidents have not resulted in death but severe injury because entrapment is a little-known risk. It is possible that many swimming pool drowning deaths or other injuries have not been classified as caused by entrapment.

I think it is curious that I know of three of these incidents: the one in Minnesota, the one I am about to talk about involving Jim Baker's granddaughter, and another one in which former Senator Edwards represented a family with the tragic incident involving a pool drain.

You know, it never even crosses a parent's mind that at the bottom of the kiddy pool is something that has enough force and will cause death or severe injury as it did to Abby Taylor. But it should never have happened, and we must do everything we can to make sure it never happens again to any child because it is preventable.

There are several simple ways, as we will discuss in the Commerce Committee hearing this week, for manufacturers to reduce entrapment risk at pools: installing antientanglement and antientrapment drain covers; installing multiple drains, reducing suction force for each drain; installing a gravity flow or a safety vacuum release system, that prevents entrapment by automatically shutting off the pool pump.

These antientrapment measures are simple and inexpensive, and they can literally save children's lives. I saw a drain today that costs 50 bucks. That, plus adequate monthly inspection, can save lives.

There are also reasonable measures that Congress can take to help strengthen pool safety standards and prevent this kind of terrible incident from ever happening again to another child. The Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over product safety. It is led by two of my colleagues, Senators INOUYE and STEVENS, who have been leaders on this issue. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the legislation introduced last week by Senators PRYOR, STEVENS, DODD, and myself, which would strengthen the safety standards for America's swimming pools and spas so we can prevent the kind of incident that happened to 6-year-old Abby Taylor.

As chairman of the Consumer Subcommittee, Senator PRYOR has pushed to have this legislation included on the agenda for this week's committee markup. This legislation is called the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Safety Act, named in memory of the 7-year-old granddaughter of former Secretary of State James Baker.

It was an honor to meet this morning with Graeme's mother. She was here in her daughter's memory talking to Members of Congress. Several years ago, Graeme died as a result of suction entrapment in a spa. Her body was held underwater by the force of the suction, and it took two adults to help pry her free from the drain. But it was too late. She had already drowned.

This tragedy occurred at a graduation party that was well supervised by scores of adults. The purpose of this legislation is to reduce the likelihood that any other child will end up like Graeme Baker or Abby Taylor.

This same bill was introduced last year. The Senate passed it by unanimous consent. But in the closing days of the last Congress, it failed to pass the House of Representatives by a narrow margin. Now, what do you say when you talk, as I did, to the father of this little girl, Abby Taylor, who is lying maimed in a hospital bed losing her intestines? You tell them that: Well, we got it through the Senate, but the House just did not have the votes to do it.

These parents are so courageous that they have moved on from that. They want her severe injuries to be discussed today. They are not afraid to have us talking about what happened to their little daughter because they want it never to happen to another child.

This year this legislation must pass. The legislation has several important provisions. It would take Consumer Product Safety Commission standards for pool drains, which are now voluntary, and make them mandatory.

It would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or distribution of drain covers that do not meet the standards established by the Commission. It is important to strengthen the legislation to make sure that not only new pools but all public pools meet the same standard.

The legislation also provides incentives for States to adopt their own

comprehensive pool safety laws regarding certain water safety devices, that they be installed to protect children. It also would contain grants to create these incentives.

There is a saying that when an accident happens that could reasonably have been prevented, then it is not accurate to call it an accident; it is actually a failure.

In the case of injuries and deaths caused by pool entrapment, it is not a failure by children or by their parents, it is a failure of our product safety laws. This means it is also a failure that it is within our power to correct, a problem that can be fixed through reasonable measures contained in this legislation.

We deal with issues larger than life, as we will today as we debate the war in Iraq. But sometimes a simple, small change in a law will save the life of a small child. Let's never forget what happened to innocent children such as Abby Taylor and Graeme Baker. For the health and safety of all of our children, I urge the Senate to take quick action to approve this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

DR. NORMAN BORLAUG'S RECEIPT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, in a very beautiful ceremony in the Rotunda of the Capitol this morning, Dr. Norman Borlaug was presented with the Congressional Gold Medal, America's highest civilian award.

Dr. Borlaug, of course, as we know, is the father of the Green Revolution and the winner of the Nobel Peace Price in 1970. In 1986 he established a World Food Prize, which is headquartered in my home State of Iowa, to recognize individuals who have improved the quality, quantity, and availability of food around the globe.

Dr. Borlaug was born and raised in Iowa, earned his Ph.D. in plant pathology and genetics at the University of Minnesota in 1942. After graduation he went to work in Mexico where he developed high-yield, disease-resistant varieties of wheat, which dramatically increased food production.

He then went on to introduce these and other high-yield wheat varieties in Pakistan and India, which had the effect of nearly doubling production in those countries, saving countless lives.

It was pointed out this morning that in the previous 4,000 years, rice production in those countries had leveled off, but in the 4 years after Dr. Borlaug introduced his new strains of rice, they actually doubled that production. Yields that had been basically unchanged for 4,000 years, they doubled in 4 years with new genetics and practices.

Iowans are a humble people. But we are very proud of the long line of Iowans who have been extraordinary leaders in bringing food to a hungry world, people such as Herbert Hoover, Henry C. Wallace, Henry A. Wallace, and first and foremost, Dr. Norman Borlaug.

When I think of Dr. Borlaug's achievements, I am reminded of those famous words in the Book of Proverbs:

> Where there is no vision, the people perish.

More than half a century ago, Dr. Borlaug surveyed a world where starvation and malnourishment were rampant. And he had a vision of a Green Revolution. Because of that vision, upwards of 1 billion lives were saved across the globe, which is an accomplishment of staggering proportions.

Well, that's not bad for a kid who began his education in a one-room rural schoolhouse near Cresco, IA.

Norman Borlaug has been called a great scientist, a great agronomist, and a great humanitarian. Of course, he is all of those things. He is also a great persuader, a man who time and again overcame political and cultural challenges in order to spread his revolution, first in Mexico, then in Asia, and now Africa.

The good news is that at the age of 93, Dr. Borlaug is still going strong, still curious and creative, still full of dreams for changing the world. As I said, he started the World Food Prize and has devoted a great deal of time and energy to strengthen and elevate that initiative with crucial help from John Ruan of Des Moines. There is, for example, the World Food Prize Borlaug-Ruan Internship Program, in which young people, about 100 every year, take part. They present papers on research in different parts of the world, and then a number are chosen and are sent as interns to places around the world to learn and begin the process, as Norman Borlaug did, of working with people to expand food production.

Let me just read from one paragraph of Norman Borlaug's statement on the occasion of the Congressional Gold Medal ceremony this morning on July 17.

He ended his remarks by saying:

> My plea today to the members of Congress and to the Administration is to re-commit the United States to more dynamic and generous programs of official development assistance in agriculture for Third World nations, as was done in the 1960s and 1970s. Ever-shrinking foreign aid budgets in support of smallholder agriculture, and especially to multilateral research and development organizations such as the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) where I have worked for 40 years, as well as its sister research institutes under the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), are not in our nation's best interest, nor do they represent our finest traditions.

In other words, he is saying cuts to these programs that we are making are not in our Nation's best interests and do not represent our finest traditions.

> As you chart the course of this great nation

Dr. Borlaug tells us—

> for the future benefit of our children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, I ask you to think more boldly and humanely about the Third World and develop a new version of the Marshall plan, this time not to rescue a war-torn Europe, but now to help the nearly one billion, mostly rural poor people still trapped in hunger and misery. It is within America's technical and financial power to help end this human tragedy and injustice, if we set our hearts and minds to the task.

One more thing that Norman Borlaug said this morning, is this: When people are in misery and they are hungry and they do not have enough to eat, all kinds of ''isms'' begin to flourish, including terrorism.

He said, if we really want to get at the root cause of terrorism and the recruitment of terrorists, feed a hungry world. Make sure everyone has enough to eat.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the full statement of Norman E. Borlaug on the occasion of his receiving the Congressional Gold Medal this morning.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORMAN E. BORLAUG—STATEMENT ON THE OCCASION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL CEREMONY, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, JULY 17, 2007

It is a great honor to be awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, in recognition of my work to feed a hungry world. I thank members of Congress for giving me an opportunity to comment on the challenges and complexities of feeding a world of 10 billion people who I expect will be living on the planet Earth sometime this century.

When I was born—in 1914—there were only 1.6 billion people on Earth. Today, we are 6.5 billion and growing by 80 million per year. The task of feeding this growing population has been made more complex, since agriculture is now being asked not only to produce food, feed and fiber, but also raw materials for bio-fuels. Thus, there is no room for complacency for those of us working on the food front.

I am now in my 63rd year of continuous involvement in agricultural research and production in low-income, food-deficit developing countries. I have worked with many scientists, political leaders, and farmers to transform food production systems. Any achievements I have made have been possible through my participation in this army of hunger fighters. There are too many to name, but you know who you are. I thank you for your dedication and assistance all of these years. I also thank my family, and my late wife Margaret, for the understanding and unselfish support you have given me

The Green Revolution was a great historic success. In 1960, perhaps 60 percent of the world's people felt hunger during some portion of the year. By the year 2000, the proportion of hungry in the world had dropped to 14 percent of the total population. Still, this figure translated to 850 million men, women and children who lacked sufficient calories and protein to grow strong and healthy bodies. Thus, despite the successes of the Green Revolution, the battle to ensure food security for hundreds of millions of miserably poor people is far from won.

The Green revolution

The breakthroughs in wheat and rice production in Asia in the mid-1960s, which came to be known as the Green Revolution, symbolized the beginning of a process of using agricultural science to develop modern techniques for the Third World. It began in Mexico with the ''quiet'' wheat revolution in the late 1950s. During the 1960s and 1970s, India,

Pakistan, and the Philippines received world attention for their agricultural progress. In the 1980s and 1990s, China, home to one fifth of the world's people, has been the greatest success story. China today is the world's biggest food producer and its crop yields are approaching those of the United States with every successive year. However, it is almost certain, that China and India—home to one third of the world's people—will become the largest agricultural importers in the coming decades, as their economies shift from being agrarian to industrial.

Critics of modern agricultural technology invariably turn a blind eye on what the world would have been like without the technological advances that have occurred, largely during the past 50 years. For those whose main concern is protecting the ''environment,'' let's look at the positive impact that the application of science-based technology has had on land use. If the global cereal yields of 1950 still prevailed in 2000 we would have needed nearly 1.2 billion ha of additional land of the same quality—instead of the 660 million ha that was used—to achieve the global harvest of that year. Obviously, such a surplus of land was not available, and certainly not in populous Asia, where the population had increased from 1.2 to 3.8 billion over this period. Moreover, if more environmentally fragile land had been brought into agricultural production, the impact on soil erosion, loss of forests and grasslands, biodiversity and extinction of wildlife species would have been enormous and disastrous.

At least in the foreseeable future, plants—and especially the cereals—will continue to supply much of our increased food demand, both for direct human consumption and as livestock feed to satisfy the rapidly growing demand for meat in the newly industrializing countries. It is likely that an additional 1 billion metric tons of grain will be needed annually by 2025, just to feed the world, let alone fuel its vehicles. Most of this increase must come from lands already in production through yield improvements. Fortunately, such productivity improvements in crop management can be made all along the line—in plant breeding, crop management, tillage, water use, fertilization, weed and pest control, and harvesting.

Africa's food production challenges

More than any other region of the world, African food production is in crisis. High rates of population growth and little application of improved production technology during the last two decades resulted in declining per capita food production, escalating food deficits, deteriorating nutritional levels, especially among the rural poor, and devastating environmental degradation. While there are more signs since 2000 that smallholder food production is beginning to turn around, this recovery is still very fragile.

Sub-Saharan Africa's extreme poverty, poor soils, uncertain rainfall, increasing population pressures, changing ownership patterns for land and cattle, political and social turmoil, shortages of trained agriculturalists, and weaknesses in research and technology delivery systems all make the task of agricultural development more difficult. But we should also realize that to a considerable extent, the present food crisis is the result of the long-time neglect of agriculture by political leaders. Even though agriculture provides livelihoods to 70–85 percent of the people in most countries, agricultural and rural development has been given low priority. Investments in food distribution and marketing systems and in agricultural research and education are woefully inadequate. Furthermore, many governments pursued and continue to pursue a policy of providing cheap food for the politically volatile urban dwellers at the expense of production incentives for farmers.

In 1986 I became involved in food crop technology transfer projects in sub-Saharan Africa, sponsored by the Nippon Foundation and its Chairman, the late Ryoichi Sasakawa, and enthusiastically supported by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter. Our joint program is known as Sasakawa-Global 2000, and has operated in 14 sub-Saharan African countries the past 20 years. We have assisted several million small-scale farmers to grow extension demonstration plots for basic food crops: maize, rice, sorghum, millet, wheat, cassava, and grain legumes.

The recommended production technologies come from national and international agricultural research organizations, and include: (1) the use of the best available commercial varieties or hybrids (2) proper land preparation and seeding to achieve good stand establishment, (3) proper application of the appropriate fertilizers and, when needed, crop protection chemicals, (4) timely weed control, and (5) moisture conservation and/or better water use if under irrigation. We also work with participating farm families to improve on-farm storage of agricultural production, both to reduce grain losses due to spoilage and infestation and to allow farmers to hold stocks longer to exploit periods when prices in the marketplace are more favorable. Virtually without exception, farmers obtain grain yields that are two to three times higher on their demonstration plots than has been traditionally the case. Farmers' enthusiasm is high and political leaders are taking much interest in the program.

Despite the formidable challenges in Africa, the elements that worked in Latin America and Asia will also work there. With more effective seed, fertilizer supply and marketing systems, hundreds of millions of smallholder farmers in Africa can make great strides in improving the nutritional and economic well being of their populations. The biggest bottleneck that must be overcome is lack of infrastructure, especially roads and transport, but also potable water and electricity. In particular, improved transport systems would greatly accelerate agricultural production, break down tribal animosities, and help establish rural schools and clinics in areas where teachers and health practitioners are heretofore unwilling to venture.

Crop research challenges

Crop productivity depends both on the yield potential of the varieties and the crop management employed to enhance input and output efficiency. Agricultural researchers and farmers worldwide face the challenge during the next 25 years of developing and applying technology that can increase the global cereal yields by 50–75 percent, and to do so in ways that are economically and environmentally sustainable. Much of the yield gains will come from applying technology ''already on the shelf'' but yet to be fully utilized. But there will also be new research breakthroughs, especially in plant breeding to improve yield stability and, hopefully, maximum genetic yield potential.

While we must continue to push the frontiers of science forward, we also must be mindful of the need to protect the gains already made. Agriculture is a continuing struggle against mutating pathogens and insects. A clear example is the new race of stem rust that has emerged in East Africa, which is capable of devastating most of the world's commercial bread wheat varieties. Ironically, I began my career in agricultural science combating stem rust some 60 years ago and I am now in the twilight of my life, once again facing my old nemesis. There hasn't been a major stem rust epidemic for more than 50 years, since the virulent race called 15B devastated much of the North America wheat crop during 1950–54. Out of that crisis came new forms of international cooperation in plant breeding, which led to accelerated development around the world of high-yielding, disease-resistant, broadly adapted wheat varieties. However, in the ensuing years, complacency, increasing barriers to international exchange of plant breeding materials, declining budgets, staff retirements and discontinuity in training programs, has resulted in a much weakened system. This has been evident in the slow international response to a very serious new stem rust race, called Ug99, first spotted in Uganda and Kenya in the late 1990s. Ug99 has now escaped from Africa and begun its migration to North Africa and the Middle East. It won't be long before it reaches South Asia and later China, North America and the rest of the wheat-growing world. Wheat scientists are now scrambling to control this disease before it gains a foothold and causes catastrophic losses to the livelihoods of several hundred million wheat farmers and widespread global wheat shortages that will affect prices and the welfare of several billion consumers. Since 2005, excellent collaboration has been forthcoming from the USDA, key land grant universities, and USAID. A far-reaching research program is being considered by a major U.S. foundation located in Seattle that if approved could solidify and accelerate the progress to date. As part of this research effort we also hope to identify why rice, alone among the cereals, is immune to the rust fungi, and then use biotechnology to transfer this genetic immunity from rice to wheat and other cereals. If we are successful in this quest, the scourge of rust, mentioned in the bible, could finally be banished from the Earth.

What can we expect from biotechnology?

During the 20th Century, conventional plant breeding has produced—and continues to produce—modern crop varieties and hybrids that have contributed immensely to grain yield potential, disease and insect resistance, stability of harvests and farm incomes, while sparing vast tracts of land for other uses, such as wildlife habitats, forests, and outdoor recreation.

The majority of agricultural scientists including myself anticipate great benefits from biotechnology in the coming decades to help meet our future needs for food, feed, fiber, and bio-fuels. Promising work, now utilizing the powerful new tools of biotechnology, is also under way to develop greater tolerance of climatic extremes, such as drought, heat, and cold. Such research is likely to become more important in the future as the world experiences the effects of climate change. We must also persist in scientific efforts to raise maximum genetic yield potential to increase food production on lands currently in use while protecting against serious negative environmental impacts.

Seventy percent of global water withdrawals are used for irrigating agricultural lands, which account for 17 percent of total cultivated land yet contribute 40 percent of our global food harvest. Expanding the area under irrigation is critical to meeting future food demand. However, competing urban demands for water will require much great efficiencies in agricultural water use. Through biotechnology we will be able to achieve ''more crop per drop'' by designing plants with reduced water requirements and adoption of improved crop/water management systems.

Developing country governments need to be prepared to work with—and benefit

from—the new breakthroughs in biotechnology. Regulatory frameworks are needed to guide the testing and use of genetically modified crops, which protect public welfare and the environment against undue risk. They must be cost effective to implement yet not be so restrictive that science cannot advance.

Since the private sector patents its life science inventions, agricultural policy makers must be vigilant in guarding against too much concentration of ownership and also be concerned about equity of access issues, especially for poor farmers. These are legitimate matters for debate by national, regional and global governmental organizations.

Even with private sector leadership in biotechnology research I believe that governments should also fund significant public research programs. This is not only important as a complement and balance to private sector proprietary research, but is also needed to ensure the proper training of new generations of scientists, both for private and public sector research institutions.

U.S. agriculture is being asked to produce more food, feed, fiber and now biofuels, while protecting the environment and not greatly increasing land use. Science is ready for the task, but science will not succeed without wise and adequate support from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and its congressional committees. Traditional programs of research and education at USDA and in the land grant universities must continue. Congress must also invest more generously in fundamental research to learn more about the cellular and molecular events that determine how plants and animals reproduce, grow and fight off stresses such as drought, cold and disease. Most of these major innovations will start first with acquiring deeper fundamental understanding.

Getting the most from fundamental research will require changes in the culture of decision making in public agricultural institutions. Leading scientists must be involved in deciding which programs have scientific merit and in setting realistic scientific priorities. There should be a council, like those of the National Institutes of Health, where scientists and stakeholders can pool their wisdom in recommending research priorities. Building such changes into the current farm bill is a high priority.

Educating urbanites about agriculture

The current backlash against agricultural science and technology evident in some industrialized countries is hard for me to comprehend. How quickly humankind becomes detached from the soil and agricultural production! Less than 4 percent of the population in the industrialized countries (less than 2 percent in the USA) is directly engaged in agriculture. With low-cost food supplies and urban bias, is it any wonder that consumers don't understand the complexities of re-producing the world food supply each year in its entirety, and expanding it further for the nearly 80 million new mouths that are born into this world annually? I believe we can help address this ''educational gap'' by making it compulsory in secondary schools and universities for students to take courses on agriculture, biology, and science and technology policy.

One exciting high school program, in which I am personally involved, is the World Food Prize Youth Institute program originated by Des Moines philanthropist Juan Ruan and led by the World Food Prize Foundation. Each year, more than a 100 high school students, mainly from Iowa but now expanding to other states and countries, convene at the George Washington Carver auditorium at Pioneer Hybrid Company headquarters in Johnston, Iowa, with teachers and parents, to present their well-researched essays on about how to increase the quantity, quality, and availability of food around the world. They make these presentations in front of past and present World Food Prize laureates and other experts, and lively discussions ensue. Each year, a select few graduating seniors win travel fellowships to go to a developing country where they live and work at an agricultural research institute, and learn first hand about hunger and poverty, and the role that science and technology can play to alleviate these calamities. It is especially gratifying to see the growth and development of these young, mostly female, summer interns. It literally is a life-changing experience for them, and it shows in their performance at university and in career selections. More programs like this are needed, so that future generations of Americans have a better sense about the complexities and challenges of feeding a growing world.

Agriculture and the environment

As the pace of technological change has accelerated the past 50 years, the fear of science has grown. Certainly, the breaking of the atom and the prospects of a nuclear holocaust added to people's fear, and drove a bigger wedge between the scientist and the layman. Rachel Carson's book Silent Spring, published in 1962, which reported that poisons were everywhere, also struck a very sensitive nerve. Of course, this perception was not totally unfounded. By the mid 20th century air and water quality had been seriously damaged through wasteful industrial production systems that pushed effluents often literally into ''our own backyards.''

We all owe a debt of gratitude to environmental movement in the industrialized nations, which has led to legislation over the past 40 years to improve air and water quality, protect wildlife, control the disposal of toxic wastes, protect the soils, and reduce the loss of biodiversity. However, these positive environmental trends are not found in the developing countries, where environmental degradation, especially in Africa, threatens ecological stability if not reversed.

There is often a deadlock between agriculturalists and environmentalists over what constitutes ''sustainable agriculture'' in the Third World. This debate has confused—if not paralyzed—many in the international donor community who, afraid of antagonizing powerful environmental lobbying groups, have turned away from supporting science-based agricultural modernization projects still needed in much of smallholder Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, and Latin America. This deadlock must be broken.

We cannot lose sight of the enormous job before us to feed 10 billion people, 90 percent of whom will begin life in a developing country, and many in poverty. Only through dynamic agricultural development will there be any hope to alleviate poverty and improve human health and productivity, and reducing political instability.

Closing comments

Thirty-seven years ago, in my acceptance speech for the Nobel Peace Prize, I said that the Green Revolution had won a temporary success in man's war against hunger, which if fully implemented, could provide sufficient food for humankind through the end of the 20th century. But I warned that unless the frightening power of human reproduction was curbed, the success of the Green Revolution would only be ephemeral.

It took some 10,000 years to expand food production to the current level of about 5 billion tons per year. By 2050, we will likely need to nearly double current production again. This cannot be done unless farmers across the world have access to high-yielding crop production methods as well as new biotechnological breakthroughs that can increase the crop yields, dependability, and nutritional quality. Indeed, it is higher farm incomes that will permit small-scale farmers in the Third World to make desperately needed investments to protect their natural resources. As Kenyan archeologist Richard Leakey likes to reminds us, ''you have to be well-fed to be a conservationist.'' We have to bring common sense into the debate on agricultural science and technology and the sooner the better!

The United States is the greatest agricultural success story of the 20th Century. Through science and technology and farmer ingenuity, American agriculture has achieved levels of productivity second to none. We also have a great tradition, especially in earlier decades, of helping low-income; food-deficit nations to get their own agricultural systems moving. Our private agri-businesses have invested heavily in the development of productivity-enhancing technology, not only to the benefit of this country but also around the world. American public institutions—the land-grant universities and colleges, the USDA, and the U.S. Department of State—have played key roles in the transformation of subsistence agriculture, especially in Asia and Latin America. This has been good for the American people and the world. Lest we forget, world peace will not be built on empty stomachs or human misery.

I would be remiss if I did not thank the Administration for establishing the USDA Borlaug Fellows program in 2004, in my honor, at the time of my 90th birthday. This is an international program that actively engages universities like my own Texas A & M University, my alma mater, the University of Minnesota, and many other of our fine land grant universities and colleges. The Borlaug fellows program also has links to the international agricultural research centers located abroad and to private agro-industry. The aim is to provide relatively young scientists from developing countries with opportunities to travel to the USA to gain practical experience and upgrade their technical skills at advanced agricultural laboratories. So far, USDA has been able, with the assistance of USAID, to piece together funding for about 150 Borlaug fellows to come to the United States each year. With more permanent funding, along the lines of the Fulbright program, USDA and the partner universities could implement a more substantial range of learning and personal development opportunities for young scientists and agricultural leaders from developing countries. This would be good for the individual recipients, their sponsoring institutions and countries, and also, I believe, for America. Texas A&M University and Ohio State University have been working through the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) to prepare a more substantial proposal for consideration by Congress.

My plea today to the members of Congress and to the Administration is to re-commit the United States to more dynamic and generous programs of official development assistance in agriculture for Third World nations, as was done in the 1960s and 1970s. Ever-shrinking foreign aid budgets in support of smallholder agriculture, and especially to multilateral research and development organizations such as the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) where I have worked for 40 years, as well as its sister research institutes under the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), are not in our nation's best interest, nor do they represent our finest traditions.

As you chart the course of this great nation for the future benefit of our children, grand-children, and great-grandchildren, I ask you to think more boldly and humanely about the Third World and develop a new version of the Marshall plan, this time not to rescue a war-torn Europe, but now to help the nearly one billion, mostly rural poor people still trapped in hunger and misery. It is within America's technical and financial power to help end this human tragedy and injustice, if we set our hearts and minds to the task.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, earlier today in the Capitol Rotunda we honored Dr. Norman Borlaug with the Congressional Gold Medal. This is the highest expression of national appreciation.

At least two-thirds of Federal lawmakers must sign on to support a nominee before his or her nomination is allowed to advance through Committees in the House and Senate. Previous recipients include distinguished public servants, military heroes, humanitarians, entertainers, musicians, authors, athletes, religious leaders and pioneers in the fields of medicine, science, and aeronautics including our Nation's first President, George Washington.

Many of you know that I farm in Iowa with my son Robin.

Those of us farming take satisfaction in feeding people through our labors.

Through his labors, Dr. Borlaug has been able to feed many more people that Robin and I will ever be able to, even if we worked day and night.

He has spared more people from the sharp hunger pains that strike an empty stomach than anyone of us could ever dream of doing.

He has saved more lives than any other person in history.

An extraordinary man, with a brilliant vision, and the common sense to turn his dreams into a reality—that's Norm Borlaug.

I am grateful, but not surprised, that it didn't take long for Congress to advance the legislation giving Dr. Borlaug this award.

A few years ago, I spoke with Dr. Borlaug just outside the Senate Chamber.

It was overwhelming just how many Senators came off the Senate floor to shake hands with him.

I was glad to be able to claim Dr. Borlaug as a native Iowan who has become a true citizen of the world—from a boyhood on a farm in northeast Iowa—a one-room schoolhouse—to a PhD in plant pathology, to decades in the poorest areas of rural Mexico, and a life of scientific breakthroughs to ease malnutrition and famine all over the world. His work in biotechnology has vastly improved food security for countries including India, Pakistan, and Mexico. This humanitarian hero has been instrumental in seeking social justice and promoting peace around the world.

Far from resting on his laurels, Dr. Borlaug continues to inspire future generations of scientists and farmers to innovate and lift those mired in poverty.

As a fellow Iowan said, ''If you never stick your neck out, you'll never get your head above the crowd.''

Dr. Borlaug stuck his neck out and became a hero and a legend.

He deserves every bit of recognition and gratitude we can find to offer him.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Dr. Norman Borlaug of Dallas, TX.

Today, Dr. Borlaug receives the Congressional Gold Medal—the Nation's highest civilian decoration.

Dr. Borlaug's service to the world's hungry was cultivated on his boyhood farm in Iowa where he learned the value of hard work. He sharpened his knowledge of agriculture and science at the University of Minnesota and later applied his farm and classroom experiences to researching and developing high-yield wheat varieties in Mexico that thrived in arid conditions. Under his leadership, these innovative crops were introduced into India, Pakistan, and later Africa, having since fed the hungry in astonishing numbers.

Never allowing himself to become satisfied with the status quo, Dr. Borlaug continued his humanitarian efforts, paving the way for other scientists to fight hunger and to feed the world's increasing population. Dr. Borlaug created the annual World Food Prize to recognize and reward those who advance human development by improving the quality, quantity, and availability of food in the world.

Each fall semester, Dr. Borlaug returns to Texas A&M University to teach those who would follow in his footsteps and continue to innovate. In his role as distinguished professor of international agriculture in the Department of Soil & Crop Sciences, aspiring Aggie students have the opportunity to witness hard-working benevolence and learn from one of mankind's greatest and most humble benefactors.

There are many lessons we can learn from Dr. Borlaug's service. This man saw a need and applied his education to the realities of poverty and hunger. He chose to put his hands in the soil and work to make a vision become reality.

Dr. Borlaug reminds us that a single individual with the knowledge and courage to make a difference can indeed change the world.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the most recent addition to a long list of accolades that Dr. Borlaug has earned throughout his lifetime, including the 1970 Nobel Peace Prize for his innovative work in agriculture. It has been suggested that Dr. Borlaug's humanitarian efforts have saved the lives of perhaps one billion of the world's hungry, and through his ongoing legacy of leadership his work will feed many more.

We join in gratitude for his consistent dedication in applying the agricultural sciences to benefit so many. I am honored to have been able to cosponsor this award for Dr. Borlaug.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess under the previous order.

Thereupon, at 1:15 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CASEY).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 2100

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30 minutes of debate equally divided on amendment No. 2100 offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I rise to discuss my amendment which lays out the consequences of a failed state in Iraq. As every parent of a teenager knows, one of the things you have to impress upon your teenager is the consequences of their actions. I think we need to have an adult conversation and talk about the consequences of our actions in Iraq.

The one thing we all agree on is that we want to bring our troops home. We want to bring them home as soon as we can. The line of division between us seems to be between those who want to do so based upon an arbitrary political timetable and those who want to do so based on conditions on the ground. So I think it is important to have—as any adult would say to their child—a conversation about the consequences of your actions because I think these are the birds that are going to come home to roost should the Levin amendment be adopted.

As we know from the Iraq Study Group as well as the National Intelligence Estimate, the consequences of a failed state in Iraq are numerous, but they are significant and highly dangerous to the United States.

First of all, Iraq would become a safe haven for Islamic radicals, including al-Qaida and Hezbollah, who are determined to attack the United States and U.S. allies. The Iraq Study Group found that a chaotic Iraq would provide a still stronger base of operation for terrorists who seek to act regionally or even globally. That is not me talking; that is the Iraq Study Group. The Iraq Study Group also noted that al-Qaida will portray any failure by the United States in Iraq as a significant victory that will be featured prominently as they recruit for their cause in the region and around the world.

The National Intelligence Estimate presented by the intelligence community, which consists of the best and the brightest America has to offer, concluded that the consequences of a premature withdrawal from Iraq would be

that al-Qaida would attempt to use Anbar Province for further attacks outside of Iraq, neighboring countries would consider actively intervening in Iraq, and sectarian violence would significantly increase in Iraq, accompanied by massive civilian casualties and displacement. The Iraq Study Group found that a premature American withdrawal from Iraq would almost certainly produce greater sectarian violence and further deterioration of conditions. The near-term results would be a significant power vacuum, greater human suffering, regional destabilization, and a threat to the global economy. Al-Qaida would depict our withdrawal as a historic victory, much as they did when the Soviet Union was run out of Afghanistan.

A failed state in Iraq could lead to a broader regional conflict involving Syria, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey. The Iraq Study Group noted that Turkey could send troops into northern Iraq to prevent Kurdistan from declaring independence. The Iraq Study Group noted that Iran could send troops to restore stability to southern Iraq and perhaps gain control of oilfields. The regional influence of Iran could arise at a time when that country is on a path to producing a nuclear weapon, as we know they are all about.

A failed state in Iraq would lead to massive humanitarian suffering. I know we are all concerned about what we see as the genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan, but those of us who are concerned about that huge humanitarian crisis there must also be concerned about the humanitarian crisis in Iraq should we prematurely withdrawal our troops and that country descend into massive ethnic cleansing and genocide and massive dislocation of refugees to other areas of the Middle East.

A recent editorial in the New York Times said Americans must be clear that Iraq and the region around it could be even bloodier and more chaotic after Americans leave. There could be reprisals against those who work with American forces, further ethnic cleansing, and even genocide. Potentially destabilizing refugee flows could hit Jordan, Syria, and Iran and Turkey could be tempted to make a power grab. The Iraq Study Group found that if we leave and Iraq descends into chaos, the long-range consequences could eventually require the United States to return.

My amendment commits the Senate to take no action that would lead to a failed state in Iraq that would invariably, in the opinion of the Iraq Study Group, a bipartisan group of experts, as well as the National Intelligence Estimate, lead to consequences that would not only be devastating for the Iraqis, it would be destabilizing in that region and would lead to greater loss of life and greater insecurity in the United States.

So I hope all of my colleagues will vote in favor of this amendment at 2:45 when that vote is scheduled. I can't imagine any possible objection to this sense of the Senate on the consequences of a failed state in Iraq.

Finally, I would say this is an important part of the overall debate where we talk about not only what our preferred policy is but what the consequences of a failure would be. I think part of a responsible adult debate is talking about what the consequences would be as we commit ourselves to take no action that would lend an increased likelihood to that failed state.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair notify me when I have spoken for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for explaining his amendment. But when I hear him describe the Levin-Reed amendment, I am afraid I don't recognize it because, unfortunately, the Senator from Texas has failed to include some of the most important elements of this Levin-Reed amendment.

This is the only amendment the Senate will consider during debate on this bill which will change the policy of the war in Iraq. It is the only amendment which establishes a timetable to bring this war to a responsible end. It is the only amendment which in law will require American troops to start to come home, the Levin-Reed amendment.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. A sense-of-the-Senate resolution is done on a regular basis on the floor of the Senate. It does not have the power and impact of law. It is an observation made by the Senate. That is all. It is not binding on the President. It won't change the policy. There is no suggestion that it even could.

What the Senator from Texas brings to us is the possibility that things could get worse in Iraq than they are today, and that is a possibility. But let's be very honest about the state of Iraq today. It is a nation in chaos. It is a nation that is engulfed by its own civil war. It is struggling to decide which faction within its nation will govern. Frankkly, some question whether it will be a nation. I think the Kurds, for example, given their way, would be independent of Iraq as we know it today. This struggle to define Iraq is part of the chaos and consternation we find in that country.

Finally, of course, this civil war is driven by so many elements—criminal elements, al-Qaida elements, Ba'athist elements, Iranian elements, and, yes, a civil war generated by a division within Islam that has gone on for more than 14 centuries. It is into this crucible of hate and killing that we have sent 170,000 American troops who each morning get up, strap on their armor, and go out and pray to God they will live for another day. Is that what we bargained for when President Bush said we had to rid ourselves of Saddam Hussein and weapons of mass destruction?

The Senator from Texas makes the argument that if we leave, things could get worse. It is possible. But I will tell you this: Stabilization will occur on Iraqi terms whenever the American military departs, and it is likely to be chaotic. We have to acknowledge that. Whether we leave in 10 months or 10 years, the Iraqis have to decide their own future.

The elements of the Levin-Reed amendment which the Senator from Texas does not acknowledge are absolutely essential. He will find, when he reads the Levin-Reed amendment, on page 3, paragraph 3, we will still have troops engaged in targeted counterterrorism operations against al-Qaida and al-Qaida-affiliated organizations and other international terrorist organizations.

The Senator from Texas suggests that we will leave and walk away from the scene and hope for the best. That is not true. Under Levin-Reed, we will continue to fight al-Qaida, the fight which we should have been dedicated to from 9/11 forward and a fight which by this time should have brought us Osama bin Laden and his major lieutenants.

Secondly, the argument made by the Senator from Texas is that the Levin-Reed amendment is going to lead to a broader regional conflict as American troops start to come home. I recommend for reading by the Senator from Texas page 2 of the amendment, which goes into graphic detail about our hope that as we start to withdraw, as our troops start to withdraw from Iraq, we will initiate a comprehensive, diplomatic, political, and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement with Iraq's neighbors and the international community for working out collective stability in that country.

I would say to my friend from Texas, what he has suggested as part and parcel of the result of Levin-Reed is already taken care of. We want to start bringing American troops home. Losing 100 American soldiers every month, 1,000 seriously wounded, $12 billion in taxpayers' money, put into a situation which is nothing short of a civil war, is unacceptable.

The future of Iraq is in the hands of the Iraqis. They have to stand up and defend their own country. They have to decide their own future. Is it likely to be smooth sailing as we leave? No. But it is a process which will take place whether we leave within a few months or a year or wait much longer.

I encourage my colleagues to look honestly at this Cornyn amendment. As I reflect on it, I don't think it offers any serious challenge. None of us want to see a failed Iraq. But let's remember that the bottom line is the only

amendment which will change the policy in Iraq is the amendment by Senators LEVIN and REED which we will vote on, after an all-night session, first thing tomorrow morning.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Illinois, but I do see things a little differently.

First of all, when he talks about a civil war in Iraq, he seems to overlook the fact that al-Qaida is present in Iraq and is the precipitating cause for the sectarian strife we are all concerned about. What would he do to deal with al-Qaida in Iraq, which they regard as the central front in their war against the West?

When my friend from Illinois says we need a limited presence of our American troops in Iraq, I am not sure what that means, but I sure would rather have the four star Army GEN David Petraeus determining the appropriate tactics to deal with the threat on the ground rather than politicians, armchair generals here in Washington, DC.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. I will make this very brief. Isn't it a fact that over the weekend, the Prime Minister of Iraq invited us to leave at any time?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, to my knowledge, we are of one mind that we do want to leave Iraq. The question is, Under what conditions? I don't believe Prime Minister Maliki certainly is on record as saying he wants us to leave at a time when his government would be rent asunder and Iraq would descend into sectarian war and perhaps a regional conflict. But the fact is, GEN David Petraeus, the general whom we confirmed unanimously just a short time ago, has recommended to the Commander in Chief a new strategy known as the surge, which was completed just last month, a few short weeks ago. Now he has said to give that surge an opportunity to do its job and he will come back and report to us in September. I think we ought to give that a reasonable chance.

While the distinguished majority whip wants to talk about the Levin amendment, I think we will have plenty of time to talk about that during the course of the evening.

The irony is, we are ready to vote on the Levin amendment at almost any time. But we are going to have a big political theater tonight. We will have a lot of fun having a Senate slumber party for the benefit of organizations such as moveon.org, which is having a press conference at 8:30 tonight. We ought to be having a serious debate and voting on these amendments, which we are happy to do at virtually anytime.

I worry when I hear my friend say stabilization will take place on Iraqi terms, as if the only consequences of a failure in Iraq would be borne by the Iraqis. The fact is, according to the National Intelligence Estimate, the intelligence community, the Iraq Study Group, and others, it will make America less safe by creating a safe haven for organizations such as al-Qaida to plot, plan, train, and to export future terrorist attacks against the United States.

If we think they are modest in their goals, I think we need to think again. Rather than a crude instrument like an airplane flying into the Pentagon and the World Trade Center, this terrorist organization in Iraq, which considers Iraq the central front in their war against the West, is trying to get biological, chemical, and even nuclear weapons. Woe be the day that they get their hands on those and use them against America or its allies.

So I think we should be of one mind with this sense of the Senate that says we would take no action that would make it more likely that Iraq would descend into a failed state to create that haven for terrorists.

I yield the floor and reserve my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 9½ minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I think everybody in this body would like to leave Iraq better than we found it. That is not the current situation. The current situation is chaos and violence in Iraq. It is an Iraq that is torn apart by sectarian violence. When you have group slaughtering group in a civil war, a sectarian type of war, it requires that the Iraqi political leaders take action to end the violence. The only way to end the violence is if the Iraqi political leaders will reach a political settlement. I think almost everybody agrees with that. I think our uniformed military agrees with that, our civilian leaders agree, and almost everybody agrees that there is no military solution in Iraq, and that the only solution, the only way to end this violence is if the Iraqi political leaders accept the responsibility to work out political agreements on a number of disagreements they have identified for themselves.

We talk a lot about benchmarks, and the President said the other day that on eight benchmarks we are making progress, and on eight we are not—to make it sound like we have a glass that is half full. But that is not what the facts sustain or support. The facts are that we have a glass called Iraq which has a hole in the bottom. Whatever we pour into Iraq goes right through that hole. It is going to continue to do that until one thing happens, and that is that the Iraqi political leaders decide they are going to work out a political settlement. There is a consensus about that, I believe, among almost all of us.

The Iraqi Prime Minister made the following statement, and every one of us, when we vote on Levin-Reed, ought to keep this one statement in mind, I believe, first and foremost. This is what Prime Minister Maliki said:

> The crisis is political, and the ones who can stop the cycle of bloodletting of innocents are the politicians.

Well, it is long overdue that the politicians in Iraq step up to their responsibility. The amendment before us, it seems to me, states something which is clear. I believe it is obvious that it is in everyone's interest that Iraq not be a failed state. I agree with my friend from Texas. That should be a goal of everybody. The problem is that Iraq is the No. 2 most unstable state in the world right now. That is the status quo. That is what we have to end. The only way to end it is with a political settlement by the Iraqis.

There was an article a few days ago in Foreign Policy magazine called ''The States That Fail Us.'' It is about failed states. It has a list of about 60 states, and they give all of the indicators of instability. Iraq is No. 2 on the list, right after Sudan. That is the status quo. That is what we are trying to end—the failure of a policy in Iraq which has led the Iraqi leaders to believe that there is an open-ended commitment on the part of the United States to give them protection in that green zone to the extent that it exists. It is that open-ended commitment of the United States that must end—if we are going to prod the Iraqi leaders to finally step up, look into the abyss and make a decision, do they want a civil war or do they want a nation?

Mr. President, we cannot save them from themselves. To say that we don't want a failed state in Iraq is to say we don't want the status quo to continue, that the course must change in Iraq.

So I will vote for the Cornyn amendment because I think it states, in general terms at least, what I hope Members of the Senate would all agree on—that a failed state in Iraq is not in the interest of this Nation.

Mr. DURBIN. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan controls 4 minutes. The Senator from Texas controls 5 minutes. Who yields time?

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am grateful for the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Michigan, in support of this amendment. I believe it is noncontroversial. If there is one thing we ought to be able to agree upon in this debate, it is that it is not in our self-interest to leave Iraq as a failed state.

Where we diverge is where the Senator says we have to put more pressure on the politicians. I think we need to

do that, but not so much pressure that they simply collapse, which is my concern. That is why I believe what General Petraeus has said, which is that the situation in Iraq is hard but not hopeless. That gives me some hope that we can provide them the space they need in order to make those hard political decisions, which are extraordinarily difficult. If you think about it, the kind of decisions they are being called upon to make—for example, the sharing of oil revenue—I might suggest that is equivalent to the U.S. Congress trying to solve the Social Security insolvency problem. It is not easy for to us do. We have not done it yet. How in the world can we expect this new democracy, particularly under such stressful and difficult circumstances, to do things that we ourselves would find extraordinarily difficult to do? Talking about debaathification and things like that—the Baathist Party, under Saddam Hussein, was guilty of the most heinous sorts of crimes against the Shiite majority. This is a country traumatized from years of a police state under the boot heel of a terrible, blood-thirsty dictator like Saddam Hussein, where hundreds of thousands of people were killed by Saddam Hussein.

So it is not surprising that this traumatized nation is having challenges coming back from that and that they are slow to make decisions that we think they should be making. But the basic minimum is that they need the security in order to have the space in order to make those difficult decisions. That is what this new plan is, which is only in the early stages of being implemented by General Petraeus, designed to do.

What are the early reports? We are beginning to see some progress, particularly in Anbar Province in dealing with al-Qaida that up until recently basically had the run of the place. The tribal sheiks and others are coming forward and volunteering for the police and security forces. So I guess we are seeing the most hard-bitten cynics, but there are some signs that things are getting a little bit better in terms of the security context. It seems obvious that basic security has to prevail in order for the Iraqis, in exercising their new democratic government, to try to reconcile some of these terrible and difficult decisions.

I am delighted that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee has said he will support this amendment. My hope is that this is one thing in the course of all of this fractious debate that we can unify behind.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to address two comments made earlier by the Senator from Texas. He referred to the possibility of an all-night session in the Senate as a so-called Senate slumber party. Trust me, that is not what this is about. What we are facing on the Republican side of the aisle is an objection to an up-or-down vote, a majority vote, on the Levin-Reed amendment. That amendment is the only amendment which establishes a time line and a timetable for ending this war responsibly and beginning to bring our troops home within 120 days. It is the only amendment before us that will achieve that. Other amendments are interesting. None of them have the power of law.

The Levin-Reed amendment has the power of law. The President will have to follow it or veto it. Those are his choices. That is why it is so serious. That is why the Republican leadership has opposed our having a majority vote on this in the Senate. They are filibustering it, trying to stop us from getting to a vote on that amendment.

Ordinarily, when you filibuster something, it is so sanitized and civilized, you don't even know it is happening. Members of the Senate file a cloture motion and go out for dinner and say: We'll see you in the morning for the vote. Tonight they will stick around. If they want to filibuster this amendment that will change the policy in Iraq, they will have to stay and debate it. It will be a real filibuster. If they believe this is still right, we will see if they feel that way at 4 a.m. tomorrow morning. That is what this is about. It is not a slumber party.

The Senator from Texas said, ''We are ready to vote.'' Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to vote on the Levin-Reed amendment No. 2087 at 6 p.m., with the time between 3:05 and then equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, if this were the first time that a 60-vote requirement were made, I would have some sympathy for the Senator from Illinois. I am having staff compile the number of times when the other side of the aisle was in the minority, they demanded 60 votes as well. You cannot do it with a straight face.

You cannot say that all we are going to do here in the Senate is have us govern by 51 votes; otherwise, we may as well be unicameral because we would have the Senate and the House exactly the same.

So, of course, I will object, Mr. President. I wish we would get off this horse of saying that somehow the other side never employed the 60-vote requirement in the Senate, because they did. It is a tradition in the Senate, and it is within the rules of the Senate. It may be frustrating. It certainly was to us when we were in the majority and the Democrats were in the minority and they employed it. But to somehow act as if what is being done is unprecedented—I will tell you what is unprecedented; it is taking a Defense authorization bill that is there for the training and equipping and pay raises and necessities of life for the men and women serving in the military, when we should be passing this—we all know it is going to come up in September. We should be passing this so the men and women can get what they need and deserve in order to defend the security of this Nation. Instead, Mr. President, what we are doing is having, again, for the eighth or ninth time, without having passed one appropriations bill, including the Military Construction appropriations bill, which is ready to be passed—instead, we will have this ''argument'' against the filibuster.

Mr. President, it doesn't pass the smell test. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The time in opposition has expired.

The Senator from Texas has 1 minute.

Mr. CORNYN. I have 1 minute remaining?

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Arizona, of course. My belief would be that if our friends on the other side of the aisle wanted to move up the cloture vote on the Levin amendment to 6 p.m. tonight, we could expedite things and get right to the vote that perhaps the distinguished majority whip wishes to have. I think there is no objection on this side to providing a vote on that cloture vote. We could do that sooner rather than later. I certainly would support that action. I will have to consult with the leaders on this side of the aisle, but that certainly might help us get to the bottom of things that much sooner.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in support of the amendment before us that would be a vote against any action that would enhance the likelihood of a failed state in Iraq, which is not in America's best security interests.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request. I need Senator MCCAIN to listen. Apparently, the time the Senator from Arizona took on his reservation came out of our time, and I am wondering if he would give us a minute.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to give that to the distinguished chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on the question of the 60 votes, there is a procedural roadblock which is being placed here. It is not the first time in history, of course, but a decision has to be made here whether the verdict of the American people last November that there be a change in policy is going to be thwarted by that procedural roadblock, and the Republican leader has apparently decided it will be.

In terms of precedent, last year on the Defense authorization bill, there

were at least two votes on Iraq, both majority votes. That is the precedent. Last year, there was a Levin-Reed amendment that received 39 votes and a Kerry amendment, both on Iraq on the Defense authorization bill, the most recent experience. This issue is so vital. It is so much in the minds of the American people that we should not throw up procedural roadblocks to allowing the Senate to vote. That is why we have asked that we be allowed to vote up or down on this amendment, and that apparently has now been objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2100. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 248 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Domenici	Mikulski
Alexander	Dorgan	Murkowski
Allard	Durbin	Murray
Barrasso	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Feinstein	Obama
Bennett	Graham	Pryor
Bingaman	Grassley	Reed
Bond	Gregg	Reid
Boxer	Hagel	Roberts
Brown	Hatch	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hutchison	Salazar
Bunning	Inhofe	Sanders
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kennedy	Sessions
Cardin	Kerry	Shelby
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Kohl	Snowe
Chambliss	Kyl	Specter
Clinton	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coburn	Lautenberg	Stevens
Cochran	Leahy	Sununu
Coleman	Levin	Tester
Collins	Lieberman	Thune
Conrad	Lincoln	Vitter
Corker	Lott	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lugar	Warner
Craig	Martinez	Webb
Crapo	McCain	Whitehouse
DeMint	McCaskill	Wyden
Dodd	McConnell	
Dole	Menendez	

NAYS—3

Byrd	Feingold	Harkin

NOT VOTING—3

Biden	Inouye	Johnson

The amendment (No. 2100) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, late this morning, I sent a letter to the distinguished minority leader, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL. I addressed the letter ''Dear Mitch,'' and I will read the letter.

There are no more solemn decisions facing Members of Congress than the conduct of the war and the placing of our troops in harm's way. As you know, more than 3,600 brave Americans have lost their lives and more than $400 billion has been expended on the war in Iraq, which has now moved into its fifth year, with no end in sight. Yet Senate Republicans have chosen to prevent an honest debate, an action on legislation to provide an Iraq strategy that will allow us to responsibly redeploy our troops and refocus our attention on the very real threat posed by al-Qaida. This is partisan obstruction that I fear will make us less, not more, secure, and I urge you to reconsider your course.

Today's headlines confirm the importance of allowing the Senate to consider amendments to change the course in Iraq and refocus our resources so we can more effectively wage the war on terror. The news reports indicate that the violence in northern Iraq has escalated at the same time the Director of National Intelligence released a new assessment that al-Qaida has regenerated key elements of its homeland capability. As long as our troops are mired in policing an Iraq civil war, they cannot focus on the enemy that attacked us nearly 6 years ago, an enemy that, regrettably, has regenerated its attack capacity since 9/11.

Furthermore, contrary to your previous assertions, there is a long, bipartisan tradition of allowing Senators to offer defense-related amendments on the Defense authorization bill without the obstruction Senate Republicans are employing today. The record also clearly shows that both Senate Democrats and Republicans have recently foregone the opportunity to block action on important Iraq-related amendments.

For example, just last year the Senate voted up or down on two Iraq-related amendments on the Defense authorization bill. Additionally, Senate Democrats did not place a 60-vote hurdle in front of Republican amendments to strike Iraq policy language in the Iraq supplemental spending bill, nor did votes on final passage of the Iraq supplemental require 60 votes.

Therefore, I renew the proposal I offered to you recently to permit the Senate to act on a series of amendments pertaining to Iraq. Under my proposal, the Senate would hold up-or-down votes on the bipartisan amendments offered by Senators Levin and Reed, Lugar and Warner, Salazar and Alexander, and Nelson and Collins. There are other amendments Republican and Democratic Senators wish to offer related to Iraq, and I would be willing to work with you to ensure these amendments also receive up-or-down votes.

For the sake of our troops and the American people, I hope you reconsider your decision to obstruct Senate action on critical amendments that would change the course of the war in Iraq.

We have completed a vote, yet another example of an Iraq-related amendment with a majority vote. We didn't demand a 60-vote margin on Cornyn. It is another example of how amendments should be handled; that is, with a simple majority vote.

The American people deserve up-or-down votes, yes or no: Vote on the amendment. The Levin-Reed amendment is a bipartisan amendment. For me, one of the most significant paragraphs in that legislation was authored by Senator HAGEL of Nebraska. It basically says we need to have the United Nations involved in this intractable civil war. It is a wonderfully written paragraph that strengthens this bipartisan amendment.

We have three Republican cosponsors of this amendment.

A vote on this bipartisan amendment will be a vote to change course. A ''no'' vote would be a vote to stay the course, to continue the President's failed strategy indefinitely.

President Bush's term of office is winding down. We should not have to wait until he completes his term of office before we change course on this war in Iraq. A ''yes'' vote on this bipartisan amendment would finally bind President Bush to responsibly reduce combat operations and return our focus on the real and growing threats we face. That is why I, once again, request unanimous consent to move to an up-or-down vote on Levin-Reed, along with the amendments my Republican colleagues wish to offer and other Democrats who wish to offer amendments.

I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 2088 be withdrawn and at 6:30 p.m. today the Senate vote on the Levin-Reed amendment, No. 2087, with the time between now and then equally divided in the usual form, with no second-degree amendments in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, either yes or no on this?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I believe I do have the right to at least explain my reservation.

Mr. REID. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has asked for the regular order. The Senator has to object or not.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I do object. I would like to ask if the distinguished majority leader will give me an opportunity to at least respond to some of the things he had to say. I think that would be the way we usually do business around here.

Mr. REID. I will be complete in a matter of minutes. We will have a filibuster. He can speak for as many hours as he wants or minutes he wants. We are now at the time when the time for speeches has ended. It is time for voting. We want a vote on the Levin-Reed amendment. That is what we want. We have had a lot of good words from the other side of the aisle. We want some votes, and that is what this is all about. This is not the time for reserving. Voting—that is what we want.

Mr. LOTT. If the majority leader yielded the floor, I seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Yes, once again what we have seen with my friend from Mississippi, and he is my friend—we have seen Republican leadership resort to technical maneuvers to block progress on this crucial amendment. It would be one thing for Republicans to vote

against this amendment. It is their right to do so. If they honestly believe stay the course is the right strategy, they have the right to vote no. But now Republicans are using a filibuster to block us from even voting on an amendment that could bring this war to a responsible end. They are protecting the President rather than protecting our troops. They are denying us an up-or-down vote, yes or no, a vote on the most important issue our country faces today.

I am speaking today for the American people; 67 percent of the American people think the surge has been a failure—Democrats; not even a majority of Republicans favor the surge. Of course, a significant majority of Independents recognize that the surge has not been good. We are speaking for the American people on this bipartisan amendment.

We have no choice, as I have indicated earlier, but to stay in session. The Republicans have a right to talk. Let them talk. It is their filibuster. But we will continue to speak in spite of that. When they finish their filibuster, we will still be speaking, continue speaking out on behalf of our troops and all Americans—all Americans: Democrats, a majority of the Republicans, and the Independents—to continue requesting consent for an up-or-down vote on our amendment to end this war.

I don't want to make any more calls to the families in Nevada who have lost a loved one. Tens of thousands of our bold, brave Americans have been injured, wounded—a third of them grievously. When we hear that there was an improvised explosive device and two soldiers were killed, it doesn't talk about the maiming of other soldiers. Thousands—thousands of American troops have lost multiple limbs. We have heard from the experts about the head trauma. I can't get out of my mind my trip to Walter Reed, where a woman said: I have been in the military—I have been in the Army for 22 years. I have a master's degree. My specialty was numbers. I worked in the Pentagon with numbers. She said: I don't even know my own phone number. She said: I have never had my skin pierced, but I have been knocked down; I have been in these explosions numerous times. I have no mind anymore.

That is what this amendment is all about—to change course. Is it necessary we wait 60 more days until this magic day in September to change course? How many more Americans soldiers are going to be killed? How many are going to be maimed, wounded, lose their arms, lose their minds? So we have no choice but to stay in session and continue speaking out on behalf of our troops and all Americans, to continue requesting consent for an up-or-down vote on this amendment.

Our troops in Baghdad are 8 hours ahead of us here on the east coast. As we begin our debate in earnest tonight, our troops are going to be waking up. They will be waking up to the 1,582nd day of this war. They will wake up, and it is very hot in Iraq this time of the year. They are a long ways away in some foreign land we call Iraq, far from their families, and facing, every minute of the day, danger.

This is not a war where the troops gather and face each other. This is a war in an urban setting, most of the time, where people are blown up driving vehicles up streets buying groceries in a marketplace. What happened yesterday? In a place that there had been no violence, more than 100 were killed and more than 200 injured. The picture in the paper—there is a hole where that bomb went off as big and deep as this Chamber we are in today.

The violence is escalating. The new report is out. It was leaked last week; it is out today. ''Al-Qaida stronger,'' so says the report. The President disagrees, but that is what the report says. Can't have it both ways.

So our valiant troops are going to wake up with this war facing them—more than any one of us can understand, with the exception of maybe Senator WEBB, Senator KERRY, maybe JOHN MCCAIN—I am sorry if I missed others—Senator INOUYE, Senator STEVENS. Senator HAGEL, of course—with his brother—fought in Vietnam. They are going to wake up, as I said, far from their families, facing constant danger, for what? For what? Mr. President, 69 percent of the Iraqi people don't want us there. They are saying we are doing more harm than good. Al Maliki said a couple of days ago he can do without us. We can leave whatever time we want. They can handle the situation with the billions and billions of dollars we have spent training Iraqi troops.

We as Senators owe it to each of our men and women in Iraq to debate the war openly and honestly, and we owe it to all Americans to finally vote for a responsible end to the war that has been so long in coming. I hope by the time this night is through and dawn has broken that we will have the opportunity to vote.

We are willing to vote before that. Whenever we have an opportunity, we are going to ask reasonably that we have a vote on the bipartisan amendment. It is the right thing to do. It is what the American people deserve.

We are spending, now, $12 billion a month. Is that enough to get our attention? We are trying to do other things. What are we trying to do? Get health care for kids. The President is very concerned about these appropriations bills which we are going to try to pass. Where is the money to pass them, giving the American people what they deserve? It has been taken in the sands of Iraq, to the tune of more than a half a trillion dollars.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield for a question without the Senator yielding his right to the floor?

Mr. LOTT. Does the majority leader yield the floor?

Mr. REID. I will not do that. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask the distinguished majority leader if he has not had experiences similar to mine. I was in Vermont over the weekend, as I am most weekends. I get stopped by people in the grocery store or putting gas in the car—we are a small State, and you tend to know everybody; they are Republicans and they are Democrats—and I get asked the constant question, if the President will not listen to us about getting out, can you people in Congress vote on something? Can you vote? Can you either vote to keep us there or vote to get us out, but stand up? My answer to them is we are prepared to vote on our side of the aisle. Senator REID and those following him are prepared to vote, but we are stopped from voting.

I am wondering whether the distinguished majority leader, when he goes home to Nevada, whether he doesn't hear similar sentiments about: Let us vote. Let us vote.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee, I don't have to go home. People call me. I talk to my brothers. They tell me what they think is wrong. I talk to my friends. I have tried every weekend when I have some time and I am here—I try to reach some people in Nevada I haven't talked to in a while. They say exactly what my friend from Vermont says: Get us out of there. Get us out of there.

That is what this Levin-Reed amendment is all about, to change course in Iraq. The American people deserve that.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LOTT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the majority leader, first, he has focused on the most important part of this debate, the war that is claiming American lives. But, unfortunately, this debate also focuses on the rules of the Senate. I ask the Senate majority leader if he is aware of the fact that in the last 7 years that the Defense authorization bill has been brought to the floor, every amendment which has been offered was subject to a majority vote, simple majority vote, except in five instances which required a budget waiver, a specific provision in our Senate rules when there were budget waivers required as with the minimum wage and so forth, 60 votes. But is the majority leader aware of the fact that in every authorization bill, Defense authorization bill, in the years 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007, that every amendment has been judged by a majority vote and that the decision by the Republicans to obstruct the majority vote on this is the first time in this long period of time that we have ever done this on a Defense authorization bill?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, during the years you have mentioned, there have been democratically controlled Senates, Republican controlled Senates, but it doesn't matter who is controlling the Senate, we have always done these bills with simple majority votes.

For example, I can remember last year we had one vote, as I recall, on minimum wage because it required 60 votes to waive a budget point of order. So this new thing about 60 votes on everything is something that has been ginned up in the minds of people who want to avoid votes to change the course in Iraq.

That is what it is all about. The war is not going well. We all know that. We need to sit back and understand that it needs to change course. There is a column written today, I read it, op-ed about President Bush being stubborn. And he is. We all know that. That is not all together always a bad trait.

But, boy, I will tell you, he is sure showing his streak of stubbornness on this. He was unwilling to listen to anyone who disagreed with him, and there are a number of people who have been dumped from the administration as a result. Someone who suggested the war would cost $150 to $200 billion, Lindsey, he was gone quick.

We had one of our good generals who suggested we needed a lot more troops there. Out the door he went. We could go through a list of people who disagreed with the President who hit the road.

I would hope that on this issue, when so many people all across this country, on a bipartisan basis, agree that something needs to change in Iraq, my friends, the Republicans, recognize that they also have responsibility to the American people more so than the President.

Now, I would say this. My friend, Senator LOTT, is still here. I am going to yield the floor and whoever grabs the floor can have it. I say to my friend, Senator LOTT, who has always been a gentleman to me in the many areas we have worked together here: This was a time that I wanted a ''yes'' or ''no'' response. He is a real pro in here. He knows that he can get the floor again to explain whatever his position was. This was in the middle of my speech. That is why I followed the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL.) The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. The Senator from Nevada, the distinguished majority leader and my friend for many years, points out that in previous years, the Defense authorization bill was passed without requirements for a 60-vote majority. There is a simple answer to that. We never took up an issue such as this on the Defense authorization bill.

In fact, our focus and our attention was, for 45 years, providing men and women who are serving in the military with what they needed to defend this Nation. Instead—instead, of doing what is necessary, including the 3.5-percent pay raise, including the Wounded Warriors legislation on it to take care of our veterans—we are now gridlocked in the Senate because the Senator from Nevada knows he is not going to pass a withdrawal from Iraq on this bill. If he did, the President would veto the bill, because the President has said it. We all know that in September this issue is going to come to a head, whether I happen to favor that or not.

Most people believe that September is a time where we could make the kinds of judgments necessary to see whether we are making the kind of progress that will justify continued effort in this new strategy, which I, of course, would remind my colleagues again, the last part of which was put in place a few weeks ago.

Of course, we did not have requirements for 60-vote majorities in the past few years because no one had the temerity to put an issue such as this on the very vital needs of the men and women in the military to do their job. So, of course, there was not a controversial necessity for a 60-vote majority.

I am happy to tell my friend from Mississippi that Senator LEVIN and I are moving forward with clearing amendments so we can, we hope, wrap up this bill by the end of this week. I hope that once this display that is going to take place tonight, all night, is concluded, and there is not sufficient votes in order to get the Levin-Reed amendment passed, at some point we can go back to the Defense authorization bill and get them the 3.5 percent pay raise they have earned; get them that MRAP equipment that they need; get this Wounded Warrior legislation through the Senate and to the desk of the President of the United States.

We never grow tired, nor should we, of praising the men and women in the military, particularly those who have sacrificed so much. All of us are embarrassed and ashamed at what happened at Walter Reed. Well, let's pass this Wounded Warrior legislation on this bill and get it done.

Who is holding up passage of the Defense authorization bill? Who is requiring us to stay up all night to discuss it? My friends, this is not necessary. We all know that General Petraeus was affirmed in his position by the Senate by an overwhelming vote. General Petraeus, at the time of his hearings, said we were going to have a new strategy—that strategy is called surge—and that it would require additional troops.

He also said at that time it would take time, that it would take a period of time before we would know whether it succeeded. Here we are, literally weeks after the last part of this new strategy is in place, the last detachment of an increase in troops, and we are telling them to set a date for withdrawal.

Now, you know, I share the frustration that my friend from Nevada stated about a failed policy. It was a failed policy. The Rumsfeld-Casey policy strategy was doomed to failure, and some of us recognized that and stated that at the time. We said we had to have a new strategy. It has to be the classic counterinsurgency strategy if we are going to succeed in Iraq.

Well, we got a new general. We got a new strategy. There are signs of success. There are clearly some signs of progress, and those are readily apparent. Now, is the Maliki Government acting in the way we want them to? No, they are not. Is it disappointing that they are not? Absolutely, it is disappointing.

But as far as Anbar Province is concerned, as far as some parts of Baghdad are concerned, yes, there is some progress which has been purchased at great and tragic cost, the sacrifice of young American's lives.

I would like to again assure my friend of many years, from Nevada, I understand the frustration that he shows is shared by many Americans. Our failure and our employment of a failed strategy for more than 3 years is well articulated. But I also would plead with my colleagues to at least know that we are not going to stop this now. We are not going stop it now. Even if the majority leader got the 60 votes and got this included in the bill in some way, the President of the United States would veto it. We do not want that to happen. We do not want that to happen.

We know that in September, whether I happen to like it or not—I would like to personally give it more time than September—we know that in September this whole issue is going to come to a head. Here we are in the middle of July. Can't we sit down and work out the amendments in a way that Senator LEVIN and I and Senator WARNER and previous chairmen and ranking members have for the last 20 years, get this bill done, get it out and get it to the President's desk? Then we go into recess. We come back in September. I think that that is not an unreasonable path to follow.

So, my friends, we will continue to debate this issue all night tonight. I understand that. Hopefully, when the majority sees that, the leader sees there is not the votes, maybe we could then get down to the nuts and bolts of the Defense authorization bill of which at last count there are over 100 amendments pending that Members have on both sides of the aisle, they want to be considered and voted on.

I fear—I fear—that the majority leader, because of a lack of time, may feel it necessary to pull the bill from the floor. I think that would not be in any way helpful to our Nation's national security interests.

My friends, if we could lower the rhetoric around here a bit, let us sit down and talk about the best way to proceed, recognizing that September will be a very important point, and pass this authorization bill and not for

the first time in 45 years have us not do what we need to do for our Nation's security and the men and women who are serving.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Arizona. We disagree on a number of issues. We have worked together on many others. I would like to respond to several things he said. Senator MCCAIN asked us who is holding up this bill? Well, those who followed the debate know that a few minutes ago the majority leader, Senator REID of Nevada, asked to move to vote on the amendment by Senators LEVIN and REED. He asked for unanimous consent to move to a vote within a matter of hours.

Where did the objection come from? From the Republican side of the aisle. So in answering Senator MCCAIN's question, who is holding up this bill, it is your side of the aisle, and specifically the Senator sitting next to you who objected to moving to a vote. That is what is holding up this bill.

The second question asked by the Senator from Arizona: Why are we debating the war on this bill? This bill happens to be the authorization for appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense. If you do not debate the war in Iraq on the bill authorizing appropriations for the Department of Defense, where would you turn, the agriculture bill? I don't think so. This is the appropriate bill.

The Senator from Arizona has made that point. Included within the amendments to this bill are provision for our warriors who are coming home wounded. I have been part of putting that together. I thank Senator LEVIN, I thank Senator MCCAIN. It is an important provision. But let's be very honest. The reason they are coming home wounded is because there is a war. It is fit and proper for us to ask whether that war is being waged effectively and whether our policy should be changed in this bill? If not on this bill, what bill would we use? I think, frankly, that many would rather we did not debate this at all; give permission to the President to wage the war as he wants as long as he wants: step out of the way, Congress, the President is in charge.

I don't accept that. Each of us represents our own State, represents people who expect us to articulate their point of view and speak for them. We do not cede all power in this Government to one branch, not to the executive branch. We have our own responsibility.

Let me say a word about waiting until September. Waiting until September, what difference would it make if we wait until September? What could it possibly cost us if we wait until September? Well, it is likely to cost us 200 American lives. We are losing 100 Americans, on average, every single month of this war. It is likely to cost us 2,000 more injured soldiers; that is what 2 months means.

It is likely to cost us $24 billion from America's Treasury. It is not a matter of waiting for a convenient moment chosen by some to make this decision. Many of us believe this decision should be made now and it should be made here, and it should be made with the Levin-Reed amendment which is a reasonable bipartisan amendment.

The Republican side objects. They are filibustering. We have said this will not be the most modern form of filibuster. This goes back to the roots of the Senate. We will stay in business during the period of time when we are supposed to be debating. Whether we go to this amendment, we will invite members from both said of the aisle to express their point of view. I will tell you this, the people I represent in my State, the ones whom I meet, as Senator LEAHY said of his voters in Vermont, want us to change this policy in this war. They want us to bring this war to an end. They understand, as we must understand, we never bargained for where we are today. America was misled into this war. We were told there were weapons of mass destruction, nuclear weapons, they threatened the Middle East, they threatened America. Not a single one has been found.

We were told that this dictator, Saddam Hussein, was the reason for this invasion. He is long gone—dug out of a hole in the ground, put on trial, and executed by his own people. Yet we still stay in this war, a war that has changed so drastically to the point that it is now a civil war and our soldiers, as good as they are, are caught in the crossfire of sectarian violence, now victims of al-Qaida terrorism that did not exist when we invaded Iraq, not in that country.

They are the ones who are the victims of bad planning and bad decisions. It is interesting to me how many Republican Senators see how poorly executed this war has been.

We all know our military is the best. But when it comes to the Commander in Chief and the generals, so many bad decisions have been made at the expense of our troops. It is interesting to me, they concede that point and yet want to continue: Let's just wait a few more months, maybe another year, maybe a year and a half, and then see what happens.

I was one of 23 Senators who voted against this authorization to go to war.

Mr. BYRD. So was I.

Mr. DURBIN. Senator BYRD, I remember your leadership on this issue as well. I can tell you it was not the most popular position to be in at the time.

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. DURBIN. The overwhelming majority of the American people heard their President say weapons of mass destruction, ruthless and bloodthirsty dictator, and said: Yes, maybe we should invade. But it didn't add up. It didn't add up in terms of the threat or in terms of whether we were prepared to accept the reality that it is far easier to get into a war than it is to get out of one. Here we are in the fifth year of a war that has lasted longer than World War II, a war with no end in sight. This President's response: Send more American soldiers into harm's way in Iraq.

That is unacceptable. It is time for the Iraqis to stand and defend their own nation. They will not do that until American soldiers start coming home. That is what the Levin-Reed amendment is about.

I am sorry the Republican side has initiated this filibuster to block a vote on this important amendment. I am sorry they are insisting on a 60-vote margin which was rarely, if ever, used on a Defense authorization bill over the last 7 years. Those are the facts. They have done it because their ranks are starting to change. Three Republican Senators have now stepped out and said they will join us in this effort to change the policy of the war. Many more back home have said they have decided we need a new policy in Iraq. We want to give them a chance for a vote that is significant.

Will the President veto it if we pass it? Probably. But does that mean we shouldn't try? Don't we owe it to these soldiers and their families and to our Nation to change this failed policy before it claims more American lives, sends more American warriors back wounded from battle and costs Americans the treasure we have gathered in the taxes of our citizens?

I say to my friend from Arizona, we see this war differently, but I think it is clear who is holding up this bill: the Republican minority with their filibuster. Why this bill? Because if you didn't debate a war on a Defense authorization bill, where would you debate it? Should we wait until September? The cost is too high.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I was just given information by my staff. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISPOSITION OF MEASURES UNDERGOING ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE SENATE, 109TH CONGRESS

109TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION (2005)

Number of measures on which there were rollcall votes in 2005: 40

Passed without a vote on cloture or another 60-vote requirement: 29

(1) London Terrorist Attacks (S. Res. 193; passed 76–0)

(2) Homeland Security Appropriations (H.R. 2360; 96–1)

(3) Burma Sanctions Extension (H.J. Res. 52; 97–1)

(4) Americans With Disabilities Act Commemoration (S. Res. 207; 87–0)

(5) CAFTA (S. 1307: 54–45; H.R. 3045: 55–45)

(6) Budget Resolution (S. Con. Res. 18: passed 51–49; Conference Report, H. Con. Res. 95: passed 52–47)

(7) Legislative Branch Appropriations (H.R. 2985 Conference Report; 96–4)
(8) Hurricane Katrina Resolution (S. Res. 233; 94–0)
(9) Katrina Emergency Supplemental (H.R. 3673; 97–0)
(10) Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations (H.R. 2862; bill passed 91–4; Conference Report passed 94–5)
(11) Agriculture Appropriations (H.R. 2744; bill passed 97–2, Conference Report passed 81–18)
(12) Military Construction Appropriations (H.R. 2528; 98–0)
(13) Customs Treaty (Treaty Doc. 108–6; 87–0)
(14) Transportation-Treasury-HUD Appropriations (H.R. 3058; 93–1)
(15) Foreign Operations Appropriations (H.R. 3057; bill passed 98–1; Conference Report passed 91–0)
(16) Energy and Water Appropriations (H.R. 2419; bill passed 92–3; Conference Report passed 84–4)
(17) Pension Reform (S. 1783; 97–2)
(18) Tax Relief Act (S. 2020; 64–33)
(19) Iraqi Election (S. Res. 38; passed 93–0)
(20) Class Action Reform (S. 5; 72–26)
(21) Genetic Nondiscrimination (S. 306; 98–0)
(22) Disapproval of Canadian Beef Rule (S.J. Res. 4; 52–46)
(23) Vocational Education Reauthorization (S. 250; 99–0)
(24) Mourning the Death of Pope John Paul II (S. Res. 95; 98–0)
(25) Airbus Subsidies Resolutions (S. Con. Res. 25; 96–0)
(26) Interior Appropriations (H.R. 2361; 94–0)
(27) Continuing Resolution (H.J. Res. 68; passed by voice vote after a vote on an amendment)
(28) 2nd Continuing Resolution (H.J. Res 72; passed by voice vote after a vote on an amendment)
(29) Deficit Reduction Omnibus Reconciliation (S. 1932; bill passed 52–47; the Conference Report passed 50–50 with Vice President Cheney voting aye)

Passed after a cloture vote and/or other 60-vote requirement: 7

(1) Firearm Liability Reform (S. 397; cloture on the motion to proceed invoked 66–32; bill passed 65–31)
(2) Defense Appropriations (H.R. 2863; cloture invoked 94–4; bill passed 97–0; cloture on the Conference Report failed 56–44; after ANWR provisions removed, Conference Report passed 93–0)
(3) Labor-HHS Appropriations (H.R. 3010; cloture invoked 97–0; bill passed 94–3)
(4) Bankruptcy Reform (cloture invoked 69–31; bill passed 74–25)
(5) Highway Bill (H.R. 3; cloture on the motion to proceed invoked 94–6; cloture on the Inhofe substitute invoked 92–7; motion to waive the Budget Act on the Inhofe substitute agreed to 76–22; bill passed 89–11; Conference Report passed 91–4)
(6) Emergency Supplemental (H.R. 1268; cloture invoked 100–0; bill passed 99–0; Conference Report passed 100–0)
(7) Energy Bill (H.R. 6; cloture invoked 92–4; bill passed 85–12; motion to waive the Budget Act for consideration of the Conference Report agreed to 71–29; Conference Report passed 74–26)

Passed after failure of cloture: 1

(1) Defense Authorization (S. 1042; cloture failed 50–48 on July 26; the bill later passed 98–0 November 15)

Defeated by cloture: 1

(1) Patriot Act Conference Report (H.R. 3199; cloture failed 52–47; the bill was passed in 2006)

Defeated on an up-down vote: 1

(1) Mercury Regulation Resolution of Disapproval (47–51)

Amendments voted on but no final action taken on the bill: 1

(1) Foreign Affairs Authorization (S. 600)

109TH CONGRESS, 2ND SESSION (2006)

Number of measures on which there were rollcall votes in 2006: 38

Passed without a vote on cloture or another 60-vote requirement: 16

(1) Tax Hike Prevention (H.R. 4297; bill passed 66–31; Conference Report passed 54–44)
(2) Patriot Act Short-Term Extension (H.R. 4659; 95–1)
(3) Debt Limit (H.J. Res. 47; 52–48)
(4) U.S.-Oman FTA (S. 3569: 60–34; H.R. 5684: 62–32)
(5) Homeland Security Appropriations (H.R. 5441; 100–0)
(6) Human Fetus Farming Prohibition (S. 3504; 100–0)
(7) Nondestructive Stem Cell Research (S. 2754; 100–0)
(8) Stem Cell Research (H.R. 810; 63–37)
(9) Water Resources (H.R. 5117; passed by voice vote after votes on amendments)
(10) Voting Rights Act (H.R. 9; 98–0)
(11) Pension Reform (H.R. 4; 93–5)
(12) Defense Appropriations (H.R. 5631; bill passed 98–0; Conference Report passed 98–0)
(13) Budget Resolution (S. Con. Res. 83; 51–49)
(14) Interrogation and Trial of Terrorists (S. 3930; 65–34)
(15) India Nuclear Energy (S. 3709; 85–12)
(16) Military Construction (H.R. 5385; passed by voice vote after a vote on a motion to request the attendance of absent Senators)

Passed after a cloture vote and/or other 60-vote requirement: 10

(1) Patriot Act Additional Amendments (S. 2271; cloture on the motion to proceed invoked 96–3; cloture on the bill invoked 69–30; bill passed 95–4)
(2) Patriot Act Conference Report (H.R. 3199; cloture invoked 84–15; bill passed 89–10)
(3) LIHEAP Aid (S. 2320; motion to waive the Budget Act agreed to 66–31; cloture invoked 75–25; bill passed by voice)
(4) Lobbying Reform (S. 2349; cloture was first rejected 51–47 due to a Dubai port amendment, after that issue was resolved, cloture was invoked 81–16 and the bill passed 90–8)
(5) Emergency supplemental (H.R. 4939; cloture invoked 92–4; bill passed 77–21)
(6) Illegal and Legal Immigration (S. 2611; cloture invoked 73–25; bill passed 62–36)
(7) Defense Authorization (S. 2766; cloture invoked 98–1; bill passed 96–0)
(8) Gulf of Mexico OCS (S. 3711; cloture on the motion to proceed invoked 86–12; cloture on the bill invoked 72–23; bill passed 71–25)
(9) Port Security (H.R. 4954; cloture invoked 98–0; bill passed 98–0)
(10) Secure Fence Act (H.R. 6061; cloture on the motion to proceed invoked 94–0; cloture on the bill invoked 71–28; bill passed 80–19)

Defeated by cloture or other 60-vote requirement: 10

(1) Asbestos compensation (S. 852; cloture on the motion to proceed invoked 98–1; motion to waive the Budget Act failed 58–41)
(2) Illegal Immigration (S. 2454; cloture on the substitute amendment failed 39–60; cloture on the motion to commit failed 38–60; cloture on the bill failed 36–62)
(3) Medical Care Access (S. 22; cloture on the motion to proceed failed, 48–42)
(4) Mothers & Babies Medical Care (S. 23; cloture on the motion to proceed failed, 49–44)
(5) Small Business Health Insurance (S. 1955; cloture on the motion to proceed invoked, 96–2; cloture on the bill failed, 55–43)
(6) Marriage Constitutional Amendment (S.J. Res. 1; cloture on the motion to proceed failed, 49–48)
(7) Death Tax Repeal (H.R. 8; cloture on the motion to proceed failed, 57–41)
(8) Race Government for Native Hawaiians (S. 147; cloture on the motion to proceed failed, 56–41)
(9) Death Tax/Minimum Wage/Extenders (H.R. 5970; cloture on the motion to proceed failed, 56–42)
(10) Child Custody Protection Act (S. 403; bill passed 65–34; cloture on the motion to concur with the House amendment to the bill failed 57–42; bill died)

Defeated on an up-down vote: 1

(1) Flag Protection Constitutional Amendment (S.J. Res. 12; defeated 66–34; ⅔ present and voting required)

Amendments voted on and no final action taken on the bill: 1

(1) Agriculture Appropriations (H.R. 5384)

Mr. McCAIN. Passed after a cloture vote and/or other 60-vote requirement in 2005, seven; passed after a cloture vote and/or a 60-vote requirement in 2006, 10; defeated by cloture or 60-vote requirement, also in 2006, 10.

It is clear that when the Senator from Illinois was in the minority, they used the 60-vote provision as well, and that is their right to do so. I don't in any way object to their having done that. I do object strenuously to somehow conveying the impression that this is a ''filibuster'' because we require 60 votes, that this is some Earth-shattering, precedent-shattering procedure. In fact, it is not. In fact, the Senator from Illinois knows very well that 60 votes is often required, whether it be a budget point of order or whether a cloture vote, and it has been used quite often by the minority as a tool to assert their rights as the minority. I understand that.

The Senator from Illinois talks about the bill that this has to be on. This is either the eighth or ninth time we have brought up Iraq. He didn't need the authorization bill to do it then. It is the right of the majority to bring up whatever they want, whenever they want. I can assure my colleagues, the Defense authorization bill will probably not be on the floor in September, and one thing I am pretty confident of is that we will be taking up the issue of Iraq in September. So to somehow say that this is appropriate, it is not appropriate because it is controversial, and we know it will not be passed with a provision that requires what the Senator from Illinois wants on it. It will never become law because the President will veto it in the unlikely—in fact, highly unlikely—situation where this bill was passed by both Houses of Congress.

What we are doing—have no doubt about it—is keeping the 3.5-percent pay raise from going into law. We are keeping the wounded warrior legislation from being enacted by both Houses and us acting as quickly as possible. The Senator from Illinois, I believe, and all other Senators voted on behalf of the nomination of General Petraeus in February, knowing full well what General Petraeus's strategy was. That was

very well articulated. So now we find ourselves some months later saying: Well, we have to end it.

The distinguished majority leader, who is no longer on the floor, declared the war lost. I was astonished. Because if we lost the war, then somebody won. Does that mean that al-Qaida has won the war? I don't think the 160,000 young men and women who are serving in Iraq, whom I visited about a week ago, think the war is lost. I don't think the majority of Americans do either. Are they frustrated by what has happened here? Of course, they are frustrated. They want to bring it to an end. But it is the obligation of people such as me to point out what happens when we withdraw in 120 days.

Literally, in the view of every expert on national security, we will pay a much heavier price in the long run. Chaos, genocide will ensue. Quite often I hear from the other side: What is plan B, if the surge doesn't work?

What is plan B if the withdrawal results in chaos and genocide in the region? According to most experts—including Henry Kissinger, Brent Scowcroft, General Zinni according to most people who have spent their lives on national security issues, it will be chaos and genocide. What is plan B there?

I hope after the show is over tomorrow morning sometime—and it is clear to all that we will not set a 120-day withdrawal date from Iraq on this legislation—we will then be able to sit down and move forward on the bill so that we can get it passed into law. That is what we should be doing. To somehow think that we have not required, as the majority leader on many occasions required, 60 votes for passage of an amendment or legislation, of course, flies in the face of the clear record which I have just asked to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

America is now at a crossroads. America is now at a point where, according to Natan Sharansky:

> A precipitous withdrawal of U.S. forces could lead to a bloodbath . . .

From Anthony Zinni, who was opposed to us going into Iraq:

> . . . reality is that we simply cannot pull out [of Iraq], as much as we may want to. The consequences of a destabilized and chaotic Iraq, sitting in a critical region of the world, could have catastrophic implications . . . there is no short-term solution.

We have a system of government where the military is subordinate to the civilian leadership, and it should be. It is the most appropriate way. But to completely ignore, as apparently my friend from Illinois is, the leaders whom we have appointed to fight over there and do the dying and carry out the leadership responsibilities, to completely ignore their advice and counsel, they are on the ground. They know what is going on.

General Lynch, 3rd ID commander, says:

> [pulling out before the mission was accomplished] would be a mess.

By the way, these will be the guys who will be required to clean up the mess, if we pass this resolution and we have a mess.

Continuing from General Lynch:

> . . . you'd find the enemy regaining ground, reestablishing sanctuaries, building more IEDs . . . and the violence would escalate.

I have already quoted before from Henry Kissinger.

General Lynch:

> [our soldiers] want to fight terrorists here, so they don't have to fight terrorists back home . . . I now have the forces I need to conduct that mission.

General Lynch, the 3rd ID commander, says he has the troops and the wherewithal and the success to get the job done.

The Senator from Illinois wants to say, no, you have to come home in 120 days. I don't think that is right. I don't think General Lynch is reading any polls. I think General Lynch and General Petraeus are fighting an enemy that, according to them, they will be fighting here if we have a precipitous withdrawal.

General Lynch:

> . . . surge forces are giving us the capability we have now to take the fight to the enemy . . . the enemy only responds to force, and we now have that force.

That is the force that the Senator from Illinois wants to withdraw within 120 days.

> We can conduct detailed kinetic strikes, we can do cordon and searches, and we can deny the enemy sanctuaries . . . If those surge forces go away that capability goes away, and the Iraqi security forces aren't ready yet to do that [mission].

Brent Scowcroft, who opposed our entry into the Iraq conflict:

> [reduction of American presence in Iraq] should follow success in our efforts, not the calendar or the performance of others.

I hope that sometime my friends who were involved in this debate will listen to the people we have delegated to lead the best Armed Forces in the history of mankind who are doing one of the most difficult jobs in history.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I have been waiting 1 hour to respond to some comments that were directed at me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I had hoped that in this debate and in this Congress, we would be able to maintain some semblance, some modicum of courtesy. But it appears we have lost it all. I have been in Congress 35 years. I have been in the Senate 19 years. I have been in a variety of positions. Never before have I been denied or did I ever deny any Senator the opportunity to have a reservation on his right to object to a unanimous consent request. Now that has occurred. So that courtesy, one of the few remaining ones we have left in this institution, is gone.

Let me correct some of the things that have been said here that the record will show, certainly, in the debate. The other side speaks about a new standard for 60 votes. That is interesting.

During this Congress, 47 clotures have been filed. In the 106th Congress, there were 71; 107th, 72; 108th 62; the 109th, 68. This is not a new phenomenon. It has occurred all the time, regardless of whether Republicans or Democrats were in the majority. Even Senator REID said twice this year:

> In the Senate it has always been the case you need 60 votes. I don't have 60 votes—

The particular issue he was referring to—

> 60 votes are required for just about everything.

That was what Senator REID had to say earlier this year.

We are ready to vote. We could have a vote on this amendment, the Levin-Reed amendment, right now. We are ready to go. We can have the cloture vote that would be scheduled in the morning in an hour, to be fair to everybody, so we could have wrapup statements. Everybody knows we can have that vote now, or 5:30 or 6:30, or in the morning. I have been involved in these all-night discussions. Interestingly, the last time we had one of these so-called all-night debates, it was because the Democrats wanted to require 60 votes to confirm a Federal judge, which had not been the practice throughout the history of this great country.

I understand about the 60-vote requirement. Nobody is surprised by this. We have already had 60-vote votes taken on amendments on this bill.

First, before the majority whip leaves, let me ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled for the morning occur at 5:30 this afternoon.

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I have not yielded the floor, so I wish to go ahead and complete my remarks on the broader issues that have been raised here.

We debated in March and April and May whether we should confirm General Petraeus, whether we should go forward with the funds that our troops needed to do the job, and whether the surge could go forward. The vote was 80 to 14 in May to go forward with trying to bring down the violence, get control and, of course, encourage the Iraqi government to do more. We confirmed General Petraeus unanimously. They are already saying the surge has failed when, as a matter of fact, the troops that were supposed to be involved in that effort have only been there for some 3 weeks. So I think it is premature and unfair to the men and women who are there on the ground doing the job. We need to have the debate, allow both sides to have their say, but it is going to require 60 votes, and then we can go on to the underlying bill.

This is the Defense authorization bill. Every year we pass the Defense authorization bill. Yet I think we have had maybe one amendment even considered that has to do with the underlying bill, which provides funds and authorization for our troops for the

equipment they need, the supplies, the ships, the planes, the pay raise, and quality of life. That is something we have to come to terms with. We have to have a debate on amendments that affect this bill. We could work out how to do that.

Somebody said amendments are being blocked. As a matter of fact, Senator LEVIN and Senator MCCAIN are clearing amendments right now. The process is underway. So I would say I am very disappointed in the way this issue is being handled. I must say I am even surprised we have allowed it to deteriorate to this level, but I think we will get through it. The Congress is not going to precipitously mandate that our troops begin to be withdrawn. We are going to go forward and allow them the time to do the job. In September and October we will debate this issue again, as we should. But to come back again after having just voted in May to allow us to go forward and say here we are in July and the surge has failed, I think that is a terrible mistake.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, since the minority whip is ready to vote, I ask unanimous consent to vote on the Levin-Reed amendment No. 2087 at 6 p.m. with the time between now and then equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. LOTT. I object, Madam President.

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the objection is heard, and I think it is very clear. You cannot object to the vote, say you are ready to vote, and then object to the vote. You cannot have it both ways.

The fact is, when you look at these past votes on the Defense authorization bill, they don't make the case that the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Mississippi say. I will go through each one of them:

For the year 2000, considering the fiscal year 2001 Defense authorization bill, of 14 amendments on which there were rollcall votes, only 1 required 60 votes because it involved a budget waiver. In 2001, when we considered the fiscal year 2002 Defense authorization bill, of the 2 amendments on which there were rollcall votes, all were simple majorities; no 60-vote requirements. In 2002, for the 2003 Defense authorization bill, of the 5 amendments on which there were rollcall votes, only 1 60-vote requirement; again, a specific budget waiver, which is not the case with the pending amendment. In 2003, when we considered the 2004 Defense authorization, of the 10 amendments on which there were rollcall votes, all were simple majorities; no 60-vote requirements. In 2004, with the 2005 Defense authorization, of the 30 amendments on which there were rollcall votes, all were simple majorities; no 60-vote requirements. In 2004, with the 2005 Defense authorization, of the 30 amendments on which there were rollcall votes, only 2 required an extraordinary majority of 60 votes, both requiring budget waivers. In 2005 when we considered the Defense authorization bill for 2006, for 25 amendments they were simple majority votes. None required 60 votes. In 2006, when considering the fiscal year 2007 Defense authorization bill, 15 amendments, only 2 required 60 votes. They related to the minimum wage. They required budget waivers. Those are the only 2.

Let me also correct the record. When the Senator from Arizona says we don't take up the war in Iraq on the Defense authorization bill, I would remind him that in the last Defense authorization bill, there were two specific amendments offered relative to the conduct of the war in Iraq—on this very bill last year: one by Senator LEVIN and Senator REED, another by Senator JOHN KERRY, both of which only required a majority vote.

I would say from the Senator from Arizona's point of view, there is scant evidence to support his position that No. 1, we never considered Iraq on Defense authorization bills—we just did last year; No. 2, we always require 60 votes when it comes to amendments on the bills. Six times in 7 years we did, each one because of a budget issue that is not involved in the Levin amendment.

Let me say a word about the other things said by the Senator from Arizona before yielding the floor. I respect the men and women in uniform. I have been to Iraq twice. I have visited with them. I have been to send-offs in my State of Illinois as National Guard units have been activated. I have been there to welcome them home. I carry on many conversations with the Illinois soldiers overseas. I keep in touch with their families. I respect them very much. But to say this is the first time we have heard from generals in Iraq that they just need another 6 months or another year, I think the Senator from Arizona knows better. We have been told this over and over again: When they stand up, we will stand down. Do you remember that one? How many years have we been hearing that? How many hundreds of millions of dollars have we put into Iraq for training Iraqi Army soldiers? Yet we are still there with a larger force today than there we were just a year ago.

So when my colleague argues that just a little more time is all they need, I hope he will understand the skepticism of the American people and many Members of the Senate. We have heard this before over and over again.

I also want to take issue with one point the Senator from Arizona said—and I am sure he didn't mean to mislead anyone. We are not talking about withdrawing the troops in 120 days, which is what has been said over and over again. The Levin-Reed amendment begins the withdrawal of troops in 120 days, completing it on April 1 of next year—transitioning by April 1 to a different force; not the combat force we know now caught in the midst of a civil war but a force with the specified mission of fighting al-Qaida and other terrorism, of helping transition the Iraqi Army to self-defense, and protecting our own men and women and our assets and security during this transition. Those things are all included in this bill. So this notion that somehow in a matter of 120 days all the troops will be gone, that isn't even envisioned in the Levin-Reed amendment.

So I would say to my friend from Arizona: Yes, I guess my patience has worn thin. I guess I have heard from too many generals such as those quoted by the Senator from Arizona that they just need a little more time. I have seen what time has cost us. It has cost us American lives. It has cost us serious, debilitating injuries. It has cost us a great deal in terms of our national treasure and resources. I think it is time for a change of policy, and so do the American people. They said that in the last election. They don't want us to dream up procedural obstacles to keep us from this decision. They want us to vote up or down to change the policy or keep the policy. That is what we were sent here to do.

I hope the Republican side of the aisle, as they initiate this filibuster, as they try to stop us from coming to a majority vote on the Levin-Reed amendment, understand that America sees that clearly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. The Senator from Illinois—and this is growing a little wearisome, it really is. The fact is, 60 votes have been invoked by the minority time after time after time, whether it be a district judge or an appellate court judge, or most any other issue that is controversial. The Senator from Illinois knows that, and that is why it is very disappointing to see him using this kind of rhetoric when he is willing to have 60 votes be required for some judge but somehow feels—which they did invoke when they were in the minority—and yet feels that it is not appropriate to have 60 votes on an issue of this importance.

The Senator from Illinois talks about beginning the withdrawal in 120 days, beginning the withdrawal in 120 days. The day that is signed into law would be the day—would be the day, in the view of every military expert, that al-Qaida would sit back and wait until we left.

The Senator from Illinois continues to call it a civil war. There is sectarian violence. There is very little doubt in the minds—of course, perhaps the Senator from Illinois and others know more than literally every expert I know. It has become, in the words of General Petraeus, a center for al-Qaida and a central front in the war on terror, according to our leading generals.

Now, I resent a little bit this comment by the Senator from Illinois about he has heard the generals before. I heard the generals before, and I disagreed with the generals, and that is our right to do. But to denigrate their opinion I don't think is appropriate to people who spend their lives in the service of the military, defending this Nation. General Petraeus, it is my understanding, has been wounded three times in different wars fighting for this Nation. I think he deserves respect rather than being dismissed by saying: Well, I have heard the generals say that before. We should pay attention to the generals. We should have paid attention to the generals at other times in our history, including those who disagreed with the former Secretary of Defense, Secretary Rumsfeld.

Again, I repeat, since we seem to be going in a certain circularity, conditions in Iraq today are terrible, but they become way worse as the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, Ryan Crocker, a career foreign service officer, recently told the New York Times. I am quoting from the Washington Post editorial of just a few days ago:

> The generals who have devised—

The generals whom the Senator from Illinois derides—

> The generals who have devised a new strategy believe they are making fitful progress in calming Baghdad, training the Iraqi Army, and encouraging anti-al-Qaida coalitions. Before Congress begins managing rotation schedules and ordering withdrawals, it should at least give those generals the months they ask for to see whether their strategy can offer some new hope.

Why do you think the Washington Post and literally most every national security expert feels that this ought to be given an opportunity, remembering that the last part of it has just been put in place a short time ago? Because the consequences of failure, as I have just quoted from many military experts, are a catastrophe.

General Lynch says:

> What the Iraqis are worried about is our leaving. And our answer is: We are staying, because my order from the Corps Commander is that we don't leave the battle space until we can hand over to the Iraqi security forces. Everybody wants things to happen overnight, and that is not going to happen.

So when the amendment of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Michigan is passed, then the word is spread and General Lynch can no longer say to the Iraqis we are staying, because we will be leaving.

General Odierno says:

> My assessment right now is, I need more time to understand how the current offensive targeting al-Qaida and Iraq terrorists is working and how it could lead to political progress in the months ahead.

Odierno said:

> I am seeing some progress now here in Iraq. We have really just started what the Iraqis term ''liberating'' them from al-Qaida. What I've got to determine is what do I need in order to continue that progress so that the political peace can take hold and Iraqi sources can hold this for the long term.

I want to point out to my colleagues that I am not guaranteeing success. I wish it had gone better. I think there are areas, particularly as far as the government is concerned, where dramatic improvement has to take place. But I do know the consequences of failure, and that view of setting a date for withdrawal is a clear recipe for a much larger conflict with much greater involvement in the region over time.

So when the Senator from Illinois and my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about how this won't be withdrawal if this is passed, I say: My friends, this is withdrawal. This is the message to those people who have to remain in the neighborhood: We are leaving and you are going to have to make adjustments to the neighborhood and the new big guys on the block.

Again, I wish we could take up this issue in September. I wish we could pass the necessary legislation to care for the men and women who are wounded. I wish we could pass the necessary legislation in order to take care of the needs of the men and women in the military. If we pass this bill this week—I tell my colleagues we are going to be going into the August recess. We will be coming back in September with probably a very contentious conference with the House. The chances right now of us getting final passage and the President's signature on this bill by the first of October is not good. So the sooner we get this bill off the floor and to the President, the better off we are going to be.

I certainly hope we will take into consideration the great needs that are existing in the military today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, tomorrow's vote in the Senate is not a vote on the Levin-Reed amendment. It is a vote on whether the Senate will allow us to vote on the Levin-Reed amendment. It is a vote on whether the Senate will break a filibuster so that the Senate can express its will, which I think is totally clear and reflects the will of the American people as expressed last November.

A change in course in Iraq is critical for our national security. If you think the present course is working, if you think we are making progress, as the President has said month after month, year after year, then presumably you are going to vote against the Levin-Reed amendment—if we can ever get to a vote on the Levin-Reed amendment. But if you believe that changing course is the only hope of success in Iraq, that forcing the political leaders of Iraq to accept responsibility for their nation and to work out the political settlements that could prevent this violence from continuing and lead to the ultimate success in Iraq, and if we can get to the Levin-Reed amendment and break the filibuster, then you will be voting yes.

Madam President, it has been more than 4 years since the United States invaded Iraq. Despite a military victory that toppled Saddam Hussein and routed his army, Iraq soon became victim to a Sunni insurgency, to Shiite militias bent on revenge, and became victim to an incursion of al-Qaida terrorists whose actions were aimed and are aimed at promoting an Iraqi civil war.

As the situation on the ground has shifted, so has President Bush's rationale for our involvement. He took us into Iraq to get rid of Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction. When no weapons of mass destruction were found, the President said we needed to create a democracy in Iraq. Now the President says we must stay on to fight al-Qaida.

The President had a pre-surge strategy, a surge strategy, and now he has offered a post-surge strategy. What has remained constant in all of these strategies is one thing: They all have an open-ended commitment of U.S. forces in the middle of Iraq's civil war.

That open-ended commitment of a Muslim country by the West has played right into the hands of al-Qaida. Indeed, the intelligence community is recently reported to have concluded that the years of our occupation of Iraq have seen a surge of al-Qaida in Iraq.

It has come at a staggering cost—the loss of more than 3,600 of America's best and bravest, seven times that many wounded, and a price of $10 billion each month. In spite of the heroic efforts of the U.S. service men and women, chaos and destruction have deepened in Iraq.

Yet, month after month, year after year, the President has touted progress in Iraq and called for patience. It has been a litany of delusion. Just listen to President Bush's repeated claims of progress.

In October of 2003, President Bush said:

> We are making progress about improving the lives of the people there in Iraq.

On September 25, 2004, the President said:

> We're making steady progress in implementing our five-step plan toward the goal we all want: completing the mission so that Iraq is stable and self-governing, and American troops can come home. . . .

On April 28, 2005, the President said:

> I believe we're really making progress in Iraq. . . .

On October 28, 2005, the President said:

> Iraq has made incredible political progress. . . .

On November 14, 2005, the President said:

> Iraqis are making inspiring progress toward building a democracy.

On May 25, 2006, the President said:

> We are making progress on all fronts.

On March 19, 2007, the President said:

> There has been good progress.

The exaggeration and the hype continues to this day. On June 28, a few weeks ago, the White House press release stated:

The Iraqi security forces are growing in number, becoming more capable, and coming closer to the day when they can assume responsibility for defending their own country.

But in the benchmark assessment report released last week we read:

There has been a slight reduction in units assessed as capable of independent operations since January 2007.

That is referring to Iraqi units. Even that turned out to be an exaggeration. Just 2 days later, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Peter Pace, told the press that the number of Iraqi Army brigades that were capable of independent operations had fallen from 10 to 6—quite a difference from a ''slight reduction.''

Madam President, one merely has to take note of recent incidents in Iraq as reported in our newspapers to know that things are not going well in Iraq and that the administration's assessments of progress have been consistently overblown through the years and continue to be overblown.

Consider the headline in USA Today on July 12: ''Iraqi police assist gunmen.'' The story described our Army investigation into a January attack in Karbala that killed five U.S. soldiers. Our investigation concluded that the Iraqi police who were supposed to be partners with American troops colluded with insurgents.

Then there was this story in the New York Times on July 14: ''U.S. Troops Battle Iraqi Police in East Baghdad.'' Those are the police who are supposed to be on our side trying to quell the violence in Baghdad, not attacking American troops.

On the all-important area of political benchmarks, consider this headline from the Financial Times of June 18: ''U.S. Military Frustrated at Lack of Iraqi Reconciliation.'' The story reports that General Petraeus said there has not been any ''real substantial achievements in terms of political reform in progress.''

Reuters reported on June 18 that Iraq was ranked the second most unstable country in the world behind Sudan in the 2007 Failed States Index, produced by Foreign Policy magazine. Failed state? Obviously, we don't want Iraq to be left as a failed state. It is failing. It is on a failing course. If we don't change that course, it is going to continue to descend into that failed status.

The administration's recent self-assessment of benchmarks that there is progress on 8 of the 18 benchmarks would have us believe that the cup in Iraq is half full rather than being half empty. Eight of eighteen—that sounds pretty good, like progress. But as a matter of fact, Iraq is a cup with a hole in its bottom. We keep pouring in our men and women and resources, and there is a hole in the bottom of that cup through which they go.

It is that Iraqi hole that Secretary Gates addressed on June 14 in Baghdad when he said the message he was delivering to the Iraqi people was that ''our troops are buying them time to pursue reconciliation and that, frankly, we are disappointed in the progress thus far.'' Secretary Gates was accurate in saying that ''our troops are buying [the Iraqis] time to pursue reconciliation.'' But what he left unsaid is that our troops and our Nation have paid, and continue to pay, far too high a price to give the Iraqis that opportunity, and the time is long past due for the Iraqi political leaders to accept responsibility for their own future.

Secretary Gates' statement that we are ''disappointed in the progress'' was surely an immense understatement. The American people are downright incensed at the failure of the Iraqi leaders.

Everybody agrees there is no military solution in Iraq and that the only way to end the violence is for the Iraqi political leaders to settle their differences. Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki acknowledged that last November when he said—and these words should be seared, I believe, into the consciousness of each of us as we vote, if we are ever allowed to vote on the Levin-Reed amendment. Here is what he said:

The crisis is political, and the ones who can stop the cycle of . . . bloodletting of innocents are the [Iraqi] politicians.

Our service men and women are dying and being wounded while Iraqi leaders dawdle. The Iraqis themselves made commitments to share resources and power, amend their constitution, hold provincial elections, and take over responsibility for their own security in many more places than they have. They made the commitments last year in writing, but they have not kept them.

Secretary of State Rice recently confirmed in a letter to me that Iraqi leaders themselves, including their Presidency Council, had approved those benchmarks and the associated timeline. Secretary Rice wrote me:

We have confirmed with Iraqi President Talabani's chief of staff that the benchmarks were formally approved last fall by the Iraqi political committee on national security. This committee includes the presidency council, the President, and the two vice presidents, as well as the leaders of all the major political blocs in Iraq.

Well, the Iraqi leaders' record on meeting the political timelines, which they approved themselves with a timeline, is abysmal.

For example, they said they would approve provincial elections and set a date for those elections by October of 2006. That has not been accomplished. They didn't do what they promised they would do.

The Iraqi political leaders said they would approve the hydrocarbon law by October 2006. That was not done. That has not been accomplished. They didn't do what they said they would do. The Iraqi leaders said they would approve a debaathification law by November 2006. They didn't do what they promised to do. The Iraqi political leaders said the Constitutional Review Committee would complete its work by January 2007 and hold a constitutional amendment referendum by March of this year. They did not do what they promised they would do.

This is not us imposing our benchmarks on them, this is the Iraqi political leaders who adopted their benchmarks, and have not met them.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Secretary Rice and her response be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, while our troops have done everything, and more, of what has been asked of them, while they have risked their all and given their all, the Iraqi political leaders remain frozen by their own history, unwilling to take the political risks that only they can take.

If there is any hope of forcing the Iraqi political leaders to take responsibility for their own country and to keep the commitments they made to meet the political benchmarks that they set and to make the compromises that only they can make, it is to have a timetable to begin reducing American forces and to redeploy those forces to a more limited support mission instead of being everybody's target in the middle of a civil war.

We need to send a clear message to the Iraqi leaders that we will not be in Iraq indefinitely, that we will not be their security blanket forever. That is what the Levin-Reed amendment would do if we are allowed to vote on it. Our amendment would require the President to begin reducing the number of American troops in Iraq within 4 months of enactment.

It would require transitioning the mission of our remaining military forces to force protection, training of Iraqi security forces, and targeted counterterrorism missions. Our amendment would require that the transition to those limited missions be completed by April 30 of next year. Finally, and importantly, it would call for a comprehensive diplomatic, political, and economic strategy, including sustained engagement with Iraq's neighbors and seeking an appointment of an international mediator under the auspices of the U.N. Security Council in order to try to bring stability to Iraq.

Some have criticized our amendment because it contains a timeline for the completion of the transition to new missions. We received similar criticism in the past about the timeline for the commencement of the transition. Timelines need to be established as the only way to force a change of course in Iraq and to force the Iraqis to accept responsibility for their own future. It is human nature to put off difficult decisions. Passage of our amendment would serve as a forcing mechanism and serve to stimulate action by the Iraqi Government to reach a political settlement.

Delaying action until the receipt of the administration's plan in September would only delay the time when Congress applies the needed pressure. There is no indication that Iraqi political leaders will compromise without our pressure. Indeed, there is every indication they will not. As Secretary Gates stated in April:

> Debate in Congress . . . has been helpful in demonstrating to the Iraqis that American patience is limited . . . The debate itself and . . . the strong feelings expressed in the Congress about the timetable probably has had a positive effect in terms of communicating to the Iraqis that this is not an open-ended commitment.

There is no indication the administration is willing to change course. For years, they have deluded themselves and the Nation with claims of progress while Iraqis descended into sectarian violence and chaos. On July 4, President Bush repeated his call for patience which he has made so many times over the years.

After more than 4 years, over 3,600 U.S. deaths, seven times that many wounded, and expenditures of $10 billion a month that we are borrowing from the future to finance this war in Iraq, the President's pleas for patience not only have a hollow ring, it is exactly the wrong message to the Iraqi leaders. Our message should be we are out of patience, and the refusal of the Iraqi leaders to work out their political differences is something which is no longer acceptable.

Congress attempted to respond to last November's election with a vote that we made on April 26. We adopted a bill that did provide a timetable to begin the reduction of U.S. forces in Iraq, the beginning of a phased troop reduction, redeployment in no more than 120 days, and a transition to a more limited mission focusing on counterterrorism, force protection, and training and logistical support for the Iraqi Army. President Bush vetoed our bill shortly thereafter.

Senator MCCONNELL made a statement which was, I believe, very direct and very accurate, when he assessed not too long ago that ''the handwriting is on the wall that we are going in a different direction in the fall.'' That Presidential veto does not wash away the handwriting on the wall. It only makes the handwriting clearer and firmer that there is going to be a change of direction in Iraq.

So the question is: Why wait? Why not decide on a change of course now to save months of lost and wounded lives and huge additional expenditure of funds?

The clearer the handwriting on the wall is to the Iraqi political leaders and the quicker they read it and accept it, the greater the prospect for political settlement.

The clearer the handwriting on the wall is that the open-ended commitment of President Bush is over, not just rhetorically but in reality, the greater chance that an even wider civil war can be avoided.

There are some who acknowledge that a change of course is needed in Iraq, including U.S. troop reductions but who then say not now. But surely time is not working for us in Iraq. The sooner we shift strategy to force Iraqis to take responsibility, the better.

If we wish to improve the chance of a positive report on political progress in September, we need to put great pressure on Iraqi political leaders in July. We cannot and must not continue to have the lives of American servicemembers held hostage to Iraqi political intrigue and intransigence.

If we can get to the Levin-Reed amendment, if we can overcome the filibuster, and if we can adopt the Levin-Reed amendment which provides for the beginning of the reduction of our forces in Iraq in 120 days and transitioning to more limited missions, no more than 120 days after enactment, if we can adopt an amendment which says we will complete that transition by April 30, 2008, if we can adopt our amendment which provides for the appointment of an international mediator under U.N. auspices, we believe we will have passed the best chance of success in Iraq, and we will have adopted the only course of action which has a chance of pressuring the Iraqi leaders to do what only they can do.

The clock is ticking. We are losing more American lives and more American resources every day we delay. The time has come to set deadlines, to reduce our forces in Iraq, to transition to the new limited missions, and to embark on a comprehensive, diplomatic, political, and economic strategy to bring stability to Iraq.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2007.

Hon. CONDOLEEZZA RICE,
Secretary of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SECRETARY: I am writing in connection with your letter of January 20, 2007 in which you advised me regarding a set of benchmarks that the Government of Iraq has set for itself.

You wrote that ''Iraq's Policy Committee on National Security agreed upon a set of political, security, and economic benchmarks and an associated timeline in September 2006. These were reaffirmed by the Presidency Council on October 16, 2006, and referenced by the Iraq Study Group; the relevant document (enclosed) was posted at that time on the President of Iraq's website.''

Yesterday, I met with Mowaffak al-Rubaie, Prime Minister Maliki's national security adviser. During the course of our meeting, Dr. Rubaie stated that the Presidency Council never reaffirmed the benchmarks. He was adamant on this point even after I showed him the statement in your letter.

This is an important point as the Presidency Council, whose three members, President Jalal Talabani (Kurd), Deputy President 'Adil 'Abd al-Mahdi (Shia Muslim) and Deputy President Tariq al-Hashimi (Sunni Muslim), are elected by the Council of Representatives and represent the three major ethnic groups of the country.

Earlier today, State Department Spokesman Sean McCormack stated ''These are the benchmarks that they've laid out for themselves. We didn't come up with them. They came up with them. And they need to be seen in the eyes of the Iraqi people as delivering for the Iraqi people.''

It seems to me that it would make a difference if the benchmarks and associated timeline were only approved by an advisory group as compared to the Presidency Council.

Accordingly, please confirm that the benchmarks and associated timeline, which you attached to your January 30, 2007 letter, were reaffirmed by the Presidency Council after being agreed upon by the Policy Committee on National Security, as stated in your letter.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

CARL LEVIN,
Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2007.

Hon. CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter inquiring about the benchmarks that the Government of Iraq set for itself last fall.

As you mentioned, I sent to you a letter in January in which I noted that Iraq's Political Committee on National Security agreed upon a set of benchmarks and an associated timeline, which were reaffirmed by the Iraqi Presidency Council in October 2006.

We have confirmed with Iraqi President Talabani's Chief of Staff that the benchmarks were formally approved last fall by the Iraqi Political Committee on National Security. This committee includes the Presidency Council—the President and the two Vice Presidents—as well as the leaders of all the major political blocs in Iraq. The Iraqi Presidency Council then posted the benchmarks on its website for several months.

Thank you for your interest in this issue. Please feel free to contact us on this or any matter of concern to you.

Sincerely,

CONDOLEEZZA RICE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, yesterday a man whom I had the opportunity of meeting and knowing a little bit, British Army Lieutenant General Jim Lamb—General Lamb is the Deputy Commander of Multinational Forces Iraq and senior British military representative in Iraq—was asked by Jamie McIntyre of CNN about how ''the growing sentiment in our Congress to bring U.S. troops home sooner'' affected the mood of his troops deployed in Iraq, meaning the British troops. Lieutenant General Lamb responded that those troops find it ''a touch difficult.'' I think that is a very interesting phrase, ''a touch difficult,'' because while it is so clear to them that we are making progress, it is not reflected by those who are not in the fight but are sitting back and making judgment upon what they, the troops, can see with absolute clarity.

Lieutenant General Lamb noted that those making such judgments and not taking note of the progress ''are not going out every day in a humvee.'' Moreover, he further noted that the progress the troops see is seldom reported. They see provincial counselors,

they see water going to people who didn't have it before, they see electricity coming online, they see stability to the networks. They see all this stuff that no one portrays.

I say to my friend from Michigan and the Senator from Illinois and others, I hope they pay a little attention to General Lamb's statement or reject it out of hand, of course, as apparently is being done.

I have to repeat, General Lamb responded that his troops find it ''a touch difficult.'' While it is so clear to them we are making progress, it is not reflected by those who are not in the fight but are sitting back and making judgment upon what they, the troops, can see with absolute clarity.

I don't think I have to editorialize anymore on General Lamb's, I think, totally accurate statements.

The New York Post reported on July 10 an interview with General Petraeus. He is asked by Ralph Peters, a person for whom I have enormous respect:

> The current military operations in Iraq appear comprehensive and tenacious, part of a long-term, integrated plan. What can we realistically expect to achieve?
>
> Petraeus: Our primary goal is to work with our Iraqi counterparts to improve security for the Iraqi people. This is intended to give the Iraqi leaders the time to resolve the tough political issues they face and to pursue internal reconciliation.

He goes on to say:

> As to reasonable expectations, we can expect a reduction in sectarian deaths and the gradual spread of Iraqi government authority. The level of sectarian deaths in Baghdad in June was the lowest in about a year. Nevertheless, the extremists still have been able to carry out car bomb and other attacks.
>
> Wherever we operate, we try to reconnect Iraqi ministries and local governments to meet the needs of the people. Finally, we provide opportunities for Iraqis to use their local knowledge to help root out al Qaeda. Successful operations of this nature have played out in recent months in Ramadi, Hit and Baquba. In each case, Iraqis turned against al Qaeda and sided with the Coalition.

Question:

> Now that the surge is fully in place, what's your sense of the positives and negatives thus far? If you could have more of any one item, what would it be? Troops? Time? Iraqi unity?

General Petraeus's answer:

> I can think of few commanders in history who wouldn't have wanted more troops, more time or more unity among their partners; however, if I could only have one at this point in Iraq, it would be more time.

I repeat, General Petraeus said:

> . . . if I could only have one at this point in Iraq, it would be more time. This is an exceedingly tough endeavor that faces countless challenges.

So what does the Levin-Reed amendment do? Deny General Petraeus exactly that. As Senator LEVIN points out in his statement, the announced withdrawal would force the Iraqi Government to act and, therefore, then we would see progress. What if, I say to my colleagues who support this amendment, what if instead the situation deteriorates into a chaotic situation, then what do we do? Then what do we do if the situation gets worse? Do we come back in? Do we sit on the sidelines and watch another genocide? What if, I say to my colleague who often asks me what is plan B, the surge doesn't work? What is plan B if the withdrawal doesn't work?

I don't think that most people would believe that an international mediator is exactly a solution that is viable.

I wish to talk a minute about the region. Finally, after our stunning military victory and shock and awe and the invasion side of the conflict was over, America was in pretty good shape in the region. The Syrians were trying to be cooperative. There were efforts on the part of the Iranians to join with us in efforts to bring about an end to terrorism in the region. Then we began to fail, and that failure has, obviously, been chronicled in many books. I recommend to my colleagues the book ''Fiasco'' or ''Cobra II'' or a number of other books that have been written that describe the failed Rumsfeld strategy. We paid a very heavy price for it. All of us know that. It has been the sacrifice of our most precious asset.

What has happened since? We find the Syrians continuing to intervene in northern Lebanon. We find the Syrians, according to many experts, transporting suicide bombers through the airport in Damascus into Iraq. We find the Iranians not only orchestrating attacks and providing intelligence and even money and funding, in some cases, but there is clear and compelling evidence that the IEDs, the most lethal IEDs are exported from Iran into Iraq, those that have the lethality even of going through the armor of a tank. We find the Iranians more aggressive in the region with Iranian support for Hezbollah and Hamas. The Syrians continue to try to unsettle the Government of Lebanon, and the Government of Lebanon is having great difficulties.

There is a U.N. Security Council resolution that calls for the disarmament of Hezbollah in southern Lebanon. There has been no effort whatsoever to achieve the goals set forth in that U.N. Security Council resolution. In fact, there is strong evidence that Hezbollah in southern Lebanon is being resupplied with the rockets they expended in their latest attack on Israel which provoked an attack on Israel. We find the Saudis becoming more and more uneasy. We once had a report—that fortunately turned out to be false—that the Turks had crossed over into the Kurdish areas because of Kurdish insurgents who are operating out of the Turkish areas, at least according to the Turks. So we have seen, because of our failure in Iraq, more strife, more conflict, and more threats to the State of Israel.

Meanwhile, the Iranians continue on the path to develop nuclear weapons. A great fear of many of us is not a nuclear weapon aimed at Israel from Iran. One of our great fears is a nuclear weapon passed to a terrorist organization by the Iranian Government, which has stated through its President and its policies their dedication to the extinction of the State of Israel. I could argue that the State of Israel is probably in more jeopardy from a national security standpoint than at any time in its history, since that very young nation achieved its independence.

So what happens in the region when we adopt the Levin-Reed resolution, and the signal is sent throughout the region ''don't worry, the Americans are leaving.'' I think the consequences are fairly obvious. So we are not just talking about Iraq, as serious and consequential as that situation is. We are talking about the region. It is hard for me to believe the Sunnis would not intervene to protect Sunnis if there is a bloodletting in Baghdad, where 2 million Sunni reside and 4 million Shia. But according to the premise of the Levin-Reed amendment, this will force the Iraqi Government to act and to control their own destiny.

My question is: What do we do if they can't? What do we do if they can't?

Some of my colleagues have talked about this ''gradual withdrawal.'' A gradual withdrawal. I think most military experts would tell you that the most difficult operation in military tactics and strategy is a ''gradual withdrawal.'' It is fraught with difficulty. When an army is defeated, and an army tries to come home, it is the most difficult of all military operations.

So I think that as we discuss this specific amendment and the issue of whether we stay or go in Iraq, whether we allow the new strategy of General Petraeus and the Joint Chiefs of Staff a chance to succeed, which calls for a surge in Iraq, while we debate this, I don't think we should ignore the larger implications for the region. I believe, and I cannot absolutely predict the future, but a failure in Iraq, according to most experts, would lead to a chaotic and unsettled situation in the region.

So I would at least ask for my colleagues' consideration of an article by Stephen Biddle in the Washington Post on July 11, entitled ''Iraq: Go Deep or Get Out.'' I think perhaps we ought to start looking at this situation from that respect. Mr. Biddle, in his piece, says:

> The result has been a search for some kind of politically moderate ''Plan B'' that would split the difference between surge and withdrawal.

I think that adequately describes the Reed-Levin amendment.

> The problem is that these politics do not fit the military reality of Iraq. Many would like to reduce the U.S. commitment to something like half of today's troop presence there. But it is much harder to find a mission for the remaining 60,000 to 80,000 soldiers that makes any sense militarily.
>
> Perhaps the most popular centrist option today is drawn from the Baker-Hamilton commission recommendations of last December. This would withdraw U.S. combat brigades, shift the American mission from one of training and supporting the Iraqi security forces, and cut total U.S. troop levels in the

country by about half. This idea is at the heart of the proposed legislative effort that Domenici threw his support behind last week, and support is growing on both sides of the aisle on Capitol Hill.

The politics make sense, but the compromise leaves us with an untenable military mission. Without a major U.S. combat effort to keep the violence down, the American training effort would face challenges even bigger than those our troops are confronting today. An ineffective training effort would leave tens of thousands of American trainers, advisers, and supporting troops exposed to that violence in the meantime. The net result is likely to be continued U.S. casualties with little positive effect on Iraq's ongoing civil war.

It is unrealistic to expect that we can pull back to some safe yet productive mission of training but not fighting—this would be neither safe nor productive.

So, Madam President, I think we ought to look at what we are discussing here not only from the standpoint of Iraq but the implications for our presence in the region. And I will say something that is very seldom stated on the floor of the Senate: as long as we are dependent on oil in the region, our greater national security interests are at stake in what happens with the outcome of Iraq. The possibility of success in Iraq, of seeing the world's third largest oil reserves being modernized and used, and those revenues used for the betterment of the American people, also presents a goal that I think is worth striving for.

I would like to again return to the fact that I am deeply disappointed in the Maliki government. Their failure to act unhinges the very important aspect of the military, political, social, and economic aspects of any successful counterinsurgency operation. But I also believe that nothing would embolden the Iranians more, nothing would embolden the Syrians more, nothing would frighten the Jordanians and the Saudis more, not to mention the Egyptians, than the passage of legislation which would require the withdrawal of the United States.

So I urge my colleagues not only to look at how this legislation and this debate affects America vis-a-vis Iraq but affects our western and national interests and values in the entire Middle East.

Madam President, I note the patience of my friend from Rhode Island, who is a thoughtful and valued member of the Armed Services Committee whose friendship I appreciate a great deal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the kind words. And one of my first reactions was a bit of confusion. He referenced General Lamb, the British officer in Baghdad, expressing chagrin at the proposals to reduce the troop strength of the American forces. He must have been beside himself last February when Prime Minister Blair announced the reduction of British forces. In fact, Prime Minister Blair stated at that time that 7,100 troops would be drawn down to approximately 5,500. That is down from a level of 40,000.

So at the time that the British are withdrawing troops, we are trying to surge troops. I think the general's peak or discomfort is somewhat misplaced with the United States. I think it should more properly be directed to Prime Minister Blair.

But let me get on with issues that I want to address, and that is to try to clarify from my perspective some of the concepts and terms that have been talked about. One is a repeated reference to General Petraeus's plan. The President makes it, and my colleagues make it. This is the President's plan. General Petraeus was asked specifically in his confirmation hearing what role he played, and here was his answer.

I met with the Secretary of Defense a couple days after he took office and before he left for his first trip to Iraq, and we discussed the situation there during that meeting. We subsequently talked after his trip. I also talked to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff several times in this period, noting that a population and security emphasis in Baghdad in particular was necessary to help the Iraqis gain the time and space for tough decisions.

As the strategy was refined, I talked on several occasions to General Odierno. I relayed my support for those levels that General Odierno recommended to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. I also supported the additional emphasis in the advisory effort.

This is not a precise quote, but paraphrases his remarks. General Petraeus is not the author of this plan. He, like many officers, participated, was asked questions; he had great experience. He was the head and led the 101st Air Mobile Division in Iraq and was head of our training effort. But this is not his plan.

Now, he has accepted this plan. He did that publicly. But this is the President's plan. And at the heart of the President's plan is the statement he made on January 10 when he announced it.

I have made it clear to the prime minister and Iraq's other leaders that America's commitment is not open-ended. If the Iraqi government does not follow through on its promises, it will lose the support of the American people and lose the support of the Iraqi people. Now is the time to act. The prime minister understands this.

Well, apparently, the prime minister did not understand, because in the intervening months, exactly what the President feared has happened. There has been no adequate political progress in Iraq. That is key rationale for the increased forces in Iraq. And without this political decisiveness on the part of the Iraqis, our military efforts will not be decisive. And what has happened because of this failure to act is precisely as the President suggested? The American people have increasingly become critical of the policy in Iraq. Their support is eroding, and similarly the Iraqi people.

So you have a situation now where the logic and the premise for the surge, for the troop levels we are maintaining in Iraq, was the fact there would be political progress. Since January, to date there has not been political progress. I daresay there is very few, if any, of my colleagues that will argue that between now and September 15 we will see remarkable progress by the Iraqi Government. Indeed, it is suspected, confirmed practically, that the Iraqi Assembly will adjourn in August for the month. So the reality is that on these critical issues of political will and decisiveness and political progress, we will know nothing in September that we do not know now.

Given the incredibly complicated political system, the incredibly complicated institutional challenges facing the Iraqi Government, the notion that we will know more even at the end of this year or the beginning of next year is doubtful. Without this political progress, all our military efforts will not produce success. That is one reason I think we have to begin to change course. We have to begin to adjust our effort to protect our self-interests and our interests in the region, but no longer be the broker, if you will, for political progress in Iraq that does not materialize.

My colleagues have been on the Senate floor and said time and time again that there have been deadlines imposed, in many cases by the Iraqis themselves, that have not been met. The latest report, just a few days ago, suggested these political benchmarks have not been issued. Without that, our efforts and the brave sacrifice of our soldiers, marines, airmen, and sailors, and every man and woman who is out there, are not producing the results we want and need. So we have to look again at this strategy.

But there is another factor, too, that I think is important to note. I was just in Iraq—as so many of my colleagues have traveled there, I have also—and I spoke with General Petraeus directly. He gave me every indication that he was not waiting for September; that he had been able to make an assessment over the several months he has been in command, and he is prepared to make a recommendation—unless I misunderstood him—before the end of August.

Now, he might be overruled by the White House in Washington, but he has a pretty good sense of what is happening on the ground, and we should have that same sense in the Congress.

The other factor that seems so critical when it is put next to the issue of no apparent progress by Iraqi political leaders is the fact that by April of next year, April 2008, our military forces will not be able to generate 160,000 troops on the ground in Iraq. The surge will come to an end regardless of what happens on the ground. Unless, of course, the President is prepared to

make Draconian personnel changes, extend deployments to 18 months or even longer, calling up Reserve and National Guard units that are not scheduled to be called up, continuing to rely upon the stop-loss practice, where individuals who are eligible to leave the service after honorable service are denied the opportunity to leave and in many cases are forced to deploy; picking reservists and people who are in the individual Ready Reserve, those are individuals who served their full active commitment, they have left, many of them have gone on with their lives and suddenly they are called up and told get back in uniform, you are going overseas.

Without such draconian decisions, then by next April we will not be able to field 160,000 troops in Iraq as we are doing today. So the reality is this policy will change. The question is, will it change now or then and will it change in a way that strengthens the national security of the United States? Also, will it change in a way it will gain the support of the American people?

One of the factors in a counterinsurgency is the fact that you need popular support. That is not something that is a special thing to have or a nice thing to have, it is essential to the strategy. We are losing—the President is losing—popular support with respect to these operations. Without that support, we will not be able to maintain our presence in Iraq.

We are seeing already Americans across the political divide, across the geographical divide, demanding that this Congress act. They have, frankly, little confidence in the President's ability, after all these years, to get it right. That is one of the major reasons we are here today debating, and we will be tonight debating, because the American people are looking for a new direction in Iraq.

The other factor that I think should be mentioned is that, while we have pursued a strategy of increasing our forces, our adversaries—and they are multiple in a complicated theater of operations—have reacted. First of all, they have taken the battle, if you will, the battle we tried to orchestrate in Baghdad, and they have spread it around the country. They have moved where there are fewer troops. This has caused us to spread our operations around. The surge, if you will, the additional approximately 30,000 troops, were initially intended to go into Baghdad.

If you, as I did, listened closely to General Petraeus at his confirmation hearing, if you listened to the President in his January 10 speech, the concept was Baghdad was going to be locked down. It was going to be saturated with American and Iraqi forces. That has not happened because our tactical leaders have determined they must get out of Baghdad, they must go ahead and pursue some of these elements outside of Baghdad, and our adversaries have decided they would rather move on than take us in a head-to-head fight.

Time, regretfully, is always on the side of the insurgent. If they can survive a day, then that is a day that is in their favor. As a result, even with these additional 30,000 troops, there is a question of whether they are an adequate number to take over this population protection mission the President has announced. The population of Iraq is significant. That is another factor I think we have to consider when we look at the adequacy of even the President's proposal today.

The Levin-Reed proposal talks about doing what is not only necessary but frankly inevitable. We have to begin to redeploy our forces. We have to begin to reduce our forces. We cannot sustain this effort because of the structure of our military forces.

The President had an opportunity several years ago, in the wake of our success in Afghanistan and in the wake of the operations in Iraq, to dramatically increase the size of the Army and the Marine Corps. Senator HAGEL and I came to the floor and we proposed an amendment, in 2003, to do that. This was opposed by the administration because, if you recall, back then this Iraq operation was basically all but over and they were getting out.

Now it is very difficult to increase the size of the military forces. The Army has missed, for the last 2 months, its recruiting objectives. But even if we stayed on track recruiting, we are still in a situation where we cannot grow the Army fast enough, the Marine Corps fast enough, to maintain indefinitely these forces in Iraq. So the strategy must change. If the strategy is not only not supported by our end strength, it certainly must change in the light of the American people.

I think the President made a significant mistake last January. After an election that sent a very strong signal all across this country that the American people wanted change, after the report of the Iraq Study Group, wise men and women on both sides of the aisle, with no particular special interest they were trying to protect or advance—they were true patriots coming forward to give their best advice—suggested that our strategy should be remarkably similar to what we are talking about today: the redeployment of the American forces; switching missions to training, force protection, counterterrorism; engaging in robust diplomatic activity in the region.

Those recommendations were cast aside by the President. At that point, if not earlier, the American public began to seriously question the direction of his policy in Iraq. Without public support, you cannot conduct military operations effectively or for any length of time.

So we face two realities in the United States. Ultimately, the inability to generate this force structure indefinitely and the fact that the American people are growing increasingly intolerant of our operations in Iraq—not our forces there, not those magnificent men and women who are fighting and sadly dying each day but our presence there and the lack each day, in their minds, of any real progress and the documented lack of political progress. It was documented a few days ago on the part of the Iraqi Government.

So we have to change. The question then is what is the best way to do it? We can debate about this. But certainly this amendment, offered by myself and Senator LEVIN, represents a change. Not a hortatory request for further assessment, not a discussion of possibilities or reference to another study group but a plan of change.

It begins by initiating a reduction of our forces 120 days after passage. That probably will be sometime toward the end of this year, given the nature of the legislative process. It doesn't specify any specific level of reductions. That is the President as Commander's prerogative. It doesn't specify a particular timetable when they can leave, who should go first. Again, that is his prerogative. But what it does suggest and, in fact, requires is that by April of next year, that we have transitioned to three missions—again, missions that were supported significantly by the Iraq Study Group: Force protection—we always have to protect our forces and facilities in the field; counterterrorism, because we never want to give up not only the option but the obligation to strike at terrorist cells wherever they may be, particularly in Iraq; and third, the continued training of the Iraqi security forces.

These I think are missions that are not only critical but they advance our national security interests. Again, this fight against terror cannot be given up. We have to continue it. To the extent that we can create effective Iraqi security forces, mitigates against the real concerns that have been expressed on this floor of the aftermath of what I think is almost an inevitable reduction in our presence. We have to be concerned about that.

One of the vexing things, though, about training the Iraqi security forces, is it is relatively easy to teach map reading and squad drills. It is relatively easy to teach calling for artillery fire. What is hard to teach, because you really can't teach it, is the political reliability, with a small ''p,'' the dedication to the country, the situation in which professional officers are truly professional. That is one of the nagging doubts that everyone has about the Iraqi security forces, particularly the Iraqi police, and to a less degree the Iraqi Army. There are many factors there, too, but we still have to, I think, press forward and try to train these forces.

Our amendment represents the only real possibility of change today, of all those that might be discussed on the floor. It represents not a precipitous withdrawal. It is a phased reduction to missions that are important and are

well within the capacity, I believe, of our military forces to sustain over time. They serve, I think, the much broader interests of the United States.

All of this, of course, has to be complemented by robust political activity, diplomatic activity in Iraq and around the region, something the President has been woefully lacking in his pursuit of, over the many months we have been engaged. We have to make the case—it is difficult to make, but we have to make the case to the neighbors, particularly, that an Iraq that becomes this caldron of instability and chaos that some of my colleagues fear—and, frankly, that we have to at least anticipate, in terms of our diplomacy and some of our military preparation—that this situation would be detrimental to them as much, if not more, than to us.

A chaotic, turbulent, anarchy on the border of any country spells serious problems for that country. That case should begin to be made immediately, not only by our diplomats but by the international community.

We suggest, also, we have to try again to involve others in this effort; not just the United States and Great Britain but others, the international actors. They, too, I think have an interest in a stable region, a stable Iraq.

It has been discussed on this floor that al-Qaida is sitting back and hoping we leave. It is an interesting concept because there is some contradictory evidence. Ayman Zawahiri, who is the second in command of al-Qaida, was quoted recently as suggesting that our departure would actually be something that would cause them some concern. Not because they don't wish us ill, they certainly do. Not because today they don't continue to try to attack us. But because they believe our presence in Iraq, in his words as translated, is a ''historic trap,'' that we are trapped there and that they can use their forces there—not the al-Qaida elements but all the sectarian groups, some of them operating against us because we are there—they can use these forces to attack our troops, diminish our presence, and effectively continue to apply pressure on us.

I think there is a suggestion there that our departure might, in fact, help us in our overall strategy. It certainly will help us to counteract the image which the propagandists, the Zawahiris of the world present, that the United States is committed to destroying the Muslim community by imperialistically invading holy territory. We are in a battle of ideas ultimately, and we are not doing a very good job because what they are able to show throughout the entire Islamic world is our forces in Iraq and our forces in Afghanistan but particularly in Iraq and try to validate their claim, their propaganda, that is why they exist, to resist us.

In the course of our strategy going forward, one should think at least about the efficacy of our presence there, not in terms of a bulwark of security in Iraq but as a way that we, in fact, are playing into the hands of many of these Iraqi terrorists, these international terrorists.

One of the other aspects we face as a reality on the ground is the complex situation in Iraq. Too often I think the President and others try to simplify this as this battle for Iraq is the central front in our battle against al-Qaida. I would argue the central front in our battle against al-Qaida is somewhere in Pakistan. That is where bin Laden is, where Zarqawi is, that is where it is reported that hundreds of Iraqis and others, Europeans, Chechens, are training to be jihadist terrorists across the globe. But regardless of where the central front is, the issue I think we have to recognize and grasp is that our presence in Iraq is something we cannot sustain indefinitely.

We have to focus, I think, on the other threats, focus more diligently on these other threats. Now, we have a situation in Iraq, a complicated situation of Kurds, Shia, and Sunni, together with criminals, together with terrorist elements, al-Qaida. Too often, as I said, we try to make the point it is just about al-Qaida.

We have made progress in Anbar Province because in that Sunni region, the Sunni tribal leaders have united against al-Qaida. But that does not define the most decisive factor in Iraq, and that is the conflict between the Sunni community and the Shia community; a community on one hand, the Sunnis, who feel profound entitlement, and on the other hand, the Shia, who feel a profound sense of paranoia.

I think we have to ask ourselves seriously, will that profound conflict between the two communities be resolved in 30 days, on September 15; will it be resolved in a week; more than that; October 1; will it be resolved 6 months from now?

It has lasted for hundreds and hundreds of years. It is the fuel that is generating the conflict we see in Iraq today. Without the political steps of the Iraqi Government leaders at least to attempt to deal with this issue, our presence will not deal with—I think in the short term—the solution.

Senator LEVIN and I have proposed what I believe is the most practical, feasible, realistic policy we can pursue today in Iraq; indeed, as I suggest, a policy which perhaps not in the same terms but in the same substance will inevitably be the policy of this country. I hope today, though, we can take decisive action to move to our bill, avoid a filibuster, to vote up or down and move forward with a new direction for Iraq, a new direction for our country.

I note the presence of the senior Senator from West Virginia.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as the Senate turns its attention to the fiscal year 2008 National Defense Authorization Act, every Member of this body is focused on the security of our Nation and the safety of our troops in Iraq. Senators Levin and McCain, along with the other members of the Armed Services Committee, have worked hard, very hard, to put together a bipartisan bill that provides our troops with the resources they need and sets priorities for defense spending for the year ahead.

This is a strong bill. I was proud to support it in committee. But it is incomplete—incomplete because we cannot possibly claim to have truly provided for our Nation's security until we have addressed the situation in Iraq.

It is now more than 4 years since President Bush declared the mission in Iraq has been accomplished. Since ''mission accomplished,'' more than 3,400 U.S. soldiers have died, died in Iraq. A sectarian civil war is now deeply entrenched, deeply entrenched and raging.

The political compromises that for years we have been promised by the Iraqis seem to be more distant than ever. Civilians are dying in ever greater numbers, and every day more American troops are hurled into the crossfire.

It is time, yes, far past time, for the Congress—that is us—to have a real debate about this war and about where our national security interests ultimately lie. We must start by sunsetting the outdated and open-ended 2002 authorization to use force in Iraq and requiring the President to request a new authorization that outlines the new mission which our troops are being asked to perform.

The amendment Senator CLINTON and I are offering does exactly that. It will end the 2002 authorization on its 5-year anniversary, October 11, 2007. That authorization which was passed to confront the threat that we were told faced us from the government of Saddam Hussein is no longer relevant. Our troops have toppled the dictator. The Iraqis have voted in a new government. No weapons of mass destruction have been found.

Meanwhile, American soldiers continue to die, die in the crossfire of another country's civil war, while the President fails to clearly articulate our mission, our strategy or our goals for continuing our occupation of Iraq. He must clearly explain his vision, his vision to an increasingly skeptical public, the American people, those people out yonder, the American people.

We were told this year would mark a turning point, a new direction in this war with a new strategy intended to give Iraq's political leaders breathing room in order to forge a political consensus. Unfortunately, that is not the way events have unfolded. Despite the addition of more than 20,000 American troops into Baghdad, civilian deaths have actually increased as the insurgents have engaged in a surge of their own—a surge of their own—far from creating breathing room for peace.

The President's current course appears to be pumping oxygen into the fire of sectarian violence. The decision to go to war—the decision to go to war—to send our sons and daughters into the line of fire, to ask them to kill and be killed on our behalf, is the weightiest decision that a Member of Congress can ever, ever, ever make.

It is wrong, wrong I say, it is wrong for Congress to continue to fail to reassess that outdated authority without a real debate about where the occupation of Iraq is headed. The authorization that Congress passed in 2002 to give the President authority to go to war in Iraq was rushed through here 3 weeks before Congressional elections—yes, rushed through.

It was passed in the shadow of warnings of mushroom clouds and the not-so-subtle implication that anyone who voted against the war could not be trusted with matters of national security.

It was a hasty and unconstitutional abdication of Congress's authority in matters of war. It is time to bring that authorization to a close—yes—and have an honest debate about the way forward. We do our troops a disservice if we do not take a fresh look, and the President should welcome the opportunity to solicit our renewed support for his policy. We must think of our national interest and think again—yes—of our brave troops. We must put politics aside.

At a recent Senate hearing, I asked Defense Secretary Gates if the 2002 authorization still applies to Iraq. His response, may I say, was surprisingly candid:

> I don't know.

I believe the answer to that question is clear and that it is time for the President to make the case to the Congress of the United States and to the American people of the United States for the U.S. military's changed mission in Iraq. Our country will benefit from the debate.

This amendment puts the ball right back in the President's court, requiring him, the President, to request a new authorization for the new mission that challenges our military. The White House has repeatedly asserted that General Petraeus needs until September to assess the progress of the security escalation in Iraq. This amendment gives him that time. But this amendment also ensures that Congress and the people will have the opportunity to examine that progress to determine our course in Iraq. It is a simple, commonsense approach that reestablishes the congressional authority decreed by the Constitution of the United States. It also respects the President's role as the Commander in Chief.

It is important to emphasize to all of my colleagues that supporting my amendment does not preclude voting for any other legislative options. This amendment addresses the legal foundation for this horrible war. We are a nation of laws, not of men. My amendment simply states the obvious truth, that the facts on the ground do not match the open-ended authorization that is still in force. Any Senator wishing to vote for legislation mandating a withdrawal date or to restrict the war funding or to implement the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group should also support the Byrd-Clinton amendment.

As the President himself said earlier this year:

> The fight we are in is not the fight that we entered.

I couldn't agree more. This is not the fight Congress authorized. I urge this body to schedule a vote on the Byrd-Clinton amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I understand our staffs have reached a point where we were able to clear something like 26 amendments on this bill but that there is one last hurdle on the Republican side. I am wondering whether my good friend from Arizona feels there may be a possibility that we can jump over that hurdle in the next couple hours.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a short colloquy with my colleague from Michigan, the distinguished chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. I say to my colleague that we have one individual, and we do have some 26 amendments that I think are cleared that we could get out of the way. I am working on that right now. I thank my colleague and most of all the staffs for their close cooperation.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend.

I understand the Senator from Nebraska wants the floor, and I yield the floor.

Mr. McCAIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to support the Levin-Reed amendment. As we know, Iraq is the most important issue facing our country today. The core challenge in Iraq is the cycle of violence, despair, and retribution that is tearing Iraq apart and threatening wider regional instability. There is no significant progress in Iraq. By any measurement, the situation in Iraq is getting worse as each week passes. Prime Minister al-Maliki's Government is essentially paralyzed and dysfunctional, in part by boycotts and sectarian rivalries and an intense sectarian war.

The Interior Ministry in Iraq, which controls Iraq's police forces, is still a disaster and does not function as a national ministry. Horrific violence in Iraq is spreading beyond Baghdad. Yesterday, car bombs and attacks in Kirkuk and Diyala Province killed more than 100 and injured almost 200 Iraqis. Kirkuk is an area of Iraq in the northern part, Kurdistan, that has been considered by this administration as one of the most secure areas of Iraq. Recent events in Kurdistan over the last few months have shown otherwise. Increasingly, regions that were previously seen as relatively stable and secure, such as the Kurdish area, are now being engulfed by violence. The southern four provinces in Iraq near Basra, which contains most of Iraq's oil and Iraq's only port and outlet to the sea, are out of control. Shiite militias control the southern four provinces of Iraq, including the most significant oil reserves in Iraq's one outlet to the sea. Shiite militias and criminal gangs control these provinces and today even demand tribute, and we pay it. The Iraqi Government pays tribute to Shia militias to use Iraq's primary port. The last remaining pipeline into Baghdad has been blown up, crippling Baghdad's access to oil, and there are no operating refineries in Baghdad. Hence, the product that comes to Baghdad today is trucked in from Kuwait. This is the nation that has the third largest oil reserves in the world. The green zone is being attacked daily.

Last week, 9 people were killed, including Americans, and over 30 wounded inside the green zone. These daily attacks on the green zone by mortar fire, rocket fire increase.

I have listened today to some of my colleagues argue that the surge strategy—the surge strategy—has only just begun; why don't we give it a chance to work; we are at a very early stage; we must give the President more time.

Let me remind our colleagues it has been more than 6 months since the President of the United States announced to the Nation on January 10 the decision to send tens of thousands of additional U.S. troops into Iraq. That was the beginning of the surge, not now. It has been more than 5 months since these additional U.S. troops began arriving in Iraq in early February. We have had months to judge the situation in Iraq. Only last week, the President reported to Congress that there has been no progress—no progress—on any of the political benchmarks in Iraq. The violence that is tearing Iraq apart has intensified and spread over the last 6 months. The current strategy is failing, and the so-called surge that some of my colleagues refuse to recognize that began almost 6 months ago has cost 532 American men and women their lives since that began. We have lost more than 3,600 Americans who have died and over 26,000 wounded over the last 4½ years.

We must change our policy in Iraq. Central to our new strategy must be diplomacy, regional engagement, and the

involvement of the international community, all of these coming together within the framework of a new policy, using all of the instruments of power to help achieve Iraqi political accommodation—political accommodation. We are captive to a cycle of violence. We cannot break out of the cycle of violence. More troops will not do that. We have put burdens on our troops and asked them to make sacrifices and do things they cannot achieve in the course of finding an answer to break the cycle of violence. It is bigger than the military. General Petraeus has said so. As a matter of fact, General Petraeus has said there will be no military solution in Iraq. Every general I have met in my five trips to Iraq, every general I have met here in and out of uniform, has said there will not be—cannot be—a military solution.

I have cosponsored the Levin-Reed amendment because it requires that the United States move toward a comprehensive policy on Iraq—a comprehensive policy on Iraq—not just continuing to feed American troops into the middle of a civil war, which is clearly not working, but something in addition to our military security. That new policy must be centered on diplomacy and helping achieve Iraqi political accommodation to get to political reconciliation.

This amendment is responsible. It is comprehensive, forward-looking, compelling, and not all that different, incidentally, from what my other colleagues are offering on the floor of the Senate as options. Yes, it requires a phased, responsible reduction of U.S. forces from Iraq. I say again, a reduction—not a withdrawal—of our forces. No one I know is calling for any sort of precipitous withdrawal or precipitous action to take America out of Iraq now. We couldn't do that anyway. Even if we wanted to withdraw precipitously or quickly, the reality of the logistics would prevent it. The fact is, we are where we are. We have national interests in the Middle East. We have national interests in Iraq. We should not confuse the issue that we debate today. We are not advocating a cut-and-run strategy. I am not sure what cut and run means. It is catchy. It is good sloganeering. But I have yet to hear anyone come to the Senate floor and say: I am for cutting and running. Those who use that term or accuse others of employing that term should define what that means.

Of all the resolutions I am aware of that have been introduced in the Senate on this issue, none that I am aware of is a so-called cut-and-run amendment.

We are talking about a transition in the mission being carried out by U.S. forces in Iraq. A policy, a strategy. Let's make something else clear. The military does not make policy. The military implements policy. The Congress is part of making that policy. Constitutionally we have a role with the President in helping frame and make policy. The military has input into that policy, as they must and as they should, but once the policy is given to the military, they can't alter the policy. They are captive to policy. That is constitutionally the way it is and the way it should be. We are talking about a new policy, a new strategy. We have a legitimate mission to carry out in Iraq, and those various missions are critical to our security, and hopefully, at some point, the stability of Iraq. The Levin-Reed amendment focuses solely on those missions and the transitions of those missions: Counterterrorism, targeting terrorists and other global organizations; training Iraqi forces, protecting U.S. and coalition personnel and facilities, helping maintain territorial integrity of Iraq.

As I have said, nearly all of the other significant amendments I am aware of that have been introduced on the floor of the Senate on Iraq, including the Warner-Lugar amendment, the Salazar-Alexander amendment focused largely on the same limited mission, as the Levin-Reed amendment, as does the Nelson-Collins amendment, on a limited mission. There is an emerging consensus on how our military mission should transition in Iraq as well. Our amendment includes a timeline and would require that this shift in our military mission be completed by April 30 of next year.

Our amendment is not alone in establishing a timeline. Again, the other significant amendments on Iraq also have timelines. The Warner-Lugar amendment recommends beginning the military transition no later than December 31, 2007. That is a timeline. The Salazar-Alexander amendment sets as the sense of the Congress that the transition be completed by the first quarter of 2008. Now, that is a timeline. There is yet another emerging consensus on establishing a timeline to transition our military mission in Iraq. Our amendment also respects that only military professionals—the generals, those who have the responsibility of carrying out the policy; not making the policy, but carrying it out—those professionals determine how many troops will be needed to carry out our limited military mission in Iraq.

So the talk I hear more than occasionally on the Senate floor that somehow the Congress is micromanaging the war is not correct; that we are micromanaging the army is not correct.

Once again, our amendment, the Levin-Reed amendment, sets policy of the military mission in Iraq. That is policy. What is the mission? What is the strategic, diplomatic mission of employing America's power and prestige in Iraq? That is the policy. But the scope of the reduction—the reduction, not the withdrawal but the reduction—of U.S. forces in Iraq will be determined by, and needs to be determined by, our military professionals based on a troop-to-task analysis; not the Congress, not the committees telling the generals how to do anything.

Troop to task is a very simple concept. You connect the requirements of your mission with the force structure needed. We are way out of balance. We have been out of balance since we invaded Iraq in March of 2003. We never had enough force structure. Some of the same people on the floor of the Senate who are now saying: Well, let's listen to the generals, where were they when the generals warned this administration that we didn't have enough men and women and force before we went into Iraq, I didn't hear many of them talking about how much faith we should put in our generals then.

The former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Shinseki, said it. He said it openly in the Presiding Officer's Armed Services Committee. When asked the question: What would it take in manpower to remove Saddam Hussein from power and help stabilize and secure Iraq, General Shinseki said: It would take hundreds of thousands of American troops.

This administration completely dismissed that as wildly—I believe as the Deputy Secretary of Defense at the time said—wildly off the mark. Well, he wasn't off the mark, I say to my colleagues. He was exactly right. He was exactly right.

So we have never had the forces to match the mission. That is not new. Some of us may be coming to that conclusion for the first time, but it is not new. We have never had the force structure to match the mission. That is not the fault of the generals. That is not the fault of the military. That is the fault of policymakers.

Our amendment also respects that only military professionals can determine those numbers. The scope of the reduction would stay firmly in the hands of the military professionals. This approach is responsible. Not one U.S. general today will tell you that there can be, there will be, there is a military solution in Iraq.

Then the next question is—and a statement being made often on the floor of the Senate is: Well, we need to buy the Iraqis time. We need to give the Maliki government time. That is true. That is why we have benchmarks. That is why we have some sense of where this is going? Are we making progress or not making progress? Is it getting better or is it getting worse? Now, 4½ years into this, we should have some measurements of giving the government time, but time for what? What is the end game as more Americans sacrifice their lives and a half trillion dollars of America's taxpayers' money has sunk into the sands of Iraq? We are buying time for what? For a political reconciliation brought about by the Iraqis themselves to be able to functionally govern their country with some sense of stability and security. That is going the other way. That hasn't gotten better; it has gotten worse by every measure. So we continue to buy time with American blood and American treasure, for what? For

what? No one wants to answer that question, by the way. We end it with we have to buy time, but the additional part of that equation is: Buy time for what? Do we buy time for another 2, 3, or 4 years?

It is also clear that the generals have said when April comes, and there is a timeline already that is built in—whether we ever deal with it or not in the Congress—there is a timeline built in, and it is called manpower. It is called deployment rotations.

We are pushing our young men and women now to 18-month rotation, and some, by the way, are longer than that because of what is known as a stopgap measure where the Secretary of Defense can stop anyone from leaving a war zone based on the speciality of his or her MOS or job. So we are actually having people stay there longer than 18 months. But now it is 18 months, even though the Secretary of Defense testified in January before the Senate Armed Services Committee that we need to get back to 12 months.

Senator WEBB and I and others, a bipartisan group of Senators / last week had two amendments on that issue. We couldn't get the required 60 votes to go back to a 12-month deployment. So now it is 15 months, and we are pushing even 18 months.

The generals have told us that when this spring comes, there is no more give in those deployment rotations. There is nothing left. So there is a timeline built in already. Whether any of us want to acknowledge that or introduce that, that is a reality.

Any change to policy in Iraq cannot be done in isolation, separate or disconnected, from the broader sense of dynamics in Iraq and the Middle East. That is why this amendment requires a phased reduction be conducted as part of a comprehensive, diplomatic, political, and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement to Iraq's neighbors and the international community.

I am very pleased to note that today the announcement came from the State Department that the United States is now prepared to hold new direct talks with Iran. That is progress, not because Iran wants to be our friend. Of course not. But Iran is a significant power in the Middle East. It is working against our interests in the Middle East. We must engage Iran. I have been calling for dialog with all Middle East nations, including Iran and Syria, or over 3 years. A constructive regional framework for Iraq can only be achieved through sustained diplomacy, not hit or miss, not ''if we have time.''

A vital element of this comprehensive diplomatic strategy must be to internationalize Iraq through an international mediator under the auspices of the U.N. to engage all of Iraq's political, religious, ethnic, and tribal leaders.

I first called for an international mediator in a letter to President Bush in May. Since then, I pressed this issue with Secretary Rice last week, our National Security Adviser, Steve Hadley, 2 weeks ago, and again today with the United Nations Secretary General. It is time to take the American face off Iraq's political process.

The United States is seen as the occupier in Iraq. We must have a new strategy that will further invest the region and the rest of the world to helping stabilize Iraq, reversing Iraq's slide into chaos. And it is chaos, Mr. President. I hear on the floor of the Senate, gee, if we changed our mission, if we moved in any different direction, if we reduced our forces, if we did anything different, Iraq would end in chaos. Some of my colleagues must not understand what is going on in Iraq. We have chaos. We have real chaos in Iraq today. That means there are no good options today. The optics here should be clear, and we should base our new policies and our new strategies on those clear optics that Iraq is in chaos today.

Creating an international mediator would help build some new common interests in the region and in the world. This amendment represents the core elements of a different U.S. strategy for Iraq, a strategy that more accurately understands the grim realities we face today, that we will face at the end of this year, that we will face next spring, and we will face next year. The question is whether the President and Congress will come together to present a new policy for Iraq that can be supported by the American people and protect and advance America's interests in Iraq and the Middle East.

We are coming dangerously close to the moment when the American people will demand that we leave Iraq and pullout of the Middle East. Almost 70 percent of the American people today, by every measurement, say enough is enough. This is not in the U.S. interest nor the world's to leave Iraq that way. That is why the United States needs a new strategy for Iraq now.

Well into our fifth year in Iraq, we are beyond nonbinding language of resolutions. We are beyond calling for new plans or new reports. We are beyond sense-of-the-Senate resolutions. We have to understand where we are today. We are in a very dangerous position in Iraq. Our policy in Iraq has been a disaster. Why are we kidding ourselves otherwise? By any measurement, it is a disaster. It must change now. The time for suggestions is over. If we do not believe our current policy is worthy of the sacrifices being made by our troops, then it is wrong to simply say we will wait until this fall to change course or let's hang on for 2 or 3 more months to see what happens.

We know what is happening. We know what is happening today, we know what has been happening, and we know what is going to happen tomorrow.

I am grateful for the opportunity to express myself on this amendment. I also appreciate the opportunity to cosponsor this responsible amendment with my colleagues. I note again it is a bipartisan amendment, and I hope all my colleagues in the Senate will take a look at all the different options and amendments and spend some time on each because they are each worthy of time, but in the end, the consistency of the amendments that have been presented so far are about one thing, and you can paint it any way you want, but that is a change of mission in Iraq and a new policy in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MENENDEZ). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to propound a unanimous consent request, but I would be remiss if I did not recognize Senator HAGEL's leadership on this issue and his articulate vision and years ago his brave service as a soldier in our Army.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to meet today at 7 p.m. in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building to consider an original bill entitled the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007, which will provide health care for needy children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I objected in a timely manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I know you did not hear me. I do not wish to keep the Finance Committee from meeting, except that we are being held for a very important debate, and if we are going to be held all night, it is the view of this side of the aisle that we should keep our focus on this very important issue.

I rise today because this is such an important issue. I don't think that any Member on this side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle is insincere in their views about this issue. However, I do think the disagreements are real, and it is so important the Senate do the right thing.

We have before us, of course, the Levin-Reed amendment that would set a deadline and cut and run from Iraq without regard to anything that is happening on the ground, including the Commander in Chief saying: For God's sake, don't do this.

So here we are debating this issue, but I think we have to also talk about the other amendments that are on the floor because we are now seeing a different variety. I think there is an attempt by many of our Members to send a message. None of these amendments would ever become law. I think everyone acknowledges that fact. So every

amendment is meant to send a message.

What is the message? It appears that the basic message is to tell the President to change strategy or to tell the generals what to do or to micromanage the war. All different kinds of messages are being proposed. But the bottom line is we cannot tell the Commander in Chief, the President, nor the commander on the ground, General Petraeus, how to do the jobs we have asked them to do.

We heard from General Petraeus what the new strategy will be. I keep hearing people say we need a new strategy, we need a new plan, a new plan. We are in a new plan. Yet the Senate is saying, when the new plan is in its infancy, when the surge of 30,000 troops has been completed within the last 2 weeks, and yet we are pulling the rug out from under the new plan. It doesn't make sense.

I think all these amendments, all these message amendments are the wrong thing at the wrong time.

We cannot be the greatest country on Earth and say: Don't trust us if you are our ally and don't fear us if you are our enemy, and that is exactly what we would be doing if we leave Iraq because Congress sets a deadline regardless of what is happening on the ground in Iraq.

This is about a war on terror and protecting our freedom. This is not about Iraq in a bubble. It is about making sure we kill terrorism in the world before it ruins everyone's way of life and takes freedom from everyone.

If I believed we were just talking about Iraq and we could isolate Iraq, that would be a very different issue. This is about making sure Iraq does not become a stronghold for terrorists. This is to make sure al-Qaida cannot take over Iraq, terrorize the people as they have done in Afghanistan for years, have the oil revenue that would feed their terrorism and spread it throughout the world. We are fighting al-Qaida in Iraq.

General Petraeus came to the Senate and put forth a different strategy. I asked him about it because I was very concerned about this strategy. I asked him why he thought this would work, why putting our troops outside the green zone and outside the protected areas embedded with Iraqis would make a difference. He talked about the need for the counterinsurgency measures to go to them and also to win over the neighborhoods.

It is said by those who are on the ground and have the expertise that it is working, that in the al-Qaida strongholds, the people have turned against al-Qaida and they are helping America, and the tribal chieftains in that area are helping Americans.

I met with a group of veterans today who have come back from Iraq. They were so strong and so firm. It was uplifting to talk with them, just as it is uplifting to talk with any of our Active-Duty military. But to talk to those who have had the boots on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan who know what is happening, one cannot fail to believe we have to give this a chance, even if the armchair generals back here in Washington have misgivings.

It is so important that despite the sincerity of so many of my colleagues in trying to put forward a different kind of a message, a message to the President—do a plan; we are not going to make you implement the plan, but we are going to make you do one—all the way up to the amendment that we are debating and on which we are going to have a vote tomorrow which is to cut and run.

That is the variety of message amendments that we have pending on this bill, and none of those is the right message. Look at the consequences. Look at the consequences if we leave without making sure Iraq is stable.

Today, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense announced there is going to be a rejuvenation of the talks that include all the people in the region. That is so important. This is something I have talked about for a long time. No longer can the neighbors to Iraq sit back and watch what is happening there and criticize America or anybody else and not take a hand in helping to solve the problems in this area. No longer can they sit back and grade America when it is they who have the very most at stake with an Iraq that might become a haven for terrorists. That is in no one's interest in that region, not even people who want the destruction of America, such as the President of Iran. It is not in his interest or Iran's interest to have a terror stronghold in the Middle East. It is certainly not in the interest of the moderate Arab nations that are trying to have stabilization in that region.

Here we are with a new strategy that is in the process of being implemented, and we have the Senate debating whether to set a deadline and leave, regardless of what has happened on the ground.

This does three bad things. No. 1, it dishonors those who have already died or been maimed. I met people today. I have met people at Brook Army Medical Center in San Antonio who have been maimed. I have met with the loved ones of people who have been lost in this war already. If we cut and run, it is akin to saying there wasn't an underlying cause for which they died. That is not true. There is an underlying cause. It is a fight for freedom every bit as much as any war which we have ever fought because if we let a caliphate take over the Middle East, we are not going to live in freedom. That is the purpose the terrorists have, and we cannot let them succeed. We cannot dishonor those who have died for this cause.

No. 2, it puts every one of our troops who have boots on the ground today in Iraq and Afghanistan in harm's way that is a much greater harm than they face in the war itself. It puts a bull's-eye on them because the enemy knows they are leaving, so why not do worse things to our troops, why not get rid of them? That has happened before in retreats in wars.

That would be the worst thing we could do, is to say to the enemy: This is when we are leaving, this is when we are going to draw down, this is when the troops go away. I cannot imagine we would do such a thing.

And No. 3—and this is the policy that the Senate must stand for, and that is to stand for the integrity of America, the integrity of the greatest country on Earth—that we will be a formidable enemy and a reliable ally, that we will not flinch when times get tough. It is a legitimate argument about why we got here or when we should have had more troops or how the war has been run up to now. That is legitimate. We can talk about that, and it is a legitimate area to debate. But what is not legitimate is—because it is a very tough time—that we would say times are too tough; America must leave. What kind of honor would that bring on our country and this United States Senate? None. It would not bring honor on this country to cut and run because times are tough.

This is a fight for freedom. This is a fight to live in peace and harmony with people of different backgrounds and different faiths. This is taking a stand for freedom because America is the country that has the commitment and the capacity to fight for freedom in the world.

If we cut and run because times are tough, who would stand for freedom? Who would have the capability to stand for freedom?

It would be unthinkable to go against the general who is in charge in Iraq, the head of the CIA, Michael Hayden, who has said also that "if we withdraw from Iraq prematurely it would become a safe haven, perhaps more dangerous than the one al-Qaida had in Afghanistan." We would be going against one of the wisest Secretaries of State we have ever had in our history, Henry Kissinger, who said:

> Whatever our domestic timetables, the collapse of the American effort in Iraq would be a geopolitical calamity.

It would go against the wisdom of wars all the way back to the beginning.

During the Civil War, General Ulysses S. Grant, who did lead the Union forces to victory, said:

> Experience proves that the man who obstructs a war in which his Nation is engaged, no matter whether right or wrong, occupies no enviable place in life or history.

Mr. President, this is not a new concept. This is a concept that has been tested time and time and time again, and retreating without honor is not an option for the greatest country on earth.

I hope the Senate will not look at the election next year or the political whims, even though I know they are strong, and I know sometimes it is

tough to stand up and do what is right for the long term when the short term is very tough. But this is the Senate. We are the elected leaders of the States of our country. And they look to us for leadership. We cannot do less. Any of these amendments that are message amendments that will never become law, and we know it, are an undercutting of our troops when they have boots on the ground.

No matter how sincere the effort of all the authors of these amendments are, and I know they are sincere, I know they are looking for a way to send that right message, there is no message in these amendments that can be right for our country. It is very simple and very clear. We are the United States of America, and the world expects our country to lead, to be strong, to be unwavering, and to be as good as our military, which everyone acknowledges is the best in the world. I just hope the Senate can meet that test.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we are the greatest country in the world, and that is why I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 2088 be withdrawn and that at 7 p.m. today the Senate vote on the Levin-Reed amendment, No. 2087, with the time between now and then equally divided in the usual form and no second-degree amendments in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is once again clear, in the greatest country in the world, where debate is supposed to be free and open, where majority rules, we have been blocked now by our Republican friends for the third time from having a vote on the Levin-Reed amendment, which simply says it is time to change course in Iraq.

It is not cut and run. You can stand here and say anything. I could say anything: Black, white, pink, brown. It means nothing. This is not cut and run. Read the amendment. The amendment is very clear. It is very well thought out.

What it says is that we will start a redeployment of our troops out of Iraq in 120 days; that we will seek diplomatic solutions; that we will change the mission, get our brave,—unbelievably brave—and courageous troops out of the middle of a civil war and give them a mission that can be accomplished. And that mission, actually, is threefold—one is to go after al-Qaida in a counterterrorism effort, one is to continue to train the Iraqi forces, and one is to protect our troops, force protection.

You can say cut and run. It isn't cut and run. It sounds good. Create a straw man. But that is not what Levin-Reed does.

It is clear our Republican friends will not allow us to vote on this amendment, and I think I know why. I think we can win this amendment, for the first time. I think we can get more than 50 votes, including a few brave Republicans for the first time on a real amendment. And so instead of allowing us to vote, as we allowed them to vote on their amendment, the Cornyn amendment, they will not allow a vote. They are setting an artificial number—60. We have to meet a 60-vote threshold in order to get to the Levin-Reed amendment.

All we are saying is let us vote. People are dying—our people—every day. They are getting blown up. They are wounded. My State has lost 21 percent of the dead, many of whom never saw their 21st birthday. We can do better. We can do better. We have given this President 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, almost 5 years, and we are in a worse position.

Oh, my colleague from Texas says, things are working. If you listen to her you would think it is just wonderful over there. Then I would ask, in a rhetorical fashion: Why do 60 percent of the Iraqis think it is OK to shoot and kill an American soldier? This is where we are going to keep our troops? And that is because we are the greatest country in the world?

The greatest country in the world doesn't keep the status quo going if it isn't working. The greatest country in the world steps up to the plate and says: It is time for a change. And it is time, Mr. President, for a change.

The head of Iraq said: America, you want to go? Go. We can take care of ourselves.

You know what is interesting is, I met with General Petraeus when I was in Iraq. He was at that time the head of training the Iraqis, and he was high on the Iraqi soldiers. He told me, and he told Senator MURRAY—he told all of us on that trip—we had Republicans and Democrats—don't you worry. At that time he said: We have trained 200,000 Iraqis, and they are top notch—they are top notch—and they will be able to take over.

Unfortunately, the head of Iraq didn't think that was true. But General Petraeus, oh, he was Mr. Rosy Scenario. He said everything was great. And when I came back I gave a report to my constituents, and I said: You know, I never voted for this war—I thought it was a mistake—but I bear good news. The Iraqis are being trained. As they step up, we will step down.

I believed the President when he said that one. Not to be. Not to be. The money we are pouring into that country a minute, folks—$250,000 a minute—while we turn to our poor kids and say: Sorry, we can't renew the children's health insurance; and, gee, we are really sorry 2 million kids are waiting in line for afterschool. We are really sorry. So we are sending good dollars after bad dollars, endlessly, open checkbook.

The Iraqis don't want us there. They do not want us there. The head of Iraq said: Go, leave, we are fine. What are we doing? Are we that stubborn as a nation? Well, I think the majority of this United States Senate might very well be ready to vote to begin the redeployment of the troops. I don't know that. My colleagues will not let us get there. Well, maybe I have convinced them, so I am going to try this again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 2088 be withdrawn and that at 7:30 p.m. today the Senate vote on the Levin-Reed amendment No. 2087, with the time between now and then equally divided in the usual form and no second-degree amendment be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California retains the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, that is now the fourth time—the fourth time—that our colleagues have objected. This Senate must not be a rubberstamp for any administration, especially when our constituents are getting killed. We are here to speak for the people.

Now, my colleague from Texas says we need to take a stand for freedom—we need to take a stand for freedom—and I agree with her. However, once we allow the Iraqis, with our Armed Forces protecting them every step of the way, to have three elections—three elections—to be able to draw up a constitution, to have the ability to self-govern, we can't force them to do that.

It is true that there is al-Qaida there. Al-Qaida, according to our own military, is responsible for 15 percent of the violence—15 percent—and it is ugly violence, it is horrific violence, and we should go after it. After all, al-Qaida cells didn't exist in Iraq—I have the document to prove it—until we went in. We have been a recruiting tool. Unfortunately, this policy has been the recruiting tool. I have the documentation from the State Department that showed right before 9/11 how many cells there were in each country. Iraq wasn't even mentioned. But they are there now, and we need to get them, and that is part of the Levin-Reed amendment: to change the mission to go after them.

A fight for freedom? If people don't want freedom, can we force them to want freedom? If people decide to kill their neighbor, what are we going to do? Shia on Shia violence, Sunni on Shia, Shia on Sunni—just read the history books and you will see how long this has been going on, and we put our brave men and women right in the middle.

This is the greatest country on Earth, by far and away, and the greatest country on Earth doesn't have a Senate that is a rubberstamp. It doesn't have a Senate that fights for the status quo when the status quo isn't working. The greatest country on Earth shouldn't send our men and

women back two, three, four, and five times to fight without adequate rest, and yet our Republican friends set up a 60-vote hurdle for Senator WEBB and Senator HAGEL so we couldn't even pass something that said give them rest before they go back; give them the equipment before they go back. It is not what the greatest country on Earth does to its fighting men and women. That is wrong.

A New York Times story, here is a woman, April Ponce De Leon, who describes herself and her husband as ''gung-ho marines,'' and in 2 weeks she deploys to Iraq where her husband has been fighting since March. But she says she stopped believing in the war last month after a telephone conversation with him.

He started telling me he doesn't want me to go and do the things he has been doing.

That is what CPL Ponce De Leon, 22, speaking by telephone, said as she boxed up her belongings in their apartment near Camp Lejeune, NC.

He said that we have all decided it's time for us to go home.

And the wife said:

You mean go home and rest? And he said, I mean go home and not go back.

And she said:

This is from someone who has been training for the past nine years to go to combat and who has spent his whole life wanting to be a marine. That's when I realized I couldn't support the war anymore, even though I will follow my orders.

So when we listen to some of our colleagues make it sound as if those of us who want to change the mission and start redeploying the troops in 120 days don't stand behind our troops, I say, Mr. President, it is the opposite. They can't speak out. They do not have a box to stand on and a microphone. We owe them the truth as we see it.

It is perfectly legitimate for our colleagues to disagree with us. Absolutely. And I would die for their right to disagree with us. But what I think is wrong is when it comes to a vote of conscience like a war, to set up a 60-vote hurdle. Let's have a vote. Let the majority rule. Let's see what happens.

What are you afraid of? The President has already said he is going to veto this thing, but it is our job to keep the pressure on, Mr. President. So I am very proud to stand here tonight. I am very sorry I have asked twice to go straight to a vote on the Levin-Reed amendment, but we are not able to do that.

Others will come, and I will be back after several hours myself. When you lose 21 percent in your home State, you have a lot on your heart; a lot you want to say. So I look forward to coming back to the floor. And to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I know this is a tough night. I know it is emotional, but I am glad we are doing it. And I hope at the end of the day, when someone asks unanimous consent to go to a vote, there will be no objection and we can do so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I would comment that in the process of working out votes, the minority leader has offered to the majority leader to schedule votes on this and other amendments at an appropriate time. There is no need to do the all-night gig. It may make grand Hollywood theater, but it doesn't necessarily move forward what is an extremely important bill.

This is a bill that not only authorizes our war fighters, it provides additional resources. It provides them a badly needed 3-plus percent pay increase. We traditionally move these bills forward because, when we are fighting a war, we need to support the troops. But these amendments are designed to substitute the judgment of 535 generals in this wonderful air-conditioned Capitol for the judgment of the generals and the commanders in the field who every day go out and fight that battle to maintain peace, restore peace and security in the area, and to protect our home front.

The Iraqis have said they don't want us there permanently. I think we all agree we don't want to be there permanently. But they also said we need to continue to train their troops. We need to make sure they maintain security in the area. They are not ready to do that now.

Sunni sheiks in Al Anbar Province, which I was pleased to visit 2 months ago, are working with our forces and they are making great progress. They have been sending in their young Sunni men to be trained as Iraqi police and Iraqi Army. They need training. They are not ready yet. They are being very successful because our American marines are embedded with them. With them, they have taken Ramadi, the capital of Al Anbar, which was totally under the control of al-Qaida a few months ago, and made it a safe place not only for Americans but for everyday Iraqis to walk the streets, to do their business, to get back to a normal life.

I am here today as the vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to talk about an important report issued today. Today, the Director of National Intelligence released key findings that could be made public on the National Intelligence Estimate, or NIE, on the terrorist threat to the U.S. homeland. That report outlined a number of key findings of which I think our colleagues and all Americans should be aware.

First, today's intelligence report found that carrying the battle to al-Qaida, gaining worldwide cooperation in the war on terror, has set them back. They have made our country and other free countries safer because al-Qaida and its related radical Islamist groups are no longer able to have the free rein they had prior to our attacks to clean them out of Afghanistan and to keep them out of Iraq.

In fact, our efforts have prevented al-Qaida from attacking the United States since the September 11, 2001, attacks, and they have disrupted a number of terrorist plots outlined in the classified portion of the report, designed to take effect in the United States of America.

One of the good parts about it is that the terrorist groups are now telling each other the United States is a harder target. That makes them less likely to attack here. That is great news. It means the hard work of our men and women in the military, our intelligence services and our law enforcement in the United States, are doing their job—and they are succeeding.

While America is safer, there are still threats around the world, and we have to remain vigilant in fighting terrorists at home and abroad. The intelligence report notes that al-Qaida leadership continues to plan attacks. They have a relative safe haven in the northwest area of Pakistan known as the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, or FATA. They are increasing their capabilities from that area to launch attacks on the United States.

It is important to point out that these findings do not mean, as some erroneously reported last week, that al-Qaida is as strong as it was before the September 11 attacks, or even nearly as strong. It does mean that America must always be prepared for attacks on our homeland and continue to take appropriate offensive and defensive counterterrorism activities.

Unfortunately, the intelligence report, the NIE, also finds that international cooperation against terrorism may wane as September 11 becomes a distant memory. That ought to be a real concern to all of us. I hope my colleagues take note because this should serve as a warning to all of us, a warning for Congress, and the American people to remain vigilant and committed to the war on terror. Our responsibility in Congress is to continue to give law enforcement and the intelligence community the tools they need to track, interrogate, capture or kill and prosecute terrorists, such as the PATRIOT Act and the modernization of the 1978 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—very important; Also, the 9/11 Commission recommendations on changing congressional oversight to make it effective in dealing with the new challenges put on the intelligence community today.

Knowing full well that the retreat-and-defeat crowd does not have the votes, I see the majority has opted for political gains and political theater. With apologies to our dedicated floor staff and the many wonderful men and women who keep this place operating, you are going to be operating all night long, around the clock, for a political show, not to achieve anything significant in terms of helping win the war.

Foremost, the biggest losers from all this grandstanding are our fighting men and women who are risking their lives on the line in Iraq, carrying out

their mission and the mission they believe they are carrying out successfully.

The majority has a political game plan. But, sadly, it is not about how to achieve victory, it is a plan blindly fixated on trying to embarrass the President, trying to figure out a way they can win votes for November 2008. It offers no help for the creation of stability and freedom in Iraq and thus continued safety for ourselves.

Our commanders and fighting men and women, while this debate is underway, are actually trying to achieve victory. But they have been listening to us and they have questions. They send questions to us saying: Why are you not going to give General Petraeus's plan, which he said he would report on in September, an opportunity to demonstrate it can work? Why have you no patience? We, who are sitting in the air-conditioned Halls of Congress while they are out in 130-plus degree heat risking their lives. They are willing to wait. But they are watching and listening to the cut-and-run arguments. So are our allies, Sunnis, such as the Sunni sheiks in Al Anbar Province who are risking everything if we run and leave because they have taken on al-Qaida. They don't want to live under al-Qaida. The neighbors of Iraq who are gradually realizing they have a role in helping Iraq be stable are seeing us falter and hesitate.

Do you know who else is listening? Al-Qaida and the violent terrorists with whom we are at war, and I suspect they are absolutely revelling in what they are hearing. I imagine they loved hearing our majority leader saying the war has been lost. That is not a great message for our troops but one that certainly brings cheer to the hearts of al-Qaida.

They call for troop withdrawal deadlines. They say the cost of war is too high. The constant barrage of negative news without the balanced report on the progress our troops are making—we need only listen to the words of the terrorists themselves who have identified Iraq as the central front on the war on terrorism. Osama bin Laden, in his audio message to what he hoped were his fellow Muslims in December of 2004, said:

> The world's millstone and pillar is in Baghdad, the capital of the caliphate.

Our own servicemembers such as 1LT Pete Hegseth, an Iraqi war veteran and director of the Vets for Freedom recently, knows the importance of achieving victory. He said, as one who has been on the frontlines:

> Iraq today is the front line of a global Jihad being waged against America and its allies. Both Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri have said so.

But despite this enormous effort, the retreat-and-defeat crowd still wants to micromanage this war 8,000 miles away from the fight and set timetables and troop movements and ultimately to engineer a defeat brought on by retreat.

These actions most egregiously send mixed messages to our enemies all across the globe that our Nation is fractured, weak, and does not have the will to see it through. This same message can discourage allies and the millions of Iraqis who are risking their lives for a chance at freedom by supporting us. For not only is the safety and security of our Nation and allies at stake but so, too, is our credibility.

Critics of us have frequently claimed the war has damaged the U.S. image and credibility throughout the world. Yet the retreat-and-defeat crowd ignores the irreparable harm that would be done here were we to leave this mission unfinished.

If you think our image and reputation has plummeted, wait and watch it nosedive if we were to leave Iraq before finishing the job. Think about what would happen to the millions of Iraqi citizens and leaders who took a stand against terrorism, who committed to take a stand with us to rebuild their country and fight against the forces of radical Islam and terrorism. What are we to say to the millions of Iraqis who trusted America and believed we would stay until the mission was complete, only to see them slaughtered by terrorists as a result of our abandoning them before they were able to stand on their own.

I mentioned on this floor before, what did we say to the thousands of South Vietnamese or millions of Cambodians who put their trust in America and were slaughtered after we abandoned them? History has taught us that when America abandons its commitments to spreading liberty and freedom, we are not the only ones who suffer. Hundreds of thousands may well suffer, but it will come back to harm us and haunt us in our homeland—not only our credibility.

In January of this year, before the Senate Intelligence Committee, the leaders—the Director of National Intelligence, the CIA Director, the Defense Intelligence Agency Director—testified in public session. They said if we pulled out on a political timetable, chaos would ensue. What would happen?

No. 1, there would be a tremendous increase in slaughter among Sunni and Shia in Iraq.

No. 2, al-Qaida would be able to establish a safe haven, a platform where they could get the oil revenues they needed to fund their efforts and significantly increase the threat to our United States of America and possibly even to foment a regionwide civil war, as other nations would come in to the rescue of their coreligionists in Iraq.

To ignore these considerations and questions simply because they are perceived to be more politically palatable than continuing the vital mission that our troops are fighting is shortsighted at best and dangerous at worst. Those who are attempting to end the war precipitously because they are vested politically in defeat do not want to talk about the fact that the war in Iraq will do anything but end—in fact would only grow more dangerous—if we leave our enemies in Iraq, unlike in Vietnam, the victors. The victors would follow us home. The North Vietnamese did not follow us home after we lost in Vietnam. Al-Qaida will follow us home if we allow them to achieve victory over us in Iraq.

We have seen in recent weeks, since the implementation of General Petraeus's plan, movement has begun in the right direction. When I returned from Iraq in May, I observed, even at that point, some initial signs that the planning and working was moving in the right direction. Sunni sheiks in Anbar are now fighting al-Qaida; more than 50 joint U.S.-Iraq stations have been established in Baghdad, conducting regular patrols, resulting in increased security and actionable intelligence.

Muqtada al-Sadr has felt the heat. His followers, while perhaps have demonstrated against American troops, are not contesting them. They and Jaysh al-Mahdi, the Shia militant group, has stood down. The Iraqi Army and police forces are increasingly fighting on their own, with their size and capability growing.

July 16, the Wall Street Journal carried an article by Omar Fadhil. He said the surge is working, fully operational for barely a month. He defines the two most dangerous enemies in Iraq we face in Iraq, Muqtada al-Sadr's militia and al-Qaida, and he says:

> Sadr's militias have moved the main battlefield south to cities like Samwah, Nasiriyah and Diwaniyah where there's no American surge of troops, and from which many Iraqi troops were recalled to serve in Baghdad. But over there, too, the Iraqi security forces and local administrations did not show the weakness that Sadr was hoping to see. As a result, Sadr's representatives have been forced to accept ''truces.''
>
> This may make things sound as if Sadr has the upper hand, that he can force a truce on the state. But, the fact this is missing from news reports is that, with each new eruption of clashes, Sadr's position becomes weaker as tribes and local administrations join forces to confront his outlaw militias.
>
> And regarding al-Qaida, he writes that they, al-Qaida, have not been any luckier than Sadr, and the tide began to turn even before the surge was announced. The change came from the most unlikely city and unlikely people, Ramadi and its Sunni tribes.
>
> He goes on to say: In Baghdad the results have been just as spectacular so far. The district where al-Qaida claimed to have established it Islamic emirate is losing big now, and at the hands of its former allies who have turned on al-Qaida and are slowly reaching out to government.

MG Rick Lynch, 3rd Infantry Division Commander, provided a telling example in yesterday's New York Times.

In the village of Al Taqa, about 20 miles southwest of Baghdad, Lynch said women and children were taping plastic pipes on streetlamps to warn Iraqi security forces of roadside bombs. He also stated that locals have exposed al-Qaida hideouts, helped troops locate 170 large caches of arms, and guaranteed organized armed neighborhood controls could keep safety.

While I would agree that there is no guarantee of victory, and we have a

long way to go, we certainly need to make every effort to achieve it. The war in Iraq is far more important on a front that is far larger than that battlefield. It is the global battlefield. That is why we are fighting in Iraq, to keep our country safe, to make sure al-Qaida does not get the upper hand, to make sure our troops, who are carrying out their mission to stop al-Qaida, can do so in Iraq rather than hand them the victory which will embolden them, which will allow them significant resources from the oil-rich Iraqi sands and give them the courage to expand recruiting and attack our country.

We cannot allow cut-and-run amendments to be added to a vital authorization bill to support our American troops.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I welcome the debate on the U.S. role in Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to allow us to vote on the issue. I think each of us was elected to cast our votes and this is the most critical issue that is facing this Nation and we should be able to cast a vote on this issue, hopefully tonight.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by Senators LEVIN and REED to the Defense authorization legislation. It is similar to the provisions Congress originally passed on the emergency supplemental appropriations bill that President Bush vetoed.

We now have more information than we did 3 months ago when we acted on the supplemental appropriations bill. We know the President's surge policy has not worked. By the President's own assessment, the Iraqis have failed to meet the most important interim benchmarks required for stability in Iraq. The Levin-Reed amendment would change our mission in Iraq to limit U.S. involvement to conducting counterterrorism operations, protecting U.S. forces and military infrastructure during redeployment, and training Iraqi forces.

It would set a deadline of April 30, 2008, for all U.S. combat troops to be removed from attempting to quell the civil war in Iraq. We should not wait a single additional day in changing the U.S. mission in Iraq.

I have opposed the war from the inception. In October 2002, I voted against giving President Bush the authority to use U.S. troops in Iraq. I have likewise opposed the President's management of this war. The administration misrepresented or ignored intelligence about Iraq. The administration's effort to garner international support for the war was totally inadequate. Our troops went to Iraq without adequate equipment. The President failed to prepare for the insurgency. The leadership in the White House wrongfully ordered the dismantling of the internal Iraqi police, putting the local communities at the mercy of the insurgents.

Our Nation and the Iraqis have paid a heavy price for the administration's mistakes. To date, over 3,600 U.S. soldiers have died and over 23,000 have been wounded, many sustaining life-changing injuries. Seventy-seven of the brave men and women who have lost their lives have been from Maryland. U.S. taxpayers have spent at least $320 billion so far. According to the Congressional Research Service, the war in Iraq currently costs $10 billion per month.

These expenditures represent lost opportunities in our own country.

Tragically, we have lost our focus in the war against terrorism. Afghanistan is not secure, and Osama bin Laden is still at large. For over a year, there has been a significant increase in the level of violence in Iraq. The main reason for this escalation has been sectarian violence.

U.S. military commanders have confirmed that the Sunni-Shiite conflict is the greatest source of violence in Iraq. Iraq is in the midst of a civil war, and the presence of American troops in the middle of a civil war is counterproductive. In fact, there is not one civil war raging in Iraq, there are many civil wars in Iraq. In Baghdad, Sunnis are fighting Shias. In Anbar and Diyala, Sunnis are fighting each other. In southern Iraq, Shiites are fighting each other. And around Kirkuik and Mosul Kurds are fighting Sunnis.

Our first priority should be to remove our troops from the middle of these civil wars. The Levin-Reed amendment will do just that. In order to bolster our military and refocus its attention on the global terrorism threat, this Congress has attempted, on more than one occasion, to redeploy U.S. forces and change the mission of our operations in Iraq.

President Bush and a minority in Congress have rebuffed this effort. Instead, President Bush proposes a strategy he claimed would improve the situation in Iraq: increasing the number of troops deployed, and stepping up traditional counterinsurgent operations.

According to President Bush, increased U.S. troops would stabilize the country so that its national leaders could operate in a safe environment in which to reach political agreement on oil and revenue sharing laws and amend their constitution. Furthermore, so the theory went, increased U.S. troop levels would enable us to accelerate training initiatives so that the Iraqi Army and police force could assume control over all security in the country by November 2007.

President Bush sent over 28,000 more soldiers into Iraq with the hope of fulfilling the goals of his plan. President Bush insists on continuing this surge policy. But the so-called surge is not working. Some of the most brutal acts of sectarian violence have occurred during the surge.

For example, in March of this year, a truck bomb in a Shia neighborhood killed 150 people. The Shia-controlled police units responded by systematically kidnapping and murdering 70 Sunnis. This is not an isolated episode.

Approximately 600 U.S. soldiers have died during the surge, and more than 3,000 have been wounded. Violence in many sectors of Iraq has increased. Despite the valiant effort of our troops, terrorist attacks in Iraq and around the world continue to rise. Tensions between countries in the Middle East region are growing.

Middle East autocrats have an even firmer grip on power. The Arab-Israeli conflict has deteriorated. Our military is stretched thin. And the most recent intelligence analysis reports that the al-Qaida group that attacked our Nation, the al-Qaida in Afghanistan and Pakistan, is stronger now than at any time since September 11, 2001.

The 2007 emergency supplemental appropriations bill required President Bush to report to Congress and the American people on the progress Iraqis are making in achieving certain benchmarks. These benchmarks were established so there could be a new way forward in Iraq with regard to securing civilian populations, establishing the Iraqi security force's capacity, and supporting an Iraqi Government that would have credibility and confidence at the national and provincial levels.

We now have received the first report from the administration. This assessment confirms the failures of the President's policies in Iraq by his own objectives. The Iraqis have failed to make satisfactory progress in key areas. For example, it is critical, critical for the Iraqi Parliament to pass legislation ensuring equitable distribution of the hydrocarbon oil revenues. Without such legislation, it is difficult to believe that the ethnic communities will have confidence in their central government. The Bush administration's assessment on this benchmark: not satisfactory.

Another benchmark concerns disarmament of the militias. We have heard about the militias and how they run their own affairs and take over ethnic communities. It is necessary that the Iraqi security forces be the national military. Eliminating militia control of local security is an additional benchmark. The Bush administration's assessment on those key benchmarks: not satisfactory and unsatisfactory.

Our goal has always been for the Iraqi commanders being able to make tactical and operational decisions without political intervention to uncover and pursue all extremists on all sides. The Iraqi security forces provide even-handed enforcement of the law. That is critical if the Government is going to have the confidence of its people. The Bush administration's own assessment on these benchmarks: unsatisfactory.

It is critical that the Iraqi security forces be able to operate independently. This benchmark is particularly important if we are going to be able to

draw down on the U.S. troops in Iraq. The Bush administration's assessment on this benchmark: not satisfactory.

The interim report the administration released last week confirms that Iraqi security forces still cannot be trusted to enforce the law fairly. Some have taken part in sectarian violence, and some even have turned on American troops.

In order to have national reconciliation and the political elements for stability in Iraq, it is necessary to enact and implement debaathification reforms; another critical benchmark that was established with the United States and the Iraqis. The Bush administration's assessment on this benchmark: not satisfactory.

Most troubling, the Iraqi Government is seriously weakened, and many predict its collapse. The major Sunni party is currently boycotting the Government. Without Sunni participation, meaningful progress on any key political benchmarks is impossible.

Whatever progress the President's interim report claims, it is clear that our military has not curbed sectarian violence, nor has the troop escalation provided sectarian influence over and infiltration of the Iraqi security forces, or forced Iraqi political leaders to make the tough decisions necessary to move forward toward peace.

I think it is time to acknowledge that President Bush's troop escalation has failed. It has failed to make Iraq more secure. The Iraqi Government remains incapable of organizing its security forces or its legislature to achieve a semblance of stability or political reconciliation.

It is time to change the mission in Iraq. The cost of further delays in lives, material, treasure, standing in the world, is just too great. President Bush's strategy has put this Nation at greater risk, a risk that metastasizes each day that we sit by and wait. Wait for what? For new evidence of failure to accumulate, for news that more American soldiers have died and Iraqi civilians have been killed?

It is critical for the United States to change policy in Iraq, and it starts by removing our troops from the middle of a civil war. The Levin-Reed amendment would do that. Our new mission must recognize that the opportunity for sweeping regional change, if it ever existed, has passed.

Instead, we need to focus on realistic objectives which include preventing the conflict in Iraq from igniting a broader regional war and preventing genocide.

Unfortunately, we cannot rewrite history. The United States does have a responsibility toward assisting the Iraqis and working for peace in that region. It is in the interests of our country to do that. There is no easy path to achieve the objectives of stability in Iraq and protection of all of its ethnic communities.

As the bipartisan Iraq Study Group noted:

> There is no action the American military can take that by itself can bring about success in Iraq.

The efforts will most certainly include stepped-up diplomatic efforts. Iraq's neighbors have a stake in Iraqi stability. The war in Iraq has produced hundreds of thousands of refugees. An escalation of the conflict will mean even more refugees, which is a major concern to Iraq's neighbors.

An escalation in the conflict means the spread of fundamentalism and sectarian violence, and an increase in basic crime and lawlessness, not just to Iraq but to the region.

We must support and broaden efforts made to create the International Compact for Iraq, a 5-year plan launched this past April under the auspices of the United Nations with benchmarks for Iraq's national reconciliation and economic reconstruction.

That compact includes formal commitments of support from the international community. But we must begin to have a broader diplomatic and economic vision in the Middle East that includes engaging both the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, OSCE, in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The various agencies of the United Nations are best suited to tackle the myriad problems plaguing Iraq. Matters of security, training, economics, and community development and providing electricity, water, and sanitation service are all areas where the United Nations has expertise.

Just as important, the United States should request OSCE to assist Iraq as a partner for cooperation. There is precedent for this. Afghanistan has already moved in that direction. Afghanistan has begun participation in OSCE proceedings under this program. This status could allow OSCE to assist Iraq with collective border security, police training—which is desperately needed—immigration and religious tolerance efforts.

Engaging the UN and OSCE could help initiate much needed multilateral and bilateral engagement with both friendly nations such as Turkey and with hostile nations such as Iran and Syria.

Engagement of the international community to deal with Iran and Syria's destabilizing regional policies is a critical factor that is needed and a renewed effort to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Iraq should request assistance from the United Nations and other international forces to help prevent continued ethnic cleansing. According to the United Nations 2005 World Summit, a high-level plenary meeting of the 60th session of the General Assembly, states have a responsibility to protect their population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. This is an international responsibility, not solely a U.S. responsibility.

I believe the strategy I have just outlined presents the best chance of helping the Iraqis negotiate a government and a governmental structure that has the confidence of its people, that protects the rights of all of its citizens, and builds the democratic institutions such as an independent judiciary and a market-based economy that are so vital to a successful country.

There is a difference between being resolute and being stubborn. We can no longer ignore overwhelming evidence or recoil from the cold reality the facts on the ground reveal. President Bush's policies have failed. The world has an interest in a safe and secure Iraq. I believe efforts to rebuild the country must be a shared responsibility among nations.

There is no more time for delay. It is time to change the mission, redeploy our troops currently stationed in Iraq, and internationalize the effort to bring stability to that country and to the Middle East. Such a strategy could give the Iraqis a real hope for peace and give Americans the best chance to achieve our objectives in that region of the world.

Our soldiers have honored our country by their incredible service. We owe it to our soldiers to change our mission now so we have the best chance to achieve these objectives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, you would never know it from our debate the last couple of weeks, but we are here to talk about the Defense authorization bill, this rather large bill that is at all of our desks. Much broader than just any particular conversation about Iraq, or any particular battle, this is to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008, for military activities and the Department of Defense, for military construction, for defense activities and the Department of Energy, to proscribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and other purposes.

One of the most important bills that we debate and pass, this includes money for aircraft, missiles, weapons systems, vehicles, all of the things we need to protect and secure our country—a very important bill.

I appreciate that the minority a number of times this evening has said: We need to go ahead and vote, particularly on the amendment in front of us, the Levin amendment. And while the normal procedure is to get agreements between the sides on when we vote, the minority filed cloture on this bill. There is really no need to delay the cloture vote any further.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Could I just offer an observation? We are not the minority, we are the majority.

Mr. DEMINT. Thank you. Bad habits die hard. Thank you for correcting me.

But we do need to move ahead with the cloture vote. There is no need for the theatrics through the evening on this. And since the majority has filed for a cloture vote, I ask unanimous

consent that the cloture vote for the pending Levin amendment occur at 8:30 this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, I wonder if the Senator will repeat that.

Mr. DEMINT. I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote on the pending Levin amendment occur at 8:30 this evening.

Mr. LEVIN. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, it is clear that the cloture motion as has been filed by the majority is clearly not what they want to happen this evening. So it does seem to be that this is all about a political circus to keep us here all night for some political theater to try to embarrass the President and in the process demoralize our troops and embolden our enemies.

Instead of talking about substantive amendments to the Defense authorization bill, what I hear the majority speaking of is message amendments, to try to message their political theater.

The fact is, this is about winning elections. The majority has given many quotes to the media. One senior Democratic aide on Fox News, when asked about staying up all night, said: Is this a publicity stunt? Yes.

Senator REID was quoted as saying at a press conference: I don't know if we will get 60 votes, but I tell you one thing, there are 21 Republicans up for reelection this time.

Senator REID was quoted in the Washington Post as: We are going to pick up Senate seats as a result of this war. Senator SCHUMER has shown me numbers that are compelling and astounding.

So while the majority is putting us through political theater in hopes of picking up Senate seats in 2008, our National Intelligence Estimate, which just came out, is very clear in their key judgment. It says: We judge that the U.S. homeland will face a persistent and evolving terrorist threat over the next 3 years.

The main threat comes from Islamic terrorist groups themselves, especially al-Qaida driven by their undiminished intent to attack the homeland and a continued effort by these terrorists groups to adopt and improve their capabilities.

The report is clear that we have a broad threat, a global threat. It is not just about Iraq. The whole Defense authorization is very important. We should not be sidelining the discussion of important issues of national defense and security with political theater this evening.

But it is important, as some of my colleagues have done, to kind of review what we have been through the last few months. Certainly, all of us are concerned about the progress in Iraq, the safety of our troops. We all want to finish our job with honor, with victory, to bring our troops home.

We have had a lot of debate this year. But recently when the President submitted his war spending bill, emergency supplemental bill, to fund our troops, we had a lot of debate. My Democratic colleagues had a lot of different ideas. The President vetoed one version. After that, we came to an agreement. The Democrats would force the President to agree that after we sent General Petraeus there—and that was a unanimous thing, to send General Petraeus to Baghdad to secure the area, we sent thousands of new troops. The Democrats agreed on that funding, but they requested that we have a report from General Petraeus in the middle of September to find out what progress we were making. We all agreed to that. But after we all agreed and had the signing at the White House, that is now not good enough for my Democratic colleagues.

As we heard one political strategist say about the Democrats, any day they are not talking about Iraq is a bad day. They want to make political hay out of this difficult situation that our country faces.

We have a new plan almost every day of how we are going to withdraw and retreat, a strategy du jour in the Senate. We will be talking about a lot of those new strategies as we go through the evening.

But as has already been mentioned by some of my Republican colleagues who talk a lot with the troops who come home, almost without exception they believe in our mission, and they believe they can win. What we are asking tonight of the majority is to let them win. Let Petraeus do what we sent him to do. Give him the time that we gave him—until September—to demonstrate that we can secure Baghdad, at least reasonably, in a way that the Government can function and the economy can rebound and the country can begin to establish itself as a free and independent democracy.

What we are seeing again is what we have seen over the past years. My Democratic colleagues, while well intended, are very often weak on defense and national security on almost every measure fighting for security. We would not even give our homeland security the same tools to fight terrorists as we give our law enforcement to fight drug dealers. Certainly, terrorists are as much a threat to us.

Some of my Democratic colleagues have even said this is a bumper sticker campaign, not a real war. I think we have to begin this whole process by recognizing, as our national intelligence estimate tells us time and again, this is a real threat, a continuing threat, one that we need to be prepared for in many ways, and we need to develop more of a consensus in the Senate of how we are going to fight it.

Our troops do believe in what they are doing. They believe it is a right cause, and they believe they can win. We need to let them win. We shouldn't continue to talk through the night and talk day after day about ''we have lost'' or ''we can't win'' or ''we shouldn't be there'' or ''we are not making progress,'' when those who are there doing the fighting are telling us quite a different story.

Mr. President, I wish to address at least one amendment to the Defense authorization bill that I think is an example of what we need to be doing to make our military more efficient. There are a lot of things we do as a Congress that force our military to do things maybe for political reasons that don't help us militarily. One is related to aircraft retirement.

I have an amendment that I hope we can get to, amendment No. 2302, that is related to aircraft retirement. Some call it flyable storage. I was amazed to find out that Congress has required the Air Force to maintain in flying condition permanently grounded aircraft at the cost of millions of dollars a year. Many of these older aircraft, because of structural integrity, safety concerns, will never fly again. Yet we require them to be maintained in operational status for that last flight to the junkyard.

Between 2000 and 2007, retirement restrictions cost the Air Force $893 million, and almost $143 million has gone to modify aircraft the Air Force would like to retire. This year, the Air Force will spend $8.1 million to maintain the aircraft in flyable storage, $8.1 million to maintain aircraft that will never be used again. This will happen year after year.

There has been some political pressure to keep this because some maintenance happens in different States where various Senators and Congressmen want that to continue.

My amendment will just give the Air Force the flexibility to retire aircraft that needs to be retired. Most Americans would think that is just basic common sense, and I hope we can agree on that in the Senate.

I hope we can get back to the debate on this Defense authorization bill. I am very sorry that the majority will not let us move to the cloture vote on the Levin amendment, which is pending. But if we need to talk through the night, we will continue to talk through the night.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Maryland finishes her remarks, then on the Republican side, I understand Senator WARNER will be the next speaker, and then that Senator SCHUMER be recognized on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would just like to add Senator BUNNING after Senator SCHUMER, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I am glad we got one of them. Maybe we can start a momentum here.

Mr. President, I never thought I would see the day in the Senate when there would be essentially a gag rule on the subject of war, essentially a gag rule preventing us from voting on the deployment of our troops and a framework for them to be able to come home. We are supposed to be the world's greatest deliberative body, but the other party has chosen to throw sand in the gears to give us a vote where we would present a framework.

The previous speaker talked about that we Democrats present a strategy du jour on the war. I challenge that statement and say it is the White House that gives us a strategy du jour, a strategy of the week, always changing goals. When the war was originally voted for, it was to get rid of Saddam Hussein and get rid of weapons of mass destruction. Saddam is gone and there were no weapons of mass destruction. If that was the goal of the war, come back home. Then it was to create democracy in Iraq. Now it is to secure Baghdad. It is a goal and a strategy du jour.

We have to come up with the right kind of framework, but we also need to be able to offer our votes. Mr. President, 47 times this year the Republican minority has threatened a filibuster on a variety of bills that we want to bring up on both domestic and foreign policy; 47 times they have threatened a filibuster, and now they have gone too far. Now the other party refuses to give us a vote on the most important issue we face: the war in Iraq and the deployment of our troops.

Our President talks about building a democratic Iraq. We should start with building democracy right here in the Senate.

Democracy is built on fundamental principles. One of the fundamental principles is freedom of speech, but not in the Senate. We are in a gag rule. We face strong-arm tactics to prevent our vote on a troop deadline.

Another fundamental principle of democracy is majority rule, but not in the Senate. It now takes 60 votes to win a vote. The reason we objected to the cloture is to end the filibuster. But we want to end the war, and that is why our unanimous consent request is a direct vote on that point. They want to hide behind parliamentary procedure. We want to go directly to the point.

Our Constitution calls for a system of checks and balances, but that is not what the White House wants. They want us to write the checks, but tonight we are trying to provide the balance. That is why we stand here the way we do.

Some people say Democrats are micromanaging the war. Well, hey, someone has to manage it, and it is about time. For the last 5 years, Congress has been under the rule of the other party. It has been a rubberstamp for the Bush administration. The results have been devastating to our military, to America's standing in the world, to the Iraqi people. We had troops sent to battle with inadequate protection and no plan for victory. We had modest international support, and now that is dwindling. Our former Secretary of Defense was imperious and turned a blind eye to cronyism and corruption at every level of the reconstruction.

You know what, it is time for someone to manage the war, and we are ready to do it. We are ready to lead. We just need to have a vote.

It is time to stop talking, it is time for action, and it is time for the Senate to have its say and its day on an actual vote.

This isn't about theater, it is not about polls, and it is not about politics. It is about the will of the American people. It is about honoring democratic principles. It is about doing the job we were elected to do.

I support the bipartisan amendment of Levin, Reed, and Hagel and other Republicans because it begins the process of bringing our troops home. But it not only brings them home, it brings them home safely and swiftly.

The Iraqis must understand the future of their nation is now in their hands, and our troops have to understand that the Congress is with them and we want to be with them when they are on the battlefield and when they come home. We believe the best way to support our troops is to create a framework to bring them home swiftly and safely.

There are those who want to talk about alternatives. There are those who are blocking the vote on this amendment saying it is too soon to withdraw. They have suddenly discovered the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, something I supported 7 months ago, 210 days ago.

Mr. President, 210 days ago, the Iraq Study Group gave us a framework. They called it a way forward. They had 79 recommendations. I stood on this floor and said out of the 79, certainly there were 60 on which we could agree. Let's have a meeting, let's pick our favorite 60, and let's start moving forward on a military solution, a political solution, a diplomatic solution, but a solution it would be.

It was dismissed. It was dismissed by the other party, the other side of the wall, the other side of the aisle—it seems like a wall sometimes—and it was dismissed by the President of the United States.

So now all of a sudden they found the Iraq Study Group. Seven months ago that Iraq Study Group did call for diplomatic and political efforts. I think we make those efforts, and I also think that is included in the spirit and substance of Levin-Reed-Hagel-Snowe and others amendment.

Now is the day that we should refocus our mission in Iraq and also follow the path forward that was recommended and have our troops home by April 1, 2008. We know the Levin-Reed-Hagel, et al, amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to begin reducing the number of U.S. forces in Iraq no later than 120 days to begin those important diplomatic and political strategies. And it also leaves U.S. forces there for three missions: protecting other U.S. troops, completing the training of Iraq troops, and engaging in targeted counterterrorism operations. But it also requires them to complete it by April 30, 2008. This is what I advocate.

I am not new to this position. I never wanted to go to war in the first place. You see, I read all those intelligence reports, and I never believed that the President should be granted unilateral authority to engage in a war where there was no imminent threat to the United States of America. I was one of 23. Four years ago on October 11, I opposed the President giving this authority and asked that we exhaust our diplomatic options, asked us to stick with the U.N., and I said: I am just so concerned that I don't know if our troops will be met with a parade or a landmine. We know where we are. So off we went. We went to war with Iraq, and now we are at war within Iraq. Saddam is gone, but we are still there mired in a civil war.

No one could ask more of our troops. They have been brave, they have been courageous, and they have followed the request of their Commander in Chief. We need to look out for them. I believe we will. Other aspects of this bill, particularly the Wounded Warriors Act, look out for the veterans who have been injured, look out by reforming the disability benefits system, look out for the health care they need from the VA.

It is time for a new direction. It is time for us to have this vote. It is time for the Iraqi elected officials to stand up. Twelve Members of the 38–Member Parliament no longer attend Cabinet meetings; 75 Members of the Iraqi Parliament are boycotting their own Parliament so that they cannot get a quorum to do their job, whether it is for oil revenue sharing or power sharing.

I think it is time now, I think it is time for us to have a vote. I think it is time to refocus the mission. I think it is time to redeploy our troops. I think it is time to bring our troops home by April 30, 2008. And that is why I think it is time to vote on the Levin-Reed amendment.

So, Mr. President, I therefore, ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 2088 be withdrawn and that at 8:30 p.m. today, the Senate vote on the Levin-Reed amendment No. 2087 with the time, in all fairness, equally divided on both sides in the usual format, and no second-degree amendments be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUNNING. I object.

Mr. WARNER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am so sorry to hear that objection. But I have now concluded my remarks for this part of the evening and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Presiding Officer. Mr. President, I am given an opportunity now, which I have been looking forward to, to have a little colloquy with my long-time friend, Senator LEVIN, now chairman of the committee, and address one or two issues to explain why I feel very strongly that I have to oppose this amendment.

Just 49 days ago, the President signed into law an appropriations bill which contained legislative language, which legislative language originated on the floor of the Senate. I was privileged to be a part of the drafting of that language, and it eventually has become now the law of the land. I would like to review some of the points we put in that language which is the law.

It, first, requires the President to come forward on July 15, which he did. He submitted an assessment of the benchmarks. It further directed that General Petraeus be here in September with Ambassador Crocker. It further called upon the new organization which was created in this most recent appropriations bill, again originating, this part of the legislation, on the floor of the Senate. We put together a requirement that there be an independent study group of the Iraq security forces.

We have periodically through the years received reports from the Department of Defense describing how many battalions of the Iraqi forces are trained, how many are equipped, how many are ready to take the point by themselves, how many are dependent on U.S. forces. That is quite an accumulation of data. I felt very strongly, and other colleagues did, that we wanted to have a report independent of the Department of Defense, and that report performed by individuals who had many years of experience assessing the capabilities of men and women in uniform.

How fortunate we were that the former Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Jones, offered to head that group. He formed a group of fellow officers, most of them three and four stars now retired, who likewise have had years of experience and training in evaluating our Armed Forces. And they added two police chiefs. They just finished this past weekend. They returned on Saturday from a 1-week trip to Iraq to study the forces.

Part of the law requires that they come forward with a report. And I am pleased to say, having consulted with General Jones, that report will be available early in September, such that the President, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and others can take it into consideration as they formulate the sequential requirement of the President to come forth and report to America, the Congress, and his people his opinion of the situation in Iraq as of September 15 of this year.

It is for that reason that I believe we should hold in place additional legislation at this time until the President has had the opportunity, that Congress has had the opportunity, and, most importantly, the American people have had the opportunity to study all of these facts provided by the professionals.

I would like to also add that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Pace, has also stated he will have a report, his own assessment, of the situation over there, and his assessment of the Iraq security forces; that is, both military and police, prepared for that September timeframe. So that is the focal point.

I say with deep respect to my colleague, Senator LEVIN, chairman of the committee, which I am proud to have served on now 29 years with Senator LEVIN, side by side, that it seems to me we have passed a law where we put in the process by which America would proceed to the 15th of September, at which time the President will report to the Nation about such changes as he deems—the President, as Commander in Chief, exercising his clear authority under the Constitution, to change or revise the strategy and how our forces will be implemented in the future.

Later this evening, perhaps when I have further time, I will address the Warner-Lugar amendment, which goes into some detail about our recommendations to the President—I repeat: recommendations. Not directing him as a matter of law—on that report on 15 September; to include certain items in it. But the point I wish to make is I feel that if the Senate were to adopt, by way of a vote—which now requires 60 votes—the Levin amendment, it would be in contravention to the very spirit, letter, and purpose of the law that this body adopted 49 days ago. That would bring about confusion in the minds of the troops, confusion in the minds of the world.

How can America take such a zigzag course in legislation at such a critical time in our history, while trying to provide the Iraqi people with a stable situation so they can have some measurable quality of life and freedom and move ahead and hopefully have a nation that will join other nations in the world in our struggle against terrorism? That is my main concern.

I also point out that my good friend, Senator LEVIN, voted for the Cornyn amendment, which we adopted this morning, and among the findings are, as follows: The Cornyn amendment, which Senator LEVIN and I, and 90-some other Senators supported, stated:

> A failed state in Iraq would become a safe haven for Islamic radicals, including al Qaeda.

We read today in the National Intelligence Estimate addressing the potential of al-Qaida and how so much of that potential is directed, clearly, at the United States.

The Cornyn amendment also said:

> The Iraq Study Group report found that ''(a) chaotic Iraq—

should we have a precipitous pullout—

> could provide a still stronger base of operations for terrorists who seek to act regionally or even globally.''

Further, the Cornyn amendment recited:

> A National Intelligence Estimate concluded that the consequences of a premature withdrawal from Iraq would be that—(A) Al Qaeda would attempt to use Anbar province to plan further attacks outside of Iraq; (B) neighboring countries would consider actively intervening in Iraq; and (C) sectarian violence would significantly increase in Iraq, accompanied by massive civilian casualties and displacement.

Now, I read that because my valued friend, Senator LEVIN, appeared last night on a national program, the Jim Lehrer show, and he was asked repeatedly in that interview about how he would envision an Iraq having to experience a withdrawal timetable, which is fixed in his amendment. How would Iraq be, once that timetable went into effect and those troops would withdraw? I read through very carefully the transcript, which I have here, and I cannot find in there the specific references, much like what was in the Cornyn amendment. It seems to me there might be some disconnect between what you said publicly last night and the document to which you attached your vote in support today.

So I would like to entertain a colloquy and have my good friend explain how he envisions what the consequences to Iraq would be should his amendment be law eventually. We would first have to pass it here and then it would have to go to a conference with the House and then survive and become a part of the conference report.

Mr. LEVIN. If I can respond to my good friend's question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. We know what we hope will happen, and there are some things we can predict that will happen.

What do we know? We know that Iraq is in chaos. We know that the Iraqi President, or Prime Minister more accurately, has said the only way to end the bloodletting of innocents in Iraq is if the Iraqi leaders reach a political settlement. We know that. We know there is no military solution in Iraq. We know there is only a political solution and that the violence cannot end unless Iraqi leaders reach a political settlement.

I think those are consensus points. Those are things we know. We know how many of our troops have been killed and how many are killed every

month and how many are wounded and come home. We know those things.

Then the question is: Since there is no military solution, there is only a political solution—that is the only hope of succeeding in Iraq—how do you promote a political settlement in Iraq? Is the current course we are on succeeding or do we need to change the course?

We all have the same goal. We all want to maximize the chances of success in Iraq. If you believe we are succeeding in Iraq now, then you vote to stay the course. If you believe after all these years and all these deaths and all these wounded and all these expenditures, now over $10 billion a month, that we need to change course because we are not succeeding in Iraq, you have to ask yourself: How do we change course? How do we change what is going on in Iraq?

So those are the things that we, each of us, I think in our own conscience, are trying to figure what is the best way to maximize the chances of success in Iraq. I believe the only hope in getting the Iraqi leaders to reach the political settlement, which everybody agrees is the only hope, is to force them to accept responsibility for their own nation, to work out the political differences on revenue-sharing, on elections, on debaathification amendments, and on constitutional changes.

They have been dithering for years. They made a promise to their people, to the American people, and to the world last year. It is on their Web site, 16 of their benchmarks—not ours, their benchmarks. They have not carried out the commitments they have made. There was a timetable attached to those benchmarks. I put that timetable in the RECORD. It was part of a letter that Secretary Rice sent to me.

So we have a situation—

Mr. WARNER. Well, Mr. President, the amendment which I worked on and which went into the appropriations bill, those are the same benchmarks in that bill.

Mr. LEVIN. They are different.

Mr. WARNER. Well, they track, in large measure, the same.

Mr. LEVIN. Some are the same, some are different, but they are political benchmarks which the Iraqi leaders said they would meet. They made those benchmarks. We didn't impose them, those are their benchmarks. The letter from Secretary Rice makes it explicit that the Presidency Council, which represents all the factions in Iraq, formally adopted those benchmarks. They were supposed to have been adopted in October, November, December, January, and in February. They have not been met.

How are we going to get them to meet them, to keep an open-ended commitment, which is what the President wants us to do. Another delay and then patience. The President asks us to be patient? We should be downright impatient with the Iraqi leaders. The message to the Iraqi leaders shouldn't be, for heaven sakes, after all these casualties, that we are going to be patient with them when it is in their hands as to whether this civil strife is going to end.

Mr. WARNER. I would say to my colleague, the President, when he enunciated his new policy on January 10, the purpose was to lay a foundation of security such that the Iraqi Government could perform in a manner given that the security is very serious in Iraq.

Even though I had misgivings about the surge, I put those aside once the President had made a decision to go forward. I wish to support the troops, and they are carrying out this mission. I think there is a strong chance there will be some measure of achievement of the surge militarily.

I agree with my colleague, the performance of the Iraqi Government to date has been extraordinarily disappointing. I have stated that on this floor a number of times, as have other colleagues. But the point I wish to urge is that if we were to take—tomorrow, for example—and begin to change the intentions of the Senate, which were expressed in law 49 days ago, and suddenly announce a withdrawal program, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan has in his amendment, it would be perceived as an undercut to the very military operation we are trying to bring about now.

Why can't we wait until September, until the President has had the benefit of all the convergence of this information, and then, as a body, review his remarks and statements and possibly change the strategy subsequent to the 15th of September? Because I do believe that your amendment is in conflict with what we did 49 days ago.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will yield for an answer.

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. I think the Senate spoke also prior to adopting your amendment. We voted 51 to 48, adopted an amendment which said we will begin to reduce our forces and to transition to the new mission, and that we would begin that transition within 120 days. That was vetoed by the President.

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. The Senate spoke even before it adopted the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. So we have spoken in many ways over the years. But now it is our belief, those of us who support this amendment, that the earlier we put pressure on the Iraqi leaders to reach a political solution, which everybody agrees is the only hope, the earlier we put that pressure on them, the better.

Mr. WARNER. Well, Mr. President, the distinguished ranking member, Mr. MCCAIN, in his remarks of this morning, made it very clear that the President made it very clear, if we proceed with the course of adopting your amendment, then there will be another veto, and then we are back into that sequence and a veto on a bill which you and I have worked on for these 29 years.

How many times have we been on the floor supporting the annual authorization bill? We have gotten a bill each of those 29 years that we have been on that committee. This will be the first time a President was compelled to veto it because he is repeating his actions he took earlier, 2 months ago.

Mr. LEVIN. I think the Senator is well aware this President is not compelled to veto anything. As a matter of fact, the report the Senator refers to, which is due in September, will be coming in before this bill gets to the President. At least there is some hope the President will see what the Republican leader in the Senate saw a month ago. It was the Senator from Kentucky who a couple of months ago said: The handwriting is on the wall. There is going to be a change of course in September.

Now, why wait? We are losing men and women, our best and our brightest, our bravest, every day in Iraq. Those who return wounded will have a lifetime of recovery in many cases. We have record numbers of problems that have come up—post-traumatic stress disorder, we have traumatic brain injuries which are plaguing our troops who survive. Thank God we have great medical care on the battlefield. Why wait until September? The Republican leader said the handwriting is on the wall. There is going to be a change of course in September. There should be a change of course, not just in September, it should have changed a long time ago. But there is no way to change this course unless the leaders of Iraq do what only they can do, what their own Prime Minister said had to happen before the bloodletting of innocents ends in Iraq. They and they alone have it in their hands to work out the political settlement, which, according to their own agreement, was supposed to have been reached months ago.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is correct, that Government has not performed. But we, 49 days ago, structured a careful sequence of events between now and September to make certain the information, the facts, the opinions, the conclusions which would guide the President in that revision of strategy the distinguished Senator MCCONNELL made observation about some time ago, that information is converging at that very point in time.

I say to the Senator, we are so close. I would not want to see the Congress disrupt what it has already enacted and put it into law as to what is to take place in September. It is for that reason I simply cannot support my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend, and I don't view this at all as personal.

A matter of fact, we had this interim report on July 15. What did it come in and say? It came in and said, on the political side, nothing has happened in Iraq; and on the political side, we see no advances. But the political side is

where the advances have to take place. As a matter of fact, the President said, when he came up with this surge policy, that the purpose of the surge was to give the political leaders an opportunity to reach a political settlement.

Well, they have had that opportunity, they haven't done it, and the surge has not accomplished anything in the area of a political settlement.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will conclude my time and yield the floor because other colleagues sequentially are participating. Perhaps we will be able to reopen this colloquy at another time during the debate. But I certainly share with you the enormity of loss of life, the loss of limb, of the hardships of the military families. Even those families who fortunately have not suffered loss of life or limb nevertheless have repeated tours of duty and separations from their loved ones brought on by this war.

But I am concerned we might lose all of that which has been given if we make the wrong decision now and precipitously fix a date for pullout. All that sacrifice might be lost. I am certain my colleague shares with me that one of the goals we should have in this situation is to make certain those losses were not in vain.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will yield, I think we all share that view, but the amendment, if it is anything, it is not precipitous. This is coming after a great deal of debate. We have had a vote on this. The Senate voted to do something very similar to this, and it was vetoed.

We have a 120-day period to begin to reduce forces. That is not precipitous. That gives the Iraqis notice, now 4 months more notice after enactment, which can't come for many months, that they have to begin to get their political act together.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, my time is nearly up. It may not be enacted for 4 or 5 months, but the signal will go out of this Chamber, if we adopt your amendment, that the Senate, in less than 40 days, has changed the law that it passed a short time ago, and it looks like a zigzag course that this Nation is taking in one of the most serious situations in my lifetime—this situation in the Middle East. It is essential to our security that area of the world not implode.

I yield the floor to the other Senators who are scheduled to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, I thank the Chair, and this is a historic night. The Senate will stay in session all night to debate the war in Iraq, something we should be doing. Frankly, Mr. President, we should have done it a while ago.

The bottom line is we need debate and to focus attention on Iraq. We need to change the course in Iraq. We need to bring an end to having American soldiers police, patrol, be wounded, maimed, and killed, as they are in the midst of this civil war not of our country's making.

The bottom line is this. We are here to debate the one true resolution that will force the President to change course in Iraq. Many of us, sadly, and with some degree of frustration, believe the President will not change course. Many of us believe the facts on the ground are not apparent to him or, if they are, do not enter into his decision. The view that military strength, and military strength alone, can prevail in Iraq is wrong. The facts do not measure up. The Shia, the Sunni, the Kurds have had age-old enmity. If I had to sum up the problem with the President's policy in a sentence, I would say this: The Shias, the Sunnis, the Kurds dislike each other far more than they might like any central government of Iraq.

In a certain sense, what we are trying to do here is to take two ''norths'' on a magnet and try to push them together. The minute we release our hands they will push apart. Those are the facts on the ground that cannot be avoided.

We can add another 20,000 troops or another 40,000 troops and might get some degree of pacification for a period of time. As soon as we leave, whether it is in 3 months or 3 years, the Sunnis, the Shiites, the Kurds, and the various factions will be fighting with one another once again.

There is indeed—and I will elaborate—there is indeed a need to protect ourselves from terrorism that might generate from the chaos in Iraq. That does not require 160,000 troops patrolling the streets of Baghdad. Most of what our soldiers do—bravely, gallantly, with great dedication to their country, but unfortunately—most of what our soldiers do has absolutely nothing to do with fighting terrorism. Yet we continue to send them back and then back again and then back again.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly those who have stated that the present policy is misguided, and even those who probably think it is misguided but don't want to say it out of loyalty to the leader of their party, will take a bold step and join us in supporting the Levin-Reed amendment. All of the other amendments are flawed, in my judgment, because they are advisory. This President will not take advice unless forced to change course. If it doesn't happen now, it will happen in September or October. It will happen. We all know that at some point there will be a group of Republican Senators who will quietly go to the White House and say: Mr. President, unless you change direction in Iraq we will change it for you.

If that is going to happen in 2 or 3 months—and the whispers on the other side of the aisle indicate that is what will happen—why wait? Why sacrifice more life and see so many more soldiers coming home wounded? Why sacrifice the billions of dollars that we are spending at the same time our schools need so much help and our health care system needs so much help? Our energy policy needs redirection.

We live in a changing world. Technology has changed everything about our world. It has created terrorism. Terrorism is a real force. I disagree with those who say we can ignore the fact that terrorism is real. Technology has empowered small groups of bad people and given them the ability to strike at us in our heartland. That is brand new. There have always been small groups of bad people. There have even been large groups of bad people. But they didn't have the ability to hurt us.

The Japanese war machine in 1941, while America slept, could only get as far as Pearl Harbor, and that was a long reach. Yet the several thousand in al-Qaida, far less wealthy and far less strong, were able to strike at the World Trade Center in my city. So terrorism is real. Terrorism is something that we have to fight against.

The problem in the equation that the President speaks about and believes in, that so many on the other side of the aisle speak about and believe in, is that what we are doing in Iraq, it is almost impossible to prove has much to do with terror.

They say al-Qaida might set up camps in Iraq and use those camps as they use the camps in Pakistan and Afghanistan to try and hurt us. That may be true. But what does having our soldiers patrol the streets of Baghdad, or Diyala, or Ramadi or any of the other cities to prevent various tribes and ethnic groups from fighting one another, have to do with that? What does trying—futilely, in my opinion—to buttress the Maliki government have to do with that, when the Maliki government is incapable of doing elementary things, let alone containing al-Qaida?

This war in Iraq has just veered out of control, and a great leader would say that and change course. Without casting aspersions on what brought us there—although we can debate that all day long; whatever happened in the past happened. But the facts on the ground are real. To just about anyone who looks at this with an unbiased eye, what we are doing in Iraq has very little to do with protecting us and, in fact, a good argument can be made it makes things worse every day we stay. Certainly the argument can be made it delays the inevitable, which will happen, which is that the Iraqis are going to have to work out for themselves how they are going to live or not live together, given the age-old enmities.

Yet this President persists. It is not good for the Iraqi people. It is not good for the American people. It is not good for the country that he does. Our job is to require the President to change because he will not do it on his own.

That is why, while I have great respect for my colleague from Colorado and for my colleague from Virginia and

my colleague from Indiana, I don't think their resolutions are what is needed because the President will not change. He knows what our opinion is. He knows what the American people's view of this war is. He doesn't need a resolution to suggest to him to change course. No. He needs to be required to do it. He needs to be forced to do it.

That is the stark choice we face tonight. That is where we are tonight. If you believe that we must change course in Iraq, the only resolution that does that is Levin-Reed.

One other thing: This country needs to do so much. The very technology I talked about, which effects terrorism and creates terrorism, creates other challenges for America. Our schools—when the OEDC ranks the 21 developed countries in terms of their K–12 education—now come out 12th, the bottom half. In math we come out 15th. We are doing virtually nothing to improve our schools, which to me is the ultimate answer to preserve the American economy and American jobs.

Our health care system is broken. There are 45 million people uncovered and many more who are not covered very well. We have a system that doesn't do the basic preventive things that would save lives and save dollars.

On energy we send $1 billion a day overseas to many people we don't like, and we can't get hold of it and change it. Our foreign policy itself needs a new direction where we are able to take on terrorists who might hurt us in a way that develops world consensus. The rest of the world is learning what terrorism is like and why it is evil. We need to change our military to be able to do that. We need to change our foreign policy arrangements to do it.

All of these things and so many more—our infrastructure and our culture are lost because everything in this administration is focused on the misguided policy in Iraq.

The damage and danger of what is done hurts Iraq and it hurts America's reputation in the world. It also hurts us at home because we are spending time and energy and resources on something that just cannot work the way it is. What the Levin-Reed resolution recommends is that we withdraw the vast majority of our troops. We don't abandon Iraq altogether because we know al-Qaida might set up camps, and we know there is a need for some troops—mainly out of harm's way—to protect us from al-Qaida camps that might help train those who might strike at us. But the Levin-Reed resolution would not entail 160,000 troops in harm's way, because they are not needed. There might be 10,000 or 20,000 or 30,000 troops, mostly out of harm's way, that could protect us from terrorism.

The view that we can train the Iraqis to take over—many of us have lost faith in that. We have heard promise after promise that we should let the Iraqis take over. They don't really want to fight this war because when there is very little loyalty to a central government, it is very hard to build an army in a divided nation.

Many of the other amendments that are before us, in my judgment, are wishful thinking. They believe they will get the President to see the light. I wish that were the case. The President seems adamant. I don't think he will change unless he is forced to change. I don't think he will change unless this body meets its responsibilities and stands up and requires a change.

The President in February said we should wait until the summer. In April he said September. Now we are hearing from some of the commanders: Oh, no, we will have to wait until January.

It is just not working. We pacify one area and violence erupts in another. If we go to that area, then the area that was pacified creates the violence. Temporarily dealing with that violence doesn't solve the fundamental facts on the ground. Therefore, we need change. I do not believe this is an issue of hawks or doves. I think whichever you are, the simple facts on the ground dictate that we should change, and only Levin-Reed has us do that.

I salute my colleagues, the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Rhode Island, for putting together this resolution. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in particular to join with us. You will be joining with us later if you don't join with us today. That is the simple fact of the matter. I hope the Levin-Reed amendment is given its due. I hope it will pass for the sake of Iraq, the sake of our soldiers, the sake of America.

With that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BUNNING be allowed to speak until 8:35 and that the majority leader be recognized immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask my colleague, does that mean we will be voting after the recognition of the majority leader?

Mr. SCHUMER. Probably, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, could we add that the next Democratic speaker will be Senator FEINSTEIN?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Reserving the right to object, could we have the next Republican speaker be Senator ALEXANDER?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who seeks recognition? Under the previous order, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise tonight to play my small part in this pointless political play put on by the Senate majority leader. It is an insult to the brave men and women in our Armed Forces and to the American taxpayer that we are here tonight for no other reason than for a publicity stunt. Instead of following the script written by MoveOn, like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I want to be honest and frank with the American people.

I hear Democrats every day talk about public opinion polls on Iraq and on the President's approval rating. To some extent they are right. The American people are not satisfied with the war in Iraq and the President is at an all-time low in his approval rating.

But I rarely hear my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about public opinion polls of Congress. It is obvious why. President Bush has a higher approval rating than the current democratically led Congress. I have never been accused of being a political strategist, but I have been around this town long enough—over 21 years—to know that the American people resent their leaders for so often taking the politically expedient path instead of doing what they think is right.

The American people see right through this charade going on tonight. It is more political theater: phony images of cots, toothpaste, and sleepy politicians, meant to convince people that what goes on here at 3 in the morning may actually do some good. But it doesn't do any good.

In fact, it does a lot of bad. Because this debate is more about a political show and placating the ''MoveOn'' folks, than it is about talking about the real issue at hand. It is appalling that we use a bill that provides vital funding of our Nation's military as a political smokescreen for Democrats to gain points in the polls.

The safety and security of the brave men and women in our Armed Forces is not a game to me. Our troops should never be used as a basis to stage a cheap political stunt. If the Senate truly supported our troops, we would be here debating the nuts and bolts of the Department of Defense authorization bill. Instead, we find ourselves back debating whether to cut and run from Iraq, as we have done countless times before tonight.

Democrats would like for you to believe that Republicans will not vote on the Reed-Levin amendment. Give me a break. I am happy to vote on the amendment right now. I plan to oppose it, as I have opposed a similar version Senator LEVIN offered 2 months ago.

It is a bad amendment. It calls for a premature withdrawal of American troops from Iraq before we have even had a chance to see the results of the surge. I wish to know how some of my colleagues know that the surge has already failed when it has only been in place for a month?

I wish to know how they know the situation in Iraq better than our commanders on the ground? The ink is not even dry on the President's plan and

Democrats are already declaring it a failure. This type of defeatist strategy is irrational and unfair.

It is important to remember the dangerous effect our debate in Washington can have on the message we are sending our enemies. Make no mistake about it, our enemies are watching us. They are watching us and using our debate on the war in Iraq to strengthen themselves. This morning, the new National Intelligence Estimate declared the United States is at an elevated threat level. It said our biggest threat is al-Qaida, specifically al-Qaida in Iraq.

This group is working to mobilize other extremist organizations in the region to mount a new attack against the United States. The report also found that al-Qaida will continue to acquire chemical, biological or nuclear materials for attacks; it will not hesitate to use them.

While al-Qaida is working to plan this attack, U.S. forces are working hand in hand with Iraqi security forces to break up this organization and root it out and root this terrorist network out.

This work is vital to our national security. We cannot forget the important lessons we learned from the tragedies of 9/11. There are still those out there who wish to do us harm. Wake up America. If we withdrew from Iraq, the terrorists will likely follow us home.

Democrats would like for us to believe we can responsibly leave Iraq and the conflict will end. This is delusional. Make no mistake, if we leave Iraq prematurely, there will be widespread chaos in the Middle East. Iran will work with Syria to dominate the region, while Sunni States scramble to oppose them. They will use any means possible to acquire the resources to bolster their nuclear weapons program in an effort to combat and conquer the United States.

The Kurds in Iran will form their own country, possibly with the Kurds in Turkey, Syria, and Iran. This could lead to an armed conflict between the Kurds and the Turkish Government. There will be widespread attacks to wipe out Israel and to topple the democratic Government of Lebanon. These pillars of democracy in the Middle East that once stood as an example for freedom within the region will crumble.

The Government of Iraq will fail, and there will be civil war within the country. This will result in massive civilian casualties and displacement. Most importantly, our national security will be in jeopardy. This afternoon, we passed, by a large majority, Senator CORNYN's amendment that said we should not leave a failed state in Iraq. It also said we should not pass any legislation that will undermine our military's ability to prevent a failed state in Iraq.

I ask my colleagues: What are we doing right now? We are debating Senator LEVIN's amendment that will, without a doubt, result in a failed state in Iraq. Let me be clear to my colleagues that believe they can support both amendments. The strategy of cut and run will lead to a failed Iraq and will undermine our military's mission.

But Democrats have already decided the surge has failed before it has a chance to work. These are the same people who voted to overwhelmingly confirm General Petraeus and are now refusing to wait to hear his report in September. This is exactly the type of message our enemy wants to hear.

Well, I, for one, am working hard to send our enemies a different message: The United States will not back down from this fight. I stand behind our troops and General Petraeus. I promised in person, in my office, to General Petraeus, that I would wait to hear his report this fall. I intend to keep my promise. I urge my colleagues to do the same. The safety and security of all Americans depends on it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the surge has now been going for 6 months. More than 600 Americans have been killed, thousands have been wounded, costing our country $60 billion.

The National Intelligence Estimate which was issued today—was leaked by someone last week—is very clear: There are two al-Qaidas now; there used to be one. There is al-Qaida in Iraq, totally separate and apart from the other al-Qaida that bin Laden led.

Where did it come from? It came from the worst foreign policy blunder in the history of our country, the invasion of Iraq.

My friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky, should understand, as a result of that invasion we now have a civil war raging in the Palestinian areas of Lebanon, the country of Israel has been basically ignored during this administration, and we have Iran thumbing their nose at us.

For the information of my friend from Kentucky, there would not be a civil war in Iraq, there already is one. It is an intractable civil war. We Americans are there in spite of the fact that the Iraqis, by an almost 70 percent margin, 69 percent to be exact, say we are doing more harm than good; they want us out of there.

The Prime Minister of Iraq said 3 days ago that he could do fine without us. Anytime we want to leave, his security would take over.

Now, wake up America? America is awake. They understand very clearly we have a situation where we have a President that will be in office only another 17 months, and they want the war to end before he leaves office. They want to change the course in Iraq which has caused the deaths of almost 3,700 Americans, the wounding of tens of thousands of Americans, cost us over half a trillion dollars.

That is what Americans want. They are awake.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative proceeded to call the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 4 Leg.]

Alexander	Durbin	Mikulski
Bennett	Feingold	Murray
Brown	Feinstein	Reid
Bunning	Kerry	Sanders
Cardin	Kyl	Sessions
Casey	Landrieu	Stabenow
Chambliss	Levin	Tester
Cornyn	McCain	Warner
Crapo	McConnell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, to direct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 249 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka	Feingold	Murray
Baucus	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Kennedy	Pryor
Boxer	Kerry	Reed
Brown	Klobuchar	Reid
Cantwell	Kohl	Salazar
Cardin	Landrieu	Sanders
Carper	Lautenberg	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Clinton	Levin	Tester
Conrad	Lincoln	Webb
Dodd	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Menendez	Wyden
Durbin	Mikulski	

NAYS—47

Alexander	Barrasso	Bond
Allard	Bennett	Brownback

Bunning	Enzi	Murkowski
Burr	Graham	Roberts
Chambliss	Grassley	Sessions
Coburn	Gregg	Shelby
Coleman	Hagel	Smith
Collins	Hatch	Snowe
Corker	Hutchison	Specter
Cornyn	Isakson	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Sununu
Crapo	Lieberman	Thune
DeMint	Lugar	Vitter
Dole	Martinez	Voinovich
Domenici	McCain	Warner
Ensign	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—9

Biden	Inhofe	Lott
Byrd	Inouye	Obama
Cochran	Johnson	Rockefeller

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, our Democratic friends thought they were going to teach Republicans a lesson today on how to proceed in Iraq. Instead, Americans got an object lesson on why Democrats have failed to accomplish any of their goals over the last 7 months.

As to this fanciful notion that we have never had 60-vote thresholds on votes, Democrats agreed just this year to 60-vote thresholds on at least five Iraq-related votes: the Reid sense of the Congress on Iraq, the Murray sense of the Congress on Iraq, the Gregg sense of the Congress on Iraq, the Hagel amendment to H.R. 1585 relating to deployment time, and the Graham amendment to H.R. 1585 relating to deployment time—at least five Iraq votes that have been subject to 60 votes.

Now, Republicans have repeatedly offered Democrats an opportunity to have a vote on the Levin amendment according to the traditional 60-vote threshold. Democrats themselves have insisted on 60-vote thresholds for judges, for example. We could have had the vote this morning and moved on to other business, like finishing this very important underlying bill and getting the men and women in the military what they need and deserve.

What is at stake, Mr. President? Iraq's Foreign Minister, Hoshyar Zebari, recently told reporters:

> The dangers could be a civil war, dividing the country, regional wars, and the collapse of the state.

The same sentiment has been echoed recently by political figures from the Sunni Arab community, which had been the least supportive of the U.S. presence after the collapse of Saddam's Sunni-dominated government.

Foreign Minister Zebari has also credited multinational forces for keeping Turkey from occupying northern Iraq. This is what he recently had to say:

> Tomorrow, another country will set its sights on Iraq—Iran, Syria, and others have certain interests, ambitions, and interferences. Ironically, it is this presence that is preserving Iraq's unity; this deterrent is preventing the outbreak of an all-out sectarian civil war, and perhaps regional wars as well.

Now, the National Intelligence Estimate released today said al-Qaida will ''leverage the contacts and capabilities of al-Qaida in Iraq, its most visible and capable affiliate and the only one known to have expressed a desire to attack us here in the United States.''

Yesterday, the U.N. Secretary General, Ban Kimoon, warned that an abrupt withdrawal may, ''lead to a further deterioration of the situation in Iraq.''

Now, what do the terrorists themselves say? What do they say, the terrorists themselves?

The Islamic State of Iraq announced during our last debate in April that certain members of Congress had declared the War in Iraq hopeless.

Those are the words of the terrorists themselves. And here is Osama bin Laden himself, quoted from an Al Jazeera broadcast last April. This is what Osama bin Laden said:

> The epicenter of these wars is Baghdad, the seat of the caliphate rule. They keep reiterating success in Baghdad will be success for the U.S., failure in Iraq the failure of the U.S. Their defeat in Iraq will mean defeat in all of their wars and the beginning to the receding of their Zionist-Crusader tide against us.

That is from the lips of Osama bin Laden.

Now, our Democratic friends have tried to have it both ways on Iraq for too long. They voted to send General Petraeus to Iraq by a unanimous vote, even as many of them undercut his mission and the morale of our troops by declaring it a failure. They voted to fund that mission even after working for more than 3 months to undercut it through legislation that would render it impossible to carry out. And now they have taken the unprecedented step of hijacking a Defense authorization bill to undercut the framework they agreed to when they funded the mission back in May.

So let's take a look, my friends and colleagues, at what we agreed to back in May. The conference report that 80 Senators voted for in May required a benchmarks report in July and a report from General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker in September.

We chose July for the benchmarks report because the Baghdad Security Plan would be fully manned, and we wanted the Iraqi Government to know we expected their cooperation and sacrifice in exchange for ours. We chose September because that is when General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker planned to give the President an update on the counterinsurgency plan currently underway. We thought it reasonable that we get the same assessment to form an appropriate legislative response.

The Congress decided in May that 1 month of a fully manned surge was insufficient to call the Petraeus plan a failure. We wrote that decision into law. Since May, we have learned that progress is mixed. Many of the military tasks assigned have been achieved, and we have not seen sufficient progress on the political benchmarks. Some of our colleagues have refrained from calling for a change in strategy until they hear what General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker have to say in September. Actually, there is really no good argument that Ambassador Crocker and General Petraeus deserve an opportunity to be heard when these significant reports come out in September.

So I would ask our colleagues on the other side to think of the tangle we are in. Republicans have asked repeatedly to move up the cloture vote on the Levin troop withdrawal amendment. They have blocked us every time because they prefer the theater of the all-nighter. We were elected to legislate, not to strut across a stage. This isn't Hollywood. This is real life here in the Senate. Much depends on how we conduct ourselves right here and how we conduct ourselves in this debate.

We have heard the warnings from people who know the dangers that lurk in Iraq, and now I have a warning of my own to my colleagues on the other side. Our commanders, our troops, and the millions of brave men and women who have stood with us in Iraq and who live in danger of the creeping prospect of precipitous withdrawal, deserve a lot better than they are getting in this debate. They deserve our resolve and, at the very least, they deserve us to keep the pledge we made as recently as last May.

It is time to put an end to this charade. The stakes are entirely too high.

Mr. President, I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I sat here for the last hour or so and listened to the discussion, and what one concludes is that, once again, we are locked in a debate about the future of Iraq. I think many people watching this debate listen and think: Does this solve anything?

But in many ways, thanks to the courage of a few Senators on the other side of the aisle, the debate has undergone a major shift in the past few weeks. We are no longer simply asking whether we should change course, it is clear today that a majority in this body believe we must change course. Today, a majority of the Senate sees that the surge is not working, and a majority believes there has been no progress on political reconciliation.

The question I hear repeated is: Do we change course now or do we wait until September? I have heard distinguished Members of this body say: Why not wait until September? I believe the answer is clear. When you know things are moving in the wrong direction, why wait to act? And a growing majority in the Senate agrees.

While there are over 50-plus votes to support this view, there doesn't appear to be the 60 votes needed to bring the debate to a close, and there still are not the 67 votes needed to overcome a Presidential veto. So those of us who believe we need to change course, and

need to change course now, have no option other than to press for a vote until we prevail.

The good news is that this debate may slowly be moving away from the partisan bickering and toward a bipartisan way out of Iraq. A growing number of well-respected Republicans have made it clear that they believe the President's current strategy is not sustainable. This includes Senators WARNER and LUGAR, two of the most distinguished Senators in this body, who have introduced an amendment calling on the President to develop a plan to transition the mission, and potentially—potentially—draw down our troops.

This includes Senators HAGEL, SMITH, and SNOWE, who have cosponsored the Levin-Reed amendment calling for a binding timetable to redeploy our troops.

This includes Senator VOINOVICH, who, according to reports, has informed the White House that the only way to salvage the President's legacy is to begin moving out of Iraq.

And this includes Senators DOMENICI, COLLINS, ALEXANDER, BENNETT, GREGG, and SUNUNU, who have embraced legislation to implement the Iraq Study Group's recommendations.

These Senators are to be commended for their courage, and I believe the ranks will only continue to grow as time goes by. Why? Because despite repeated predictions that security and stability in Iraq are just around the corner, this has proved illusory. The security situation has not improved. There has been no progress toward political reconciliation. None.

Simply put: Violence in Iraq continues unabated, and we have heard it said on the floor over and over again, just in the past few days: 25 people killed Sunday, attacks across Baghdad, 10 killed in a car bomb blast in a busy commercial area, a triple bombing attack in Kirkuk killing 85 yesterday, wounding 183. And within hours of that attack, several men in Iraqi military uniforms attacked a Shia village in Diyala fatally shooting 28 men, women, and children.

This is why we need a change in course. And these are not isolated incidents. They are not the exception. They are the norm, day in, day out. Every day there is more—more bombings, more shootings, more IEDs, more kidnappings, more death squads.

Has the surge led to a reduction in violence? No. The news continues. We also heard last week of a firefight between U.S. forces and Iraqi police.

This cannot be the right direction. The surge wasn't supposed to be a silver bullet, but it was supposed to give the Iraqi Government the space and stability needed to come to a political accommodation. But has this happened? The answer has to be no. Is this likely to happen in the next 55 days? The answer is no.

In fact, the Iraqi Parliament will be taking a month-long vacation during this critical period. That is 30 out of the 55 days.

But of greatest concern is the fact that there has been little, if any, progress in the political arena. Even by the administration's account, the Iraqi Government hasn't made progress in meeting the benchmarks. You have heard this, and there are two more reports due on benchmarks, so we will hear more of the same.

If you talk about benchmarks, to me the most critical has always been debaathification—a terrible mistake made by us and now supported to continue by Ahmed Chalabi to prevent former Baathists from working. You can never have a united Iraq as long as you have debaathification on a level that even today still exists. The absence of holding provincial elections, passing an oil revenue sharing law, ensuring that authorities are not undermining members of the Iraqi security forces, ensuring that the Iraqi security forces provide evenhanded enforcement of the law—simple things not done.

There is a misbegotten belief that we can turn Iraq into a democracy—a country with little infrastructure for democracy, a government where ministers don't show up, where parliamentarians don't arrive, where long vacations are taken in the middle of war and strife. At the same time, the Pentagon reported last week that there has been a slight reduction in the number of Iraqi security force units capable of independent operations. So there is even deterioration on that front.

Yet we are told to wait. Something good might happen. So what should we do? Rather than wait another 8 weeks, I think we should act now. I think the Senate should approve the Levin-Reed amendment, which, to date, is the only amendment, as the majority leader has stated so often, with teeth—in 120 days redeployment begins, and out by April 30th of next year. It is clear, it is definitive, and it has the support of a majority of this body.

No State has suffered more than California from this war. We have nearly 400 dead and 3,000 wounded; 400 dead, 400 young men and women dead from the State. I hear some States say they have had five or six. We have had 400 people killed in this war. It is clear we must change course, but the President and some in this body say, again, we should wait.

Let me tell you why we should not wait. Here is what we will lose in 8 weeks, if current trends continue. Hundreds more U.S. troops dead. At this present rate, that is 200 more dead. More than 1,000 U.S. troops injured. Actually, if the present rate continues, 1,200 to 1,500 more. Several thousand more Iraqi civilians killed. At the present rate, 4,000 to 6,000 by waiting. Nearly 100,000 more Iraqi civilians displaced and another $20 billion spent.

I ask you, is this an acceptable cost of waiting? It is not to me. Secretary Gates and other administration officials made it clear in January we should know in a matter of months if the surge was working. Here it is July. It is very clear the surge is not working. Every day there are more bombings. If you measure things in real terms, that kill people—there are more bombings, more killings, more IEDs, more violence. Casualties have jumped since the surge began. As I said, we are now losing 100 of our people every month. The 331 troops killed during April, May, and June is the highest 3-month total since the war began 4½ years ago.

How is this a sign of progress? Tell me how is it a sign of progress, when more people are killed, more displaced, Iraqis turn up in the morgue by the dozens every day? Because if this trend continues, 2007 will be the deadliest for our troops since this war began. Why wait to act?

Waiting is not going to change the political situation either. Will we see the Iraqi Government pass an oil revenue-sharing law by September? Does anyone believe that? I don't think so.

Will we see reform of the debaathification system by September? I don't think so.

Will we see provincial elections or an Iraqi security force that is free from sectarian influence? I don't think so. As a matter of fact, the answer to all these questions is no. We haven't seen movement on the political front in the past 7 months, so why do we believe it will happen in the next 2 months? This is especially true, given that the Iraqi Parliament is taking a month off in August.

The surge was not supposed to be this silver bullet. It was supposed to give the Iraqi Government the space, the stability needed to come to a political solution. But as I say, this has not happened. As important, moving out of Iraq would open the door to a reevaluation of our national security interests in the region.

I happened to listen to Senator LUGAR on the floor in what I think was one of the most eloquent speeches I have heard. Let me quote from him.

> Our course in Iraq has lost contact with our vital national security interests in the Middle East and beyond. Our continuing absorption with military activities in Iraq is limiting our diplomatic assertiveness there and elsewhere in the world.

We know our Nation faces major challenges and the primary focus on Iraq has allowed these problems to fester. It has sapped our ability to act elsewhere, both by crippling our military's readiness and by draining our soft power around the world. Our challenges today, our real national interests, include: preventing terrorists from gaining safe haven in Pakistan and Afghanistan; preventing the violence in Iraq from spreading throughout the Middle East, Afghanistan, and the cities of Europe; stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons technologies and strengthening the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. This is the national interest of this country.

Containing Iran and compelling it to abandon its uranium enrichment program and pursuing a sustained and robust diplomacy aimed at achieving Israeli-Palestinian peace—I am delighted the President has taken on this as a major initiative with priority and that the Secretary of State will be in charge of this effort.

Finally, improving the image of the United States and repairing the damage done to our credibility around the world.

Does anyone believe, truly, this war has gained us respect in the council of world nations? Does anyone believe that? Because if they do, they are smoking something. Because it has not. There has never been a time when America has less credibility abroad than today.

Does anybody believe this war is quelling a new generation of terrorists? It is doing exactly opposite.

Peter Bergen, whose books I have read, whose statements I follow, said the other day on CNN that he estimates terrorists have increased sevenfold, that is 700 percent, since the war in Iraq began. Is this our interest? Is our interest to encourage every madrasah all throughout the Arab and Islamic world to essentially preach to create a new generation of terrorists? That is what is happening right now and we are not addressing it. We are not spending the money, the $10 billion a month to see that there are normal schools in these countries that teach youngsters how to become educated, to accept a place of economic upward mobility in what is a modern world. No. Instead, the sores fester and the terrorists grow. That is the reason that, as far as air traffic is concerned, we are in orange alert today.

The simple truth is that none of these initiatives can be pursued adequately so long as we are bogged down in Iraq. Iraq dominates our Nation's psyche, it dominates our Nation's pocketbook, and it dominates in the loss of our men and women.

I think each deserves the continuous attention of this administration, and the longer we wait to begin a redeployment of our troops, the longer we delay the day of reckoning, the longer we refuse to take the diplomatic steps that are necessary to engage with Syria, to engage with Iran, the harder it is going to be to achieve a successful outcome. I believe this.

I believe the time has come to change course. Waiting is not going to change the facts on the ground. Oh, I wished I believed that. I wish I could say, in 2 months, we are not going to lose 200 men and women; in 2 months, 4,000 or 5,000 additional Iraqis will not be killed; 100,000 additional Iraqis are not going to be displaced, and we are not going to spend another $20 billion of our treasure. But I cannot.

In total, we have lost more than 3,600 of our brave men and women, almost 500 since this surge began 5 months ago. Nearly 27,000 have suffered injuries, and many of these injuries are more serious than anything we have ever seen in the history of veterans' care, people who will require care for the rest of their lives.

We lose 100 of our people every month. So why wait to act? The most recent Pentagon quarterly report on Iraq concluded that the ''aggregate level of violence'' in Iraq has remained ''unchanged''—unchanged. Five months into the surge, the level of violence in Iraq, according to the recent Pentagon report, is unchanged, and CIA analyst Tim Fingar testified to Congress last week the violence in Iraq has not yet been reduced significantly.

At the same time, even as we have appropriated $450 billion for this war, spending has increased to $10 billion a month; Armed Forces are stretched thin, equipment is worn, recruiting is down, and nobody knows what happens to the military come April when deployments cannot be met. So why wait to act?

We are going to be paying the costs of this war for decades. Yet this President has asked for more time. Waiting another 2 months will not change anything. It will be more of the same. As has been said on this floor tonight a myriad of times, but I must echo it: The President shows no inclination to listen to a majority of the Senate, to the American people or to the House of Representatives. He has provided no exit strategy, no plan to begin redeploying our troops. Come September, there is no reason to believe anything will have changed. Why wait to act?

I yield the floor.

(Disturbance in the visitors' galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The gallery will refrain. It is not appropriate to express approval or disapproval in the galleries.

The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, with this political stunt tonight, the Senate has reached the approximate level of the Iraqi Parliament in dealing with the war on Iraq. There will be no more votes for a fixed deadline for withdrawal from Iraq at 3 a.m. than there would be at 3 p.m. This demeans and trivializes the foremost issue facing our country. It does not show the proper respect for the men and women who have been fighting there and their families.

Here we are, issuing milestones, talking about benchmarks to an infant democracy on the other side of the world, issuing reports and report cards about how well they are doing on what we have told them to do, talking to them about why they haven't passed oil sharing and debaathification and why they have not had more elections, and we cannot come up, ourselves, with a consensus about what we are doing in Iraq.

Here we are, the oldest democracy in the world, alleging ourselves—the Senate—to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, and we are lecturing Iraq, a new democracy, an infant democracy. We are lecturing them for not coming up with a consensus when we can't come up with one ourselves.

I think it is important for the American people to know it is not necessarily that way in the Senate. I began this day at 8 a.m. at a breakfast, as I did last week, as I did the week before, which we call our bipartisan breakfast. This morning we had about a dozen Republicans and Democrats around the table—only Senators. Last week, we had two dozen around a table. Our subject was Iraq and the Defense authorization bill.

I will not say any more about what was discussed because one of the benefits of this breakfast is it is the only time during the week, except for our prayer breakfast on Wednesday, when we are not in team meetings, when there is not a group somewhere plotting what this side will do to that side or what that side will do to this side. It is amazing what sort of discussion we can have when we sit down around that sort of table. We have many of the same principles who have talked tonight on the Senate floor, people who have strongly held views and they are different views and they were stated clearly and explicitly and each of us respected those views. We heard them.

But at least as strong as the difference of opinion in that bipartisan breakfast—as it is each week when we talk—was the feeling that our main job was, as soon as we could, to come to some sort of consensus about where we go from here. Because the single most important thing we can do as a government, other than fund our troops, is to send them a clear signal that we agree on why we sent them there to fight and perhaps be wounded and perhaps to die and we failed in that responsibility. To compound it, we are in the midst of a political stunt which does not do anything to encourage us toward a consensus.

In my remarks tonight, rather than heap oil on the fire, what I would like to do is talk for a moment about how we could come to that consensus and about both Democrats and Republicans in this body who are working that way. Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the Senator from California, mentioned a number of Senators who do that. My experience with Members of this body began when I came to work here for the first time 40 years ago this year as a very junior aide. I have only been a Member of the body for 4 years. My experience is that most of us prefer to conduct ourselves like grownups, to not engage in petty kindergarten games, to not have partisan efforts where we taunt one another and try to put one another at a disadvantage but actually recognize we are here to look at big, difficult issues and to see if we can come up with a solution for one.

If there is such an issue that demands such a solution, it is America's role in Iraq. How would the Senate—if I am right that most of us would like

to have that kind of result—how would we go about working toward consensus, when we obviously have strongly held different views? For example, Senator LEVIN and Senator REED, two of the most senior Members of our body—one a distinguished graduate of West Point, one who has served as chairman or ranking member of the Armed Services Committee for a long time—they strongly believe, as the Senator from California believes, that unless the Congress imposes upon the President a fixed deadline for withdrawal, that we will not have any motion in that direction.

I respect that. I disagree with that. I believe that interferes with the constitutional prerogatives of the President. I do not believe it is practical in a time of war to say that a group of legislators, 100 generals here in this body, can guess a year out, even if that is the direction we want to go, exactly how to do it and exactly when to do that. That is why we have a Commander in Chief.

The Founders didn't pick this particular President, but they picked a President, a Chief Executive, with that responsibility. I respect that. That is of a difference of opinion. So we have profound and real and honest differences of opinion and they are reflected all the way across our country.

I hear them in Tennessee. The Presiding Officer hears them in his State. We hear them everywhere, and we feel them especially strongly because so many of our men and women have been there. In my State, 10,000 members of the National Guard and the Reserves have been to Iraq and Afghanistan; almost all of them more than once.

We think of General Petraeus as almost a hometown boy because he commanded the 101st Airborne Division. When he was there as its commander, he was accidentally shot through the heart in a training exercise. His life was saved, when he went to Vanderbilt Hospital, by none other than Bill Frist, our former majority leader, who was then a heart surgeon at Vanderbilt University. So we have unusual respect for General Petraeus.

We are the ''Volunteer State.'' We have sent more men and women to fight, we think, than almost any State, and we instinctively have great respect for the President of the United States.

That is where we start in our State. But, still, there are a great many Tennesseans who say to me it is time for a new strategy in Iraq. It is time for a change. We have helped depose Saddam Hussein. We have helped Iraq have an opportunity to have a democratic government. We have stayed a long time to help build their security. But now it is time for us to agree on a different strategy.

How would a country and how would a body such as the Senate go about that? One way to do it might be to pick 10 people from outside the Senate, 10 of the most distinguished Americans, and say to them: We are stuck here. We have a problem. The country has a problem. We need a shift of direction. We have a Senate that is divided, a President who is insisting on his constitutional prerogatives, and we have men and women fighting and dying in Iraq—what do we do? Ten Americans, let's pick five Democrats and five Republicans, to give it a little bit more prestige.

That happened last year. Frank Wolf, a Representative from Virginia; John Warner, Senator from this body, was a part of this as well—they created something called the Iraq Study Group. The Iraq Study Group was cochaired by Jim Baker, the former Secretary of State for President Bush, and by Lee Hamilton, the former Democratic chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. There were 10 prestigious Americans who served on the Iraq Study Group—if all of us were to put in a hat the names of Americans who might be good members of such a commission to help us unravel this problem, the 10 who were picked would come out of that hat pretty fast, in pretty good order, with a lot of Members on both sides of the aisle suggesting them.

For example, Larry Eagleburger, the former Secretary of State for the first President Bush; Vernon Jordan, the former president of the National Urban League and a very close associate of former President Clinton; Ed Meese, President Reagan's Attorney General; Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, who was the first woman to be appointed to the United States Supreme Court by President Reagan; Leon Panetta, who was President Clinton's Chief of Staff and who now in California has his own institute, the Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy in Monterey, CA; Chuck Robb, our former colleague, married to Lynda Bird Johnson. We have been thinking about that family these past 2 weeks with Lady Bird's death; Chuck Robb, a former marine, former Senator, a member of that panel; Allen Simpson, who had the No. 2 position right over here, a whip in the Senate from Wyoming; and, at one point, Robert Gates, the current Secretary of Defense, was a member of this panel before he had to step aside when he went to the administration.

So those 10 people—five Democrats, five Republicans. It would be hard to improve on that.

Then, let's say you said to this group of 10: This is an especially difficult problem. The Senate is fractured, the President is insisting on his prerogative, and the country is divided and tired, and we need a solution. So what we need for you to do, commissioners, is not come back with a majority vote, not come back with a filibuster, not come back with an all-night political stunt, but come back with a unanimous set of recommendations of where we go from here in Iraq, you five Democrats, you five Republicans with years of experience.

That is precisely what they did in December of last year, after 9 or 10 meetings all over America, and meetings in Iraq, with a distinguished staff that consisted of an honor roll list of generals and experts. They visited with former President Clinton, former Vice President Mondale, former Secretary of State Albright, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Warren Christopher, they visited with Colin Powell and George Shultz, Tony Lake, General Scowcroft, to ask about everybody whose judgment one would hope they would ask, and they came up with 79 recommendations in December, and they released it to the public.

They unanimously agreed in 9 months about what to do in Iraq. They also did not pull any punches. They said in December, even though this was chaired by Jim Baker and Lee Hamilton, they said: The situation in Iraq is ''grave and deteriorating.'' They said there is no magic bullet. But they did unanimously agree, unlike the Levin-Reed amendment, that we did not need a fixed deadline. They unanimously agreed that troop deployments should be subject to conditions on the ground.

So what did they recommend? Well, in a few minutes I cannot summarize 79 recommendations, but I can boil it down to three points. First, we should move our troops from a combat mission to a support, equipping, and training mission as soon as we honorably can. They said, as a goal, that should happen in about a year, which then would have been the first quarter of 2008. Now, some time has gone past since then. But they said in about a year. The practical effect of that would have been to remove about half our combat forces—to reduce the number of American forces in Iraq by about half.

And, rather than subject that goal of reducing troops to a fixed deadline, as the Levin-Reed amendment says, they said it should be subject to developments on the ground, which is practical in a time of war, and respects the Commander in Chief's constitutional prerogative.

They said, No. 2: We should have a long-term interest in Iraq. It should be a limited interest, but there should be sufficient troops to help make certain that in that new mission we deal with that interest. They listed some of the things the troops would be expected to do who stayed: guard the Embassy, search and rescue, intelligence, special forces to go after al-Qaida—the point being, even though our troops have a different mission, out of a combat role into a support, equipping, and training mission, there would be enough of them there to send a message to the Middle East and the rest of the world: Stay out of Iraq. Give Iraq a chance to succeed, while also protecting U.S. forces that remained there. That was the second point.

The third point was step up. Step up the political and diplomatic efforts in the region by a significant amount, including talking with everybody in the region, to try to bring a result in Iraq.

So those are the three points. One, move out of the combat mission to the support, equipping, and training mission over about a year, without a deadline; two, a long-term but limited interest in Iraq, with some specifics; and, three, step up political and diplomatic efforts. Plus, the Iraq Study Group emphasized that we would still have a considerable presence in the region in Qatar and Kuwait and in Bahrain. So that is what the Iraq Study Group said.

What happened with the Iraq Study Group report? Well, I was very disappointed by the reaction to the report, especially when I saw that the recommendations were unanimous. When I first saw who were the distinguished members of that panel, I was convinced that at the State of the Union Address, President Bush would seat them in the gallery, and at the appropriate time, as Presidents often do, he would say: There they are, from the Reagan administration, from the Clinton administration, from my father's administration, and they have unanimously agreed on where we go from here in Iraq. And it is not exactly my proposal, it is their proposal, but because it is important to our troops and to our country and to the world that we move forward in a unified way, I accept their recommendations. I will develop a plan based upon their report. I ask you and the Congress to accept it.

I think there is a good chance that the Congress would accept such a plan, and an important part of that reason is because even the President needed someone else to help him develop support for whatever proposal he came up with. So that would be the first thing I think we would do if we were trying to solve this problem: go ask 10 of the most distinguished Americans of both parties to tell us what to do in specific recommendations, and do it unanimously.

Now, what is the second thing we would do? Well, I think we would come to this body and say: Every time we turn around there is a political stunt going on. Someone has had an early morning meeting and decided we are going to do this to the Republicans, and then some Republicans get excited, and they have an early morning meeting and say: We are going to do this to the Democrats. And you do not have the kind of discussion that these 10 Americans had or the kind we have in our bipartisan breakfasts.

But the second thing that needs to be done to move us in a consensus on where we go from here in Iraq would be to find some Senator in this body who would say: We are going to accept this Iraq Study Group report, and we are going to ask that the President agree to it and develop a plan based upon it and report to us on it in 90 days.

That is precisely what Senator SALAZAR did with his legislation. After saying in January that I was disappointed the President did not adopt the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, I made a speech on the floor in March. I find that sometimes you have to say things more than once in order to have anybody pay attention.

I said: Why didn't the President, in March, take the Iraq Study Group down off the shelf and use it for something other than a book end? And then I made another speech to that effect, and Senator PRYOR of Arkansas came by to see me and said: We need to do something about this. We need to find a way to work together rather than to continue to have Democratic and Republican votes on Iraq.

Then Senator SALAZAR called me and said: I have been working with Secretary Baker, and with Lee Hamilton and their staffs. I put together legislation that accurately reflects the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. And it simply adopts those recommendations as our law. If the President agrees to it, he is asked to develop a comprehensive plan based on those recommendations.

Since that time, there are now 14 of us in the Senate on both sides of the aisle who are cosponsors of that idea. Senator SALAZAR is the leader. He has done a terrific job on that. He is a Democrat from Colorado. In addition to my cosponsorship, we have been joined by MARK PRYOR, a Democrat from Arkansas; BOB BENNETT, a Republican from Utah; ROBERT CASEY, a Democrat from Pennsylvania; JUDD GREGG, a Republican from New Hampshire; BLANCHE LINCOLN, a Democrat from Arkansas; JOHN SUNUNU, a Republican from New Hampshire; SUSAN COLLINS, a Republican from Maine; PETE DOMENICI, a Republican from New Mexico; BILL NELSON, a Democrat from Florida; MARY LANDRIEU, a Democrat from Louisiana; CLAIRE MCCASKILL, a Democrat from Missouri; and KENT CONRAD, a Democrat from North Dakota.

My guess is that if the Democratic Senate leadership would back off a little bit, if the President would be more flexible, there are probably 60 votes coming from both sides of the aisle for the Baker-Hamilton report, and if that should be adopted by the Congress, we can move forward, which brings me to my final point.

What would be the third step in having a bipartisan consensus for our country that would say to our troops and the world: We agree on why you are there, and we support that mission? It would be for the President to embrace the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. The President of the United States does not want to do that. I respect that. He has an absolute constitutional right to say: Our Framers created the Executive, I am the Commander in Chief, we cannot have 100 generals, I will develop the plan, and I will command the troops. That is my job.

He is right about that, except he has another part to his job. George Reedy, who was the Press Secretary to former President Lyndon Johnson, wrote a book called, ''Twilight of the Presidency.'' In it he defined the President of the United States. He said, No. 1, his job is to see an urgent need; No. 2, to develop a strategy to meet the need; and No. 3 is to persuade at least half of the people that he is right.

I do not believe that President Bush, even if he is right in September, is likely to be able to persuade enough people to support his strategy to be able to sustain the strategy. Let me say that again. Even if he is right in September, even if he takes many parts of the Baker-Hamilton group and announces it as his strategy, at this stage in our history, I do not believe he can persuade enough Americans to support his strategy to sustain the strategy.

I believe this strategy should be sustained. So how does he do that? The way he does that is to embrace those who wrote this and those who support this so that it is not just his strategy, so that it is our strategy, so that he can say to the troops in the Middle East, and to the rest of the Middle East, and to the world: The Congress and I have come together around a set of principles. I am developing a plan on those principles. And not everyone agrees, but a consensus of us agree, which is why I would say to the Democratic leader, with respect, I do not mind requiring 60 votes on the Iraq issues. We need a consensus. We do not want to have an Iraq policy that passes by 51 to 49. We need a consensus. I believe we can have it.

There are some who say adopting the Iraq Study Group principles, the Salazar-Alexander legislation, is toothless. I respectfully disagree. My grandfather was a railroad engineer, a Santa Fe railroad engineer. He lived in Newton, KS, and his job was to drive the big locomotives onto the roundtable it was called. And that was how you turned a locomotive around. A locomotive might be about as hard to turn around as a country in the middle of a war. But that is what my grandfather did. He turned that locomotive around. And it was turned around. They put it on a different track and off it went in a different direction.

If we and the President were to agree on the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, it would be just like my grandfather putting that big locomotive on the roundtable in Newton, KS. It would be turned around and sent down a different track. And, for now, at least, those on the other side would pick another engineer. But the engineer cannot do much about that track once he is on it. It would be headed down the track, the world would know it, and in good faith we could work together.

When I was an impatient young man working in the White House 40 years ago, a wise man named Bruce Harlow said to me: Lamar, just remember that here—he meant the White House—just a little tilt makes big waves out there.

If this Congress and this President adopted together the Iraq Study Group recommendations this week, that

would make big waves out there, and that would be a new consensus for our country.

Some said: Well, the Iraq Study Group is a little stale. It is out of date. It was done in December.

Lee Hamilton, the Democratic co-chairman said: No. He said: We said in December the situation was grave and deteriorating. It still is. We said in December we need to move from a combat mission to support, equipping, and training. We still do. This week he said: In addition, we need to have a long-term limited role in Iraq. And we still do. And finally he said: We need to step up our diplomatic and political efforts in Iraq, and we still do.

To the President, I would say with the greatest respect, because he is a member of my own party, and I have talked with him about this before, I would say: Mr. President, I do respect your prerogative. I know you can draw the plan up. I know you want to sit down first with General Petraeus, whom we all respect and whom I especially do, as a friend, because he spent so much time in Tennessee. But the Salazar-Alexander legislation has no chance of taking effect until September. And all it asks you to do is to draw up a comprehensive plan based upon the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. The first person you sit down with can be General Petraeus.

And I would ask the President whether it be better for him to ignore the Iraq Study Group and come up with his own plan, or would it be better for him to come to the Congress and say: Congress, I will adopt these. Why don't you adopt these and let's send our troops a message that we are united in what they are fighting for?

So there are 14 of us, 8 Democrats, 6 Republicans at this point, who support and cosponsor the Iraq Study Group. But I believe there are many more of us who could be comfortable with it, who could vote for it, even if it is not our first choice.

So I regret this all-night political stunt, but I respect this body. I see it every week in those bipartisan breakfasts, talking like the people of this country wish we always would when confronted by a major issue. I salute Senators SALAZAR and PRYOR and those on that side, and Senator GREGG, Senator BENNETT, Senator COLLINS, and those on this side who are working together to fix that. I hope more of our colleagues will join us soon.

The President and the Congress could agree on the Baker-Hamilton recommendations, and we would say to our troops: We not only will fund you, but we can now also say to you and to the Middle East that we agree on your mission, on why you are fighting, and why you are being wounded, and why you are dying.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I see that many of my colleagues have come to the floor, so I will try to be brief in my remarks. But I would like to assure my good friend from Tennessee that this is not a stunt. This is a very strong and clear and unwavering statement tonight that the President and the Republican leadership are leading this country in the wrong direction, and now is the time to change it.

I have not been to Hollywood too many times, but I have been there enough to know that there is a lot of glitter, fountains, big lights. I do not see any fountains or glitter on the floor of the Senate. I see hard-working Senators who are here to debate the most important issue.

And for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to question our intentions is beneath the dignity of this body. Let me repeat again for the Senator from Tennessee, to the Senator from Kentucky, and all of my friends: This is not a stunt. This is an exercise in reality. And this is not Hollywood, this is the Senate, and this is exactly what people in the Senate do, debate.

And what we also like to do is vote. But we are not allowed to vote because the minority leader has decided that we are not going to have a vote. We have a majority of votes to change direction. I would argue with the other side that we are never going to get 80 percent or 90 percent of the Senate to move in one direction or another in a situation such as this. It is an impossible barrier to achieve.

But we may get a growing number, a majority of Senators who represent the majority of the population in America to say to the President that we want to go in another direction. So tonight is not a stunt. It is a statement saying it is time to allow us to vote.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the President yield for a question?

Ms. LANDRIEU. No, I will not.

I also say to the Senator, I am a cosponsor of the Iraq Study Group legislation by Senator SALAZAR, on which he worked so hard and so honestly to build bipartisan support. But what happened when the President gave his State of the Union Address 2 years ago when things looked as though they were not going very well in Iraq? We had more deaths, more violence, and a bipartisan group did come together, some of the great minds on this issue. What did the President do? He dismissed the document.

I am not sure what the Senator from Tennessee thinks, maybe the President will wake up tomorrow morning and decide to read the report. But he hasn't read it for 2 years. It is not being implemented. That is what this debate is about.

I don't know how many more commissions we could commission. I don't know how many more experts we could gather. I don't know how many more Republicans and Democrats could come together to explain to this President it is not working. So I am not sure about creating another commission. We have already had many. He doesn't even read the recommendations. They are right here. Here they are, not implemented into law. But can we vote on this? No, because the minority leader says they don't want to have a vote on these recommendations.

I wish to say another thing about the role of the Congress and the President. I am so tired of hearing the other side say: Why does Congress have anything to say about this matter? Maybe because our Constitution says we should, maybe because the intelligence reports that are done are not just presented to the President and his military generals and leaders and war fighters. The intelligence reports are given to us. There was one delivered this morning I would like to read.

Before I read what it says, I wish to read the way it says it.

> Since its formation in 1973, the National Intelligence Council has served as a bridge between the intelligence and policy communities, a source of deep, substantive expertise on critical national security issues, and as a focal point for Intelligence Community collaboration. . . . [It] provides a focal point for policymakers . . .

That would be me, I am a policymaker. I ran for the job. I am elected. I am here to make policy, and I intend to make it.

> . . . Warfighters, and Congressional leaders to task the Intelligence Community for answers—

We sure need some important questions, such as how to win the war against terrorism.

They don't send this to the President and say: After you finish reading it, let us know what you want us to do. They send it to us, and today they sent us another one.

What it said in this report is:

> Al-qa'ida is and will remain the most serious terrorist threat to the Homeland, as its central leadership continues to plan high-impact plots, while pushing others in extremist Sunni communities to mimic its efforts and to supplement its capabilities.

It is clearly saying, yes, there are some threats and activities in Sunni areas in Iraq, but there are also Sunni areas around the world. And so Osama bin Laden is still loose.

I brought his picture tonight so I could remind the President what he looks like. He is still on the loose, the leader of al-Qaida. This is his description. He is 6 foot 4 inches to 6 foot 6 inches, approximately 160 pounds. He is thin. Occupation unknown. We know now what he does. His hair is brown. His eyes are brown. His complexion is olive. And there is a reward—and thank goodness they let us have a vote on Byron Dorgan's amendment because now the reward is $50 million instead of $25 million. Maybe the President will veto that provision. I don't know. But I, frankly, think that was a good idea. Maybe we should raise it a little higher. I don't know what Congress is doing discussing what the reward should be for Osama bin Laden. Clearly, we have nothing to say about this issue. I am glad we voted to increase the reward. I would like to see if we can find him and

kill him. If we would stop spending $500 million a day, $35 million before breakfast every day in Iraq, maybe we could find him because he is not in Baghdad.

We, obviously, have disagreements about the way to proceed, but I can assure my colleagues this is not a stunt. This is a real debate that is taking place in a real place that is the real Senate of the United States. It is not Hollywood.

The President and the Republican leadership have made many mistakes. Nobody is perfect, and we all make them. But we have to change course. What we are doing is not working. He is still loose. The estimate today says that al-Qaida is as strong as it was on 9/11. If we are winning the war, I am not sure that 4 years after you engage, if your enemy is stronger than it was when you started, that is winning under any definition. But that is what the Republican leadership continues to tell people: despite the mounting casualties, the increased funerals, and the tremendous strains on our soldiers and their families coming home, that we are most certainly winning. The American people don't believe it.

Some people are asking to pull out. I am not asking that, but I am asking for a change of direction. I brought this picture to the floor today to remind everybody how we got here in the first place. Saddam Hussein did not attack the United States, Osama bin Laden did, and he is still alive, and now terrorism is around the world in places it was not before we started down this road. If we are not careful, we are going to spend all our money there, all the American people's patience there, and all their will there and still not find the guy we are looking for and the central intelligence of al-Qaida. I know he is not the only part of al-Qaida, but he is the leader, and we need to find him.

So however one feels about the issue, I don't think spending one night on the floor of the Senate, which is not a Hollywood set but the real deal, is too much to ask, since our soldiers have spent every night for 5 years on the battlefield around the world.

I will make one more point. I hope that nobody comes to my State or on the floor and accuses me of not supporting our troops in uniform because I will have several words for them. Every time we disagree about procedures, the ones who don't agree with the President are accused of not supporting our troops. We couldn't support them more.

So I hope we can get past that reasoning and perhaps we can find a better consensus. But the place we are going, the direction we are going is not right. We need to change course, and we need to fight smart, we need to fight tough, we need to go where the enemy is, and we need to protect America.

According to this intelligence report that was issued this morning, it doesn't look like we are doing that. That is what this debate is about. I look forward to continuing many nights into the future and days ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from Connecticut begins, can we see about getting a unanimous consent agreement relative to some order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I will yield to the Senator for the purpose of propounding a unanimous consent request but without yielding the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I propose that the Senator from Connecticut go for as long as he might take; that the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, follow him. Does the Senator know who wants to go next on his side? The Senator from New Jersey?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, responding to the Senator from Georgia, I understand the Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, wishes to speak next in order.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Senator BROWN would follow Senator COLLINS and Senator ISAKSON would follow Senator BROWN.

Mr. BROWN. I object. The informal order established was Senator ALEXANDER, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator LIEBERMAN, myself, then a Republican, and then Senator MENENDEZ. I ask unanimous consent that be the order.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I think that is what I said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut still has the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I am sorry, I put Senator COLLINS ahead of Senator BROWN and I was wrong. Senator BROWN would follow Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator COLLINS follows Senator BROWN.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Then if my friend from Georgia will allow, I gather the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, will be next.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Following Senator COLLINS, that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. We will figure out where we are at the end of that time.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to address the amendment offered by Senator LEVIN and Senator REED and to explain why I will vote against cloture on the amendment tomorrow morning.

I think it is important to explain that because my friend from Louisiana who spoke before me had behind her a sign that said: Let us vote. We may see that sign again. I wish to indicate that we are going to have a vote. We are going to have a vote tomorrow morning. And the question is: Will we sustain what has been a bedrock policy of the Senate to require 60 votes for a matter of great importance that comes before this body, particularly a matter where there is a lot at stake?

This amendment offered by my colleagues from Michigan and Rhode Island is a very serious amendment. Some of us believe it would have disastrous consequences for the security of the United States of America, for the safety of our troops in Iraq, for the stability of the region, for any hope for democracy in the Middle East, and a better future for the people of that part of the world than the suicidal death and hatred al-Qaida offers them.

But you know, I have recollection of times in the Senate hearing the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD. He has made, over the years, some compelling arguments for why the Senate has this unusual procedure of requiring 60 votes on matters of great importance. I am not quoting him directly, but this is consistent with the vision of one of the Framers—I believe it was Madison, I am not sure—who said, if you will, that the Senate is the saucer in which the Congress will cool the coffee. As Senator BYRD said much more to the point, we in this Chamber have had for a long time this ability to request 60 votes to pass a matter when there are Members of the Senate—and I am one in this case—who believe the passage of this matter would have a profoundly negative effect on our country and its security.

I know some of my colleagues disagree with me, of course. But I am exercising my right within the tradition of the Senate to do what senior colleagues have advised over the years: to stop the passions, the political passions of a moment from sweeping across Congress into law and altering our future permanently. I have done it on other matters. I have done it on environmental matters, where I think something proposed will have so adverse an effect on some of the natural wonders that God has given the United States of America that I have said: No, I am going to be part of a group to demand 60 votes because if I allow this to pass by less, there will be an irreversible change that will occur.

With respect to my colleagues who are saying let us vote, we will vote. But the question on that vote is will we ask for 60 votes to adopt this very significant amendment? I say it is in the best traditions of the Senate to require 60 votes before this amendment is adopted.

Second, before I get to the merits of the amendment or my opinion about it, I wish to respond to something my friend from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, said about the bipartisan meeting we had this morning, people of different opinions on this issue discussing in a closed room across a table looking for common ground. I wish to express my own sense of disappointment, sadness, though unfortunately in these

very partisan times not surprise, that this debate we are having which reaches a kind of pitch, a moment of confrontation on the Levin-Reed amendment which would mandate a withdrawal from Iraq, that this debate is so partisan. I have a point of view about the war in Iraq and what I think is best for our security and future policy in Iraq.

I know people have different points of view. I respect that. This is a difficult, a very difficult matter on which to reach judgment. So people, of course, can have different points of view, but why do we divide in those different points of view on party lines? There is no inherent reason why that should happen. It is a sign of what ails our political system, what afflicts our Federal Government and hamstrings it, what frustrates and ultimately angers the American people about what they see here because what they see is that too often we seem to be playing partisan politics, we seem to be in a kind of partisan tug of war. The net result of that is that nothing gets done.

Wars are always controversial. Wars have been controversial throughout our history. But rarely have the divisions between those who support a war and oppose it or support particular policies associated with it and oppose it been as partisan as they are at this moment. It has to stop. If it doesn't stop on Iraq, I believe our Nation will be weakened seriously.

We have to find ways, no matter what the partisan pressures are, to come together as Americans to defend our Nation against those who hate us all—al-Qaida, Iran, the fanatics running around who exhort the tens of thousands to shout ''Death to America.'' They have been doing it since the revolution of 1979. They do it weekly throughout Iran: ''Death to America.'' Surely we understand they don't distinguish between Republicans and Democrats when they shout ''Death to America. We should have the common sense, let alone a sense of responsibility to our country, to come together and defend our Nation against those who want to destroy us, as al-Qaida began to do on 9/11.

I regret the partisanship that characterizes this debate.

I wish to talk very briefly about how we got here, not going over it in any detail. This Congress authorized the President to take action to overthrow Saddam Hussein after the administration had attempted, through the United Nations Security Council, to get Saddam to take certain steps, including proving to us he had destroyed the weapons of mass destruction, he had filed an inventory with the United Nations Security Council as a condition of the truce and end to the gulf war of 1991.

I don't wish to revisit that. I know people look back at him and think they were deceived in why we went to war. I think the world is better off without Saddam Hussein in power. But this takes me to this point. For 3 years afterward, this country followed a strategy in Iraq that didn't work. We followed a strategy in Iraq for too long that didn't work. I strongly supported the war to overthrow Saddam Hussein and deeply desired that we do everything we could not just to overthrow him but to try to create within Iraq a new Iraq, a free Iraq, a self-governing Iraq that would give hope to people throughout the Arab world, the Muslim world, of a better future than the one that al-Qaida offers them, which is a return to a millennium ago, away from the modern world, but we erred for 3 years. Many of us cried out that we did not have enough troops there, we were following a strategy that did not work, too few troops and not focusing on al-Qaida training, an insufficient ability to do that, and letting the terrorists essentially take hold of the country.

Finally, last year, the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, changed the course in Iraq. He changed the leadership of the Pentagon, which was critically necessary. He brought in a new Secretary of Defense, consulted with experts on all sides about what to do, how to improve what was happening in Iraq, and adopted a totally new strategy. That is why when I hear people in this debate saying we need a change of course in Iraq, well, we got a change of course, finally. It was later than I hoped for, but, finally, at the end of last year, beginning in February, the counteroffensive, called a surge, and a new general, a great general—a general in the tradition of Maxwell Taylor, General Abrams, a general who was called on in a very difficult situation, probably the single most informed leader on counterinsurgency in our military, GEN David Petraeus, to take charge of these troops—and he gave him 30,000 additional troops.

The evidence thus far is incomplete, because as has been said, and will be said again, the surge was just fully staffed about a month ago. But you have to look at the statistics. I know the benchmark that came in, the interim one last week, was mixed. But on the security side, which is what the surge was first aimed at, deaths from sectarian violence are way down in Baghdad, more than half the city is now under the control of American and Iraqi forces, and normalcy is returning to many parts of the capital city, and Anbar Province, the story is well known now. Basically, the additional troops and the new strategy enabled us to convince the Sunni tribal leaders in Anbar, which al-Qaida was going to make the capital of its Islamist extremist caliphate, We convinced the tribal leaders we were there to stay, so they came to our side, and al-Qaida is on the run—and for the first time. Always before we had the strategy where we would chase the terrorists out of a community, a city, in Baghdad, and we would leave and then they would come back. This time, in Anbar Province, we left some of our marines and some of the Iraqi security forces, working with the Sunni indigenous tribal leaders, and what did we do? We followed al-Qaida on the run to Diyala Province, to Baquba city, the major city there, and we have them on the run there as well. As a result, the tribal leaders there are beginning to come over to our side. So this surge, interim as the reports are, is, on the ground, working.

Now comes the Levin-Reed amendment. I wish to say to my colleagues this is not the Levin-Reed amendment we voted on earlier this year. That amendment did require the beginning of a withdrawal of troops within 120 days of passage, as this amendment does. But that amendment set a goal—G-O-A-L—a goal for our troops to be substantially withdrawn from Iraq by the end of March of next year. It is no longer a goal in this Levin-Reed amendment. It is a mandate, a rigid deadline that by the end of April of next year most of our troops are out of Iraq. A core group is left, presumably with the stated purpose to train the Iraqis and to fight al-Qaida, which is exactly what the previous policy that failed was aimed at doing.

Some have said this is the only amendment with teeth. It does have teeth. But I think we have to ask: Who does it bite? I think it bites our hope for success in Iraq. It bites our troops, as they proceed day in and day out, courageously, compassionately, effectively. It bites our hope for keeping al-Qaida and Iran out of controlling Iraq. This amendment mandates a retreat to begin in 4 months, 120 days, regardless of what is happening on the ground.

This is not a debate about whether to change course in Iraq, it is a debate about whether to accept and embrace defeat in Iraq. We have changed course, as I said before. This is a debate about whether we are going to give our generals and our troops the chance that they say they need to succeed, and succeed they know they can, or if we are going to order them to retreat—we order them to retreat—as they on the ground are risking their lives every day and succeeding.

We are going to, if this amendment passes, impose a deadline that is as inflexible as it is arbitrary. I say this with respect, but I say it from the bottom of my heart. This is a deadline for an American defeat, one that we will pay for, I fear, for a generation to come.

Let us be absolutely clear again about what the amendment we are debating now would do. If adopted, this amendment would literally put this Congress between the Commander in Chief, our generals, and our soldiers in the field. So just as our troops are on the offensive against al-Qaida in Iraq, just as our troops have the enemy on the run, this amendment would reach 5,000 miles across the ocean and put our troops on the run in retreat and defeat.

I will tell you this, the American military, the best in the world—courageous, resourceful, fighting a tough fight but adjusting to it, resilient, finding ways to succeed—the American military will never lose the war in Iraq. The war in Iraq, if it is to be lost, will be lost as a result of a loss of political will here at home, and you have to judge the consequences of that. Each one of us has to.

In the midst of an unpredictable war, this amendment would strip our military commanders not only of the troops they say they need to succeed—this amendment would remove the troops from our commanding generals—it would strip them of the authority and the ability to adapt to changing conditions, which, after all, is what success in war is all about, putting America's military in a legislative straitjacket.

I am going to do everything I can to stop that from happening, and that is why I am going to vote against cloture. This amendment is wrong. I truly believe it is dangerous. In fact, this amendment should not even be considered now. I welcome the debate, but I believe, when we passed the supplemental appropriations bill in which we authorized the surge to go forward, in which we appropriated funds for the surge, in which we established the requirement for the benchmark, for which we got the study last week and then the next one coming in September, to me we made an institutional pledge in that to General Petraeus and the troops. Because in that bill we required General Petraeus, along with our Ambassador to Baghdad, Ryan Crocker, to come back in September and report to us. We wanted to give them, at the request of General Petraeus, time from the middle of June, when the surge troops would have arrived, to September to see whether he could make it work and report back to us.

I don't think there is a person in this Chamber, no matter what our position on Iraq, that doesn't trust General Petraeus to tell us the truth, what he believes, when he comes back in September. I think we made an institutional pledge to him. But I know this: I made a personal pledge to him. I am going to give him and the troops a fair chance, which this amendment would deprive him of, and I am going to give him until September to come back and tell me how it is going.

All of us would like to believe, I certainly would, that there is a quick and easy solution to the challenges we face in Iraq. All of us, I certainly would, would like to go back and do over a lot of what happened after Saddam Hussein was overthrown. All of us want our brave men and women in uniform to come home safely and as soon as possible. All of us are keenly aware of the frustration and fatigue the American people are feeling about this war. But we, who have been honored by our constituents to be elected to serve in the Senate, have a responsibility to lead, not to follow. We have a responsibility—it is the oath we took when we were sworn in—to do what we believe is right for our country, even if it is unpopular.

I speak for myself, but I firmly believe what is right is that we cannot allow our Nation to be defeated in Iraq by the same Islamist extremists who attacked us on 9/11, with whom we are engaged now in a worldwide war that stretches from Baghdad to London, from Madrid to Riyadh, from Bali to Jerusalem, and from Fort Dix to JFK Airport.

The sponsors of this resolution insist what is happening in Iraq is a civil war, and they want us to not be part of it. But this argument flies in the face of the statements of al-Qaida's own top leaders who have repeatedly told us they consider Iraq to be, today, the central battlefield of their world war against us. We didn't start this world war, they did, by attacking us.

I wish to take a moment to read some comments, direct quotes, from leaders of al-Qaida that make this clear. I am not making it up. I am not quoting somebody in the administration.

December 2004. Osama bin Laden.

> I now address my speech to the whole of the Islamic nation. Listen and understand. The most important and serious issue today for the whole world is this Third World war. It is raging in the lands of the two rivers—Iraq. The world's millstone and pillar is Baghdad, the capital of the caliphate.

July 2005, Ayman al-Zawahiri, second to bin Laden, as we know, in al-Qaida. A letter to Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi, the head of Iraq, subsequently killed by coalition forces. Quote from Zawahiri to Zarqawi:

> I want to be the first to congratulate you for what God has blessed you with in terms of fighting a battle in the heart of the Islamic world, what is now the place for the greatest battle of Islam in this era.

Zawahiri, in that same letter:

> The Mujahadeen must not have their mission end with the expulsion of the Americans from Iraq. No, the first stage is to expel the Americans from Iraq; the second stage is to establish an Islamic authority, or emirate, over as much of the territory as you can, to spread its power in Iraq.

And then there is a third stage Zawahiri says.

> The third stage is to extend the jihad to the secular countries neighboring Iraq.

This is not me. This is not some administration spokesperson, this is Zawahiri, No. 2 in al-Qaida.

December of 2006, Zawahiri says:

> The backing of the jihad in Afghanistan and Iraq today is to back the most important battlefields in which the crusade against Islam is in progress, and the defeat of the crusaders will have a far-reaching effect on the future of the Muslim Umah.

I could go on. I will read one final one. May 2007, 2 months ago, and this is Zawahiri again in a tape.

> The critical importance of the jihad in Iraq and Afghanistan becomes clear, because the defeat of the crusaders there soon, Allah permitted, lead to the setting up of two mujahedin emirates, which will be launch pads for the liberation of the Islamic lands and the establishment of the caliphate. That is why I call on the Muslim Umah not to lag behind or tarry in supporting jihad in general and jihad in Iraq and Afghanistan in particular, in view of the pivotal importance of these two arenas.

I started this because I said that some of my colleagues offering this amendment say we are in a civil war in Iraq and we ought not to be there. There is sectarian violence. That is why we have the counterinsurgency plan, which is to try to stop the sectarian violence, and it is working so far. Surely we don't know whether it will work finally, but sectarian violence has been significantly reduced in Baghdad and now Anbar and Diyala Provinces. But the argument that this is simply a civil war is totally rejected, denied by these statements of al-Qaida's own leaders.

We are fighting al-Qaida in Iraq. You can't withdraw from Iraq and fight al-Qaida. That is whom we are fighting. Who is going to win if we pull out? Al-Qaida will and Iran will. Listen to what Zawahiri and bin Laden said they are going to do: They are going to establish the capital of the caliphate, the empire, and they are going to go out into the neighboring countries.

Incidentally, the notion that somehow we are not fighting al-Qaida in Iraq and that this is just a civil war also flies in the face of the National Intelligence Estimate on al-Qaida that was released today, which describes al-Qaida in Iraq as the most visible and capable affiliate of al-Qaida worldwide. Of note, and I quote in full:

> We assess that al-Qaeda will probably seek to leverage the context and capabilities of al-Qaeda in Iraq, its most visible and capable affiliate, and the only one that is beyond bin Laden and Zawahiri, the only local affiliate known to have expressed a desire to attack the American homeland.

So I know people laugh or jest when people say if we don't defeat them there we will be fighting them here, but this is what the National Intelligence Estimate says. We are fighting al-Qaida in Iraq, the only local affiliate of al-Qaida that has also talked about, and some have reason to believe may be acting upon, their desire to attack America here in our homeland. That is the National Intelligence Estimate.

It seems to me that it is perverse that on the same day we receive this National Intelligence Estimate about the threat posed by al-Qaida and about its direct linkage to Iraq, Zawahiri to Zarqawi, bin Laden talking about the centrality of what is happening in Iraq, that the Senate would consider voting for an amendment mandating our retreat in the face of al-Qaida from Iraq.

I ask, why is this amendment before us? One of the most commonly heard explanations for the amendment mandating the beginning of a withdrawal of American troops in 120 days, and most of them out by next April, is that an American military retreat is necessary—and I quote here one of the

sponsors of the amendment—''to prod the Iraqi Government to reach a political settlement.''

So we are going to force a retreat, probably threaten the viability of the Iraqi Government, yield the country to al-Qaida and Iranian-backed terrorists, and we are doing it to send a message to the Iraqi political leadership that they better get their act together. But the argument that our forcing a retreat of our military, our troops, will prod the Iraqi Government to reach a political settlement is pure speculation. It is amateur psychology without any evidence that I can see to support it. In fact, the expert evidence goes in the other direction. From people who follow what is happening in Iraq closely, who say that as soon—and maybe some of this is psychology, too, but to me it seems more sensible than the other argument—as soon as we begin to set a deadline date, the Iraqi political leadership is not going to suddenly come together and settle their differences, they are going to hunker down in camps and get ready for the battle of all battles, which will be a total civil war, huge ethnic slaughter I fear, probably a kind of genocide.

One of our military leaders in Iraq when I was there 5 weeks ago said to me: Senator, if your colleagues don't like what they see in Darfur today, and they should not like it, they are going to hate what they see in Iraq if the American military pulls out before the Iraqis can maintain security.

Here, too, we have a National Intelligence Estimate that directly rejects the contention that we need to force a retreat of our troops, open the country to a takeover by al-Qaida in Iraq, to convince the Iraqi Government to reach a political settlement.

There was a recent National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq. In it, the conclusion was presented that the rapid withdrawal of U.S. troops required by this amendment would, ''almost certainly have adverse effects on national reconciliation'' in Iraq.

So rather than promoting political progress, this amendment would have the exact opposite effect than its sponsors intend, and actually undermine it.

I know that cots have been brought in tonight to allow Senators to sleep during parts of the night when they are not required on the floor. I think, really, what I hope this does is wake up the Senators and wake up the American people to the threat we face; to wake them up to what our intelligence agencies are saying about Iraq, to what the stakes for us are in Iraq, for what the consequences are for us of a defeat in Iraq, for the strength of the Petraeus counteroffensive surge and how much it is achieving.

It is time for all of us to wake up to what is actually happening in Iraq before it is too late. It is time to stop dreaming that a mandated withdrawal, or whatever you call it—a redeployment is really nothing other than a mandated defeat. I suppose if you don't think that defeat in Iraq will have consequences for our future security, then I can understand that. But I, of course, profoundly disagree.

We face vicious enemies in Iraq today. We know who they are. They are al-Qaida and the Islamic Republic of Iran. Al-Qaida is fighting in Iraq because they want to bring down the Iraqi Government and they want to stop any progress toward self-government until a modern Iraq. They want the state to fail so they can establish what bin Laden, Zawahiri, and Zarqawi said clearly, a caliphate, an empire with the capital of the empire there.

What about Iran? Iran is training, funding, and arming terrorists to kill Americans in Iraq. This Senate spoke unanimously against that, presenting evidence of it last week, 97 to 0. Why does Iran do that? It wants America out of Iraq so it can dominate that country and the region.

These are enemies that cannot be negotiated with or reasoned out of existence. I am all for diplomacy with Iran. I am glad our ambassador met with their ambassador in Baghdad in May, but ultimately negotiations that have gone on with Iran, conducted by the European Governments for more than 2 years to try to convince them to stop the development of nuclear weapons, produced nothing but giving them 2 more years to go ahead with that development. These are not enemies who are interested in the political reconciliation of which the sponsors of this amendment speak.

In other words, al-Qaida and Iran are not fighting in Iraq to encourage or bring about a political reconciliation. These enemies must be confronted and defeated through force of arms. That is precisely what our brave men and women in uniform are doing today under this new counterinsurgency strategy, and they are succeeding. I ask my colleagues in this Chamber finally to listen carefully to the words of a great American soldier, Rick Lynch, commander of the Third Infantry Division now serving in Iraq. His soldiers are, today, leading the fight south of Baghdad. General Lynch reported just this past weekend that his forces were making significant gains in reclaiming areas that just a few weeks ago in Baghdad were terrorist safe havens. These are towns on the outskirts of Baghdad where al-Qaida in Iraq had terrorized the local population into submission and then set up shop, assembling the car bombs that then were used to kill hundreds of innocent people earlier this year. That is the way to try to stop these suicidal maniacs from blowing themselves up and killing a lot of Iraqis and Americans with them—which is their attempt to respond to our counteroffensive surge policy and their attempt to do something else: to influence the American public opinion to get out of Iraq.

General Lynch also stated that in his professional military judgment—this is a soldier, not a politician—the current troop surge must be maintained through early next year in order to achieve success. In his words:

> It's going to take us through the summer and fall to deny the enemy his sanctuaries and then it's going to take us through the first of the year into the spring to consolidate these gains.

Incidentally, it may be that those gains will be consolidated by next spring, and we will be able to begin to draw down some of the American forces there. But do we have the confidence to know that today, to mandate that to happen? I hope we are in a position—and I am sure General Petraeus does, and I am sure the President does—to begin to order that kind of beginning of withdrawal because the surge has succeeded, not order a withdrawal as an alternative policy to the surge.

I return to General Lynch. He warned that pulling back before the job was completed would ''create an environment where the enemy would come back in and fill the void.'' General Lynch also reported that he was ''amazed at the cooperation his troops were encountering in previously hostile areas.'' In his words:

> When we go out there the first question the Iraqis ask us is, are you staying? And the second question is, how can we help?

In other words, what General Lynch said is what they are worried about is our leaving. And our answer is: We are staying. And when we give that answer they say: How can we help?

They want a better future than al-Qaida and Iran controlling their country. General Lynch has given us a clear and compelling explanation in the direct words of a soldier about the nature of this war. In his view, the U.S. military needs the additional troops that are now in theater to prevail, and they are, as we speak, prevailing. In this regard, the choice before this Senate is a direct one. Either General Lynch is badly mistaken about the reality of this war or this amendment is badly mistaken about the reality of this war. They cannot both be right.

I go with General Lynch. He is on the ground. He has no motives other than to do what is right for his country. He has every motive to want to protect his troops. But he believes in our cause.

We have a choice to make. We can ignore the recommendations of our general in the field and withdraw in defeat. We can rationalize our action with reassuring but falsely hopeful words such as ''redeployment,'' but no matter what we say our enemy will know that America's will has been broken by the barbarity of their blood lust, the very barbarity we declare we are fighting, but from which, if this amendment ever passed, we would actually be running.

There is, of course, no guarantee that the path we are on will lead to success. There never is in war. But what General Petraeus is offering is a strong, smart, and practical strategy, informed by his experience and expertise, that carries a reasonable hope of victory

from whose jaws this amendment would snatch defeat. This amendment is a surrender to terrorism. It is a victory to al-Qaida and Iran. It is an invitation to a disaster for Iraq, the Middle East, and most directly the United States of America.

Iraq is not lost. It can be won, and if it is won we will have secured a better, brighter future for the people of that country, the hope of greater stability and opportunity and peace for the people of the region, and the hope and promise of greater security for the American people. Iraq is not lost. But if we adopt this amendment it will be; so, I fear, will so much of our hope for democracy and stability in the Middle East and for our own safety from terrorism here at home. That is why I will vote against cloture and against the Levin-Reed amendment tomorrow morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the American people's opposition to this war is not the political passion of a moment, as some have suggested. It is a majority, a growing majority, a thoughtful growing majority reflecting the will of the people of this country. We need 60 votes because of recalcitrance, because of political game playing, because too many of our colleagues are more interested in protecting the President than they are in protecting our troops. We know to get 60 votes we need 11 Republicans.

Many Republicans, a growing number of Republicans in this body, have spoken out against this war. They have decided that we need to change course in Iraq. The problem is simply this. It seems like almost every Tuesday Vice President CHENEY comes and speaks to the Republican lunch. The Republicans meeting in conference, having lunch, Vice President CHENEY pulls up, his limousine drops him off at the door of the Senate, he comes in and speaks to them or other administration officials. The arm twisting, the lobbying by the administration, is making it that much harder to change direction in this war. That is why it is so difficult to get to 60. That is why we want a vote, we want an up-or-down vote, we want a majority vote, because a majority vote reflects public sentiment, reflects what the voters said last fall, reflects the policy that the Iraq Study Group has suggested, that the military has advised the President, but the President simply dug in and did not listen.

Last November voters in my State of Ohio, from Galion to Gallipolis, and across this Nation shouted from the ballot boxes that we needed a new direction, that the Iraq war must end. They demanded that we refocus our efforts on securing our homeland so that the darkest day in our Nation's history, 9/11, is never repeated.

With Democrats in control of Congress this session we immediately, in January, began working to end the war. We immediately began to work implementing the full recommendations of the 9/11 Commission in order to make us safer, recommendations that will go a long way toward making this country safer. By working to end the war in Iraq and by passing the Commission's recommendation, we are executing a strategy to combat terrorism and to make our country safer.

Make no mistake, ending the war in Iraq itself is a counterterrorism strategy. Global terrorist attacks have increased sevenfold since we invaded Iraq—seven times, more than 700 percent. Our continued engagement in Iraq, frankly, is the best thing that ever happened to jihadist recruitment. We know America is a less safe country because of the war in Iraq. We know global terrorist attacks have increased sevenfold, seven times worldwide since the war in Iraq began.

Democrats brought to this Chamber not one piece of legislation to redeploy our troops out of Iraq in the safest, most orderly way possible, but many resolutions, many pieces of legislation. Each and every time either Republicans defeated the measure in Congress by threatening a filibuster or the President vetoed it in the White House—each and every time.

This week we find ourselves at the same impasse, the same struggle in this Chamber between a new direction and more of the same failed policies. Again, too many of my colleagues would rather protect the President of the United States than protect our soldiers and marines in Iraq and Afghanistan. More of the same means supporting the President, but it means something very different to Ohio families. It means more loved ones wounded, more loved ones killed. Mr. President, 156 people in my State have been killed in Iraq, 156 people. More than 1,100 Ohioans have been wounded. Ohio cannot afford more of the same.

Again, too many of my colleagues care more about protecting the President than they do about protecting our troops. Ohio families have had it with hollow promises by the President. From first declaring ''mission accomplished'' in 2003 to his visit last week in my home State of Ohio, in Cleveland, the President used grand pronouncements of success in an effort to buy more time, stay the course and buy more time; continue our involvement in this civil war and buy more time. Time and again those pronouncements were followed by increased violence and expanding chaos in Iraq. Time and again those pronouncements mean more names being added to the list of dead and wounded Americans. Mr. President, 3,617 Americans have died in the war in Iraq. At least 35,000 Americans have suffered serious injuries that will be with them and with us for 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 years.

Every year I see Iraq slip further and further into a civil war with our Nation's military caught in the middle. The President sent our Nation's military into a war of choice on failed intelligence and, as we know, without proper body armor. Adding insult to injury, literally just today, a USA Today article revealed that nearly 4 years later our troops are still without the lifesaving equipment they need.

I remember before the attack, before we invaded Iraq, I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I voted against this war in October of 2002. We began questioning Paul Bremer during the beginning of 2003, before the attack. Mr. Bremer was the administrator in Iraq for the U.S. Government, the Provisional Government. We continued to focus on providing the kind of body armor for our troops and Mr. Bremer said we are doing the best we can, but we have not done very well. We have a lot to do. We still attacked that country, we still sent our troops into harm's way without that body armor.

As we discuss this issue, tonight in Baghdad it is early morning. The forecast calls for a high of 104 degrees. While our solders have some protection from the extreme heat, like water, shade, and the mini air-conditioning units, they are not protected from a far deadlier force in Iraq, the improvised explosive devices or IED bombs. The USA Today article highlighted the lack of planning to protect our soldiers riding in Humvees from the impact of IED bombs. Humvees have a very low ground clearance, a little less than a foot and a half. The bottom of a humvee is flat so when it is hit by an IED blast from the bottom, troops suffer the brunt of the explosion.

The Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle, or MRAP—the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle, on the other hand, has a 3-foot clearance, and its body is V-shaped so when the explosion happens, the explosion, if you will, is dissipated and more often than not the troops are not nearly as badly injured. The soldiers are much better protected.

The few MRAPS in theater have proven their effectiveness and clearly saved lives and clearly saved many of our soldiers and marines from injury. What infuriates me and should infuriate everyone across this Nation is that the Pentagon and the administration, similarly to back in 2002 and 2003 when they failed to work hard to provide the body armor to prepare for this war, the Pentagon and the administration again did not immediately work to fix the problem of the humvee's susceptibility to IEDs; the needless loss of life from this willful ignorance to correct the glaring problem of the unprotected humvees could have been prevented, but arrogance and stubbornness from the administration kept the administration from doing the right thing.

The President, in some sense, is proud of his stubbornness. Instead he should be ashamed of it. His stubbornness has led to a failed policy in Iraq and to a failed policy on the war on

terror. The President has yet to define victory. He has yet to tell us how many years it will take to achieve whatever his definition of victory is. Will we be in Iraq for 5 more years, 10 more years, 15 years? Will hundreds more Americans die? Will thousands more of our service men and women die? Will tens of thousands die?

The President has yet to hold himself and his administration accountable for fomenting a civil war, in breeding more global terrorism. Remember, we have seen an increase in attacks of sevenfold since the time of the attack and the beginning of this war.

The path he is wed to has simultaneously increased the threat of terrorism, reduced our nation's capability to protect against it, and made us less safe. That stubbornness is not leadership. That defensiveness is not leadership. That finger-pointing from the White House, from some of my colleagues, is not leadership. And supporting the President's strategy in Iraq, rather than supporting the troops because you support the President, is not leadership.

Blocking another vote to bring our troops home, and that is exactly what they are doing tonight by their partisan antics, by their petty political games, blocking an up-or-down vote so the American people's will can be expressed, by blocking another vote to bring our troops home, is not leadership.

Lives are at stake. Our homeland security is at stake. Global security is at stake. Last week, we learned that al-Qaida is at pre-9/11 strength. That is frightening news. Of course, it is a cause for outrage because it did not have to be that way. We also learned last week that the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan is fostering the next generation of al-Qaida at an alarming rate.

What kind of signal exactly do the President and his supporters think we send by failing to secure the region where we know al-Qaida lives and trains and plans with—according to military analysts—relative freedom, the same region that served as the breeding ground for global terrorism through al-Qaida before 9/11, the same region we now know that al-Qaida trained in before the deadliest attack on our Nation's soil, the same region where Osama bin Laden, the mastermind behind 9/11, not Iraq, Osama bin Laden, the same region where he is believed to be hiding, free to plot the next attack on our beloved homeland?

Over the objection of military advisers, the 9/11 Commission, and the voice of a nation, the President, again that word ''stubbornly,'' insists on staying the course with the failed policy in Iraq. Staying the course with the President's failed policy has not just forced our Government to take our eye off the ball of terrorism, it has caused us to drop it.

Again, global terrorist attacks have increased seven times since we invaded Iraq, sevenfold since we invaded Iraq. Prior to World War II, the French built the Maginot Line. Same thought the line would prevent Germany from attacking France. History proved the French wrong. The President's strategy in Iraq is the Maginot Line of the 21st century. It imperils our Nation by mistakenly focusing our attention in the wrong direction. We have dropped the ball on capturing Osama bin Laden. We have dropped the ball on securing Afghanistan. We have dropped the ball on implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, and anyone who thinks those are not signals that al-Qaida is paying attention to is surely mistaken.

Supporting the President's policy does not just fail to effectively target terrorism, it puts the bull's-eye squarely on our Nation. Ending the war in Iraq is not just about bringing our troops home. Ending the war in Iraq is not just about ensuring veterans get the health care and the benefits they have been denied, and the Presiding Officer tonight has done perhaps more than anybody in this institution about that.

Ending the war is not just about a new direction in our foreign policy. Ending the war is not about returning our focus to where it might be if our Nation and our community, our families are to remain safe. Ending the war is about reengaging full force on the war on terror to make us safer.

I applaud my Republican friends who chose to stand up to the President. More and more of them have taken steps of bravery with every vote we bring to the floor. But it is not enough. With every lost vote, we add more lines to the list of men and women lost in Iraq.

Every lost vote we add more names to the list of wounded. With every lost vote, we empower al-Qaida. We keep hearing the same rhetoric: If we do not fight the terrorists in Iraq, we will have to fight them here. Good line but bad logic. The real truth is: If we do not fight the terrorists where they are in cells around the world, in Afghanistan, and where they really are, then we will fight them here.

In the Senate, those of us committed to ending the war of choice and securing our Nation will keep fighting. I appreciate the leadership of so many of my colleagues who have shown courageous leadership on this crisis of our generation. Our fight to end the war and refocus our efforts has just begun. We want to vote, we want a majority vote to reflect the growing, thoughtful opposition to this war. A huge majority of the American people are trying to overcome the furious lobbying effort of the President and the Vice President. Our fight to end this war has just begun. We are going to change this policy. The safety of every American depends upon it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, the war in Iraq is the greatest challenge facing our country. Unfortunately, the political debate in Washington has not been conducive to finding a solution, as political divisions have hardened during the past year.

Vitriolic rhetoric and veto threats do not help us pursue a new direction. I believe the way forward must be a bipartisan approach that puts the interests of our country ahead of political gain. Our Nation needs to forge a new bipartisan strategy that will redefine the mission and set the stage for a significant but responsible withdrawal of our troops over the next year.

Fortunately, we do not have to search far and wide to find this new policy. It is already mapped out for us in the unanimous recommendations of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group. This group was chaired by former Secretary of State James Baker and former Democratic Congressman Lee Hamilton. It has distinguished Americans from both parties who worked hard to forge a unanimous, bipartisan consensus on the road ahead in Iraq.

The Commission's recommendations chart the path forward and remain as viable today as when they were first released last December. The Iraq Study Group report lays out three core principles. First, the report calls for a fundamental change in the mission of our military forces in Iraq, away from combat operations, and instead limited to training and equipping the Iraq security forces, conducting counterterrorism operations against al-Qaida and other terrorist organizations, and securing Iraq's borders.

The Iraq Study Group set a goal of March 2008 for withdrawing those combat forces not needed for this newly defined mission and for force protection.

Shifting the mission of our troops would require the Iraqi military and police to take responsibility for security for their country. It would allow tens of thousands of our troops to start coming home, and it would demonstrate our military commitment to Iraq is neither open-ended nor unconditional.

Second, the Iraq Study Group report recommends that American support for the Iraqi Government should be conditioned on its leaders making progress in meeting specific benchmarks, including the political reforms necessary to quell sectarian violence.

I last visited Iraq in December. After I came home, I told my constituents I had concluded a new direction in Iraq was needed and it would be a mistake to send additional troops to Baghdad, to place them in the midst of a sectarian struggle. The solution was political, not military.

I told my constituents I thought we should be moving our troops out of Baghdad and instead concentrating their effort in Anbar Province, where the local population was starting to support our efforts and joining in the fight against al-Qaida. In Anbar, the violence was not, in December and is not now, primarily sectarian, as it is in

Baghdad and the belt surrounding Baghdad; instead, in Anbar Province the fight is against al-Qaida.

The newly defined mission set forth by the Iraq Study Group in December would call for us to concentrate our efforts on counterterrorism operations, securing Iraq's borders and training the Iraqi security forces. We should not be in the midst of what is indeed a civil war in Baghdad.

Last week, the President released a progress report, a report called for by legislation that I coauthored with Senators JOHN WARNER and BEN NELSON. This report verified that the Iraqis have made, unfortunately, very little progress in achieving the most important political benchmarks. This is at a time when the Iraqis have failed to adopt the essential reforms to distribute oil revenues more equitably, to reverse debaathification, and to more fully integrate the Sunni minority into governmental power structures.

It has been our troops that have paid such a heavy price. In fact, American troops suffered more casualties during the past 3 months than at any time since this war has begun. Requiring the Iraqis to make more progress on the political reforms that were part of the strategy, as the Baker-Hamilton Commission recommended, is absolutely essential, and it is in keeping with the Warner-Collins-Nelson benchmark language incorporated into the funding bill.

Third, the Iraq Study Group urges our Government to launch a new diplomatic offensive in the region. Both the international community and Iraq's neighbors are clearly not doing enough to foster its stability, and this must change. Thus, the ISG recommendations recognize that the United States has placed too much emphasis on military actions at the expense of diplomacy. Fourteen of us, eight Democrats and six Republicans, have joined together to offer the Iraq Study Group's sound and well thought out unanimous recommendations as an amendment to the pending legislation, the Defense authorization bill.

Our amendment lays the groundwork for responsible, realistic redeployment of American combat troops and emphasizes the need for more democracy. By adopting the Iraq Study Group recommendations, the Senate can finally chart a new course and move past politics to address the most critical issue facing our country.

I have to tell you I think the debate tonight in many ways has been disheartening. To see signs put up on the Senate floor saying ''Let us vote,'' when our side has not blocked a vote on the cloture motion, we have offered to do it at any point this evening. We have offered to do it earlier today. We have offered to do it tomorrow. It has been disappointing to hear rhetoric that is clearly intended to score political points, as it is disappointing to hear the President be so inflexible in his approach.

I think the Senator from Tennessee put it well earlier this evening when he called for more flexibility on the President's part and more flexibility on the part of the Democrats, particularly the leader of the Senate.

Having vote after vote, where we fail to get to the threshold of 60 votes or even 67 votes, if necessary, to override the President's veto is not getting us anywhere. We are not moving forward. We have got to put aside such a fractious political approach to such a grave crisis.

We need to work together in a bipartisan way. By adopting the Iraq Study Group recommendations, the Senate can chart a new course and move past politics. Despite the heroic efforts of our troops, who make us all so proud, the war in Iraq has been characterized by lost opportunity after lost opportunity due to the misjudgments of this administration. I hope the Senate will not lose this opportunity to change direction in a responsible bipartisan way.

In addition to the Iraq Study Group recommendation amendment, which I am proud to cosponsor, and I salute the leadership of Senator SALAZAR and Senator ALEXANDER in bringing together a new Gang of 14, to work on this proposal, there is also another bipartisan approach that Senator BEN NELSON and I have offered as an amendment to this bill.

Let me briefly explain our proposal to our colleagues. Now, some of our colleagues are looking for a middle ground. Again, in addition to the Iraq Study Group amendment, Senator NELSON and I are proposing another attempt to find a middle ground. Our proposal would require the President to immediately transition to a new strategy. This strategy is very similar to the one laid out by the Iraq Study Group. It would move us away from combat operations and instead focus our efforts on counterterrorism operations, border security, and training of Iraqi security forces.

But it requires, and here is how it differs from the Salazar-Alexander approach, which I also support, it requires the President to immediately begin transitioning to that new strategy. Not in 120 days, not next year, not after September, but immediately. Then it sets a goal that the transition period should be completed by the first quarter of next year, by March 31, 2008.

So it sets forth a mandatory requirement for the President to immediately transition to a new strategy. I think this makes a lot of sense. There are so many people in the Senate who support a new strategy. We ought to be able to get that done, and I respectfully suggest to my colleagues that the Nelson-Collins amendment would move us quickly, the most quickly toward that new strategy.

I sincerely hope tomorrow we will see the dawn of a new approach to our strategy in Iraq. I hope very much that we will see a strong vote for the proposal offered by 14 of us, led by Senator SALAZAR and Senator ALEXANDER, to adopt the unanimous bipartisan recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. Surely, if as diverse a group as James Baker, Lee Hamilton, Larry Eagleburger, Vernon Jordan, Ed Meese, Sandra Day O'Connor, Leon Panetta, William Perry, Chuck Robb, and Alan Simpson can come together in the interest of this country, study our dilemma, study the war in Iraq, and produce a report unanimously, surely we in the Senate ought to be able to put aside our partisan concerns, our political divisions, and act together in the best interests of this country.

I hope we will do so tomorrow. I also hope we might adopt the Nelson-Collins amendment which would add a little more force to the recommendations of the changed mission put forth by the Iraq Study Group.

This is our opportunity. Let us not lose this opportunity to forge a new path, a new strategy in Iraq.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LINCOLN). Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise in strong support of the Levin-Reed amendment. That is the amendment that, unlike the Iraq Study Group, has a date certain for changing and transitioning our mission and bringing our troops home. Maybe if the Senate had listened to the Iraq Study Group last year when it presented its report and had adopted it and moved in that direction, we would not be where we are today. I personally believe it is well past time to now suggest that it is appropriate to adopt their recommendations when what we need is a date certain.

We are here tonight to ask for a vote, not just any vote. We are here to ask for a fundamental American principle: a majority vote for majority rule. Not a supermajority vote of 60 votes. A majority vote for majority rule, the same principle that has stood our country over the test of time, the same principle that average Americans fully understand, the same principle that would reflect the reality of where the American public is as it relates to this critical issue. A majority vote for a majority rule. Not just any vote.

We are here tonight because the American people deserve an up-or-down vote on this important amendment that will finally bring an end to this mismanaged war.

The war in Iraq, in my mind, is the most pressing issue of our day, and the fact that the Republican leadership and those who join them will not allow the Senate to have a straight up-or-down vote, a simple majority vote, speaks of obstructionism and of hiding behind procedural roadblocks in order to avoid facing the American people who have called for a change of course in Iraq.

Those of us who voted against the war, as I did in the first place, against popular opinion of the time, have been vindicated by history. I say to my colleagues, history will judge the votes we

cast tomorrow, and I believe those who vote against a simple majority rule and changing the course will be judged harshly.

The President has lost the support of the American public and the confidence of the global community. The only support for his misguided policy in Iraq is a minority, a minority, in the Senate. That is why they are afraid of a simple up-or-down vote on this issue because given in this body a simple majority vote proposition, a majority of the Senate would vote to transition us out of Iraq and bring our men and women home. That is why they are afraid of the vote that we ask for.

Unfortunately, some—and I say ''some'' because I know some of our Republican colleagues have joined us in the past and will again—some of my Republican colleagues seem more interested in protecting the President than doing right, in my mind, by our troops. To the Republican leadership and those who support them, I say it is time to stop filibustering and time to start a vote, a simple majority vote for majority rule.

Maybe if more of the sons and daughters, husbands and wives, or sisters and brothers of Members of the Senate were in Iraq, some of my colleagues would not be so cavalier about filibustering an up-or-down, simple majority vote. If our loved ones were in Iraq, who among us would be content with the counsels of patience and delay? Who among us would be satisfied with another mission accomplished? Who among us would be satisfied with ''victory is around the next corner''? Who among us would be satisfied with benchmarks of which not one—not one—has been accomplished, and yet we somehow suggest that is progress years later?

After 4 years of a failed policy, it is time to stop hiding behind procedural hurdles and allow the Senate to cast a definitive vote about our future course in Iraq. A majority vote for majority rule.

The American people are waiting impatiently for the Senate to heed their calls and face the facts on the ground. It is time for a responsible change of course in Iraq. And that is exactly what the amendment on which we want a simple majority vote—let's see how people vote, a simple majority vote—does.

The Levin-Reed amendment says our forces should be out of Iraq by April 30 of next year, except those needed to protect U.S. personnel, to train Iraqi security forces and for counterterrorism activities.

Last week, the House of Representatives passed very similar legislation, sending a clear message that the time for change has come. The only obstacle left is for this body to act with a simple majority vote.

Now the Senate, once again, faces a critical vote on Iraq, and I point out, as I did a few days ago when we debated an amendment to take care of our troops—we hear all the time about ''support the troops.'' Yet we had to have a supermajority vote to simply permit the rotation of our troops to be able to have a year back at home for every year they served abroad, a proposition that even the Defense Department has as its goal. No, we couldn't have a simple majority vote on that issue; we had to have a 60-vote threshold. Support the troops?

The only way we could have done that was with bipartisan support, and we didn't get it. The only way we can stop this war is with bipartisan support. But so long as we keep having these 60-vote thresholds, Democrats have 51 votes in this body and that leaves us 9 votes short. The American people know that. That is why we want a simple majority vote for majority rule.

Despite overwhelming public support, the public is way ahead of this institution, the American people are way ahead of this institution, and growing support from some of our Republican colleagues, which I respect—Democrats do not have the 60 votes needed to stop a filibuster in the Senate.

I know that many more of our Republican colleagues have serious concerns about the war in Iraq. I have been reading about it. I have been reading in the local and national papers of so many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying: We have grave reservations about where the President is continuing to take us. We believe we have to have some type of change. I urge them to listen to their inner voice. I urge them to find their moral compass. I urge them to back their strong words with meaningful votes.

A vote for Levin-Reed, a simple up-or-down vote, is a vote to transition out of Iraq, a vote to change the course, a vote to end the war.

Robert Kennedy said about the war in Vietnam:

> Past error is no excuse for its own perpetuation. Tragedy is a tool for the living to gain wisdom, not a guide by which to live.

''Past error is no excuse for its own perpetuation.''

He went on to say:

> All men make mistakes, but a good man—

And I would paraphrase in today's terms, a good woman—

> yields when [they] know [their] cost is wrong, and repairs the evil. The only sin—

The only sin—

> is pride.

This is not an issue where we can afford the sin of pride to deviate us, to take us into the appropriate course, to change the course in Iraq.

The lessons of history are poignant and instructive about today's quagmire. Rather than hiding behind a shrinking minority and procedural posturing, Republicans should listen to the American people and change the course of this failed war policy. They should stand with the American people and tell the President, even though we have given him opportunities, even though previous efforts of the Senate have given him flexibility, he has outright rejected it and, so, yes, there must be a date certain, and the message to the President by this body is if you are not going to bring our troops home, then we will.

I have heard many of my colleagues claim that what is happening now on the Senate floor is nothing more than political theater. The war in Iraq is the single greatest issue before the country and before this Senate. How many lives, how much money, how much risk to our security by being bogged down in Iraq, when we have real challenges in the world such as Iran, when we have a reconstituted al-Qaida in Afghanistan, that is the real challenge. That is the real challenge, I say to my friends. This is not about political theater. If there is political theater here, it is the sad, sad plot that the Republican leadership has weaved in creating this procedural hurdle to not permit a simple majority vote for majority rule.

I heard my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, for whom I have enormous respect, lament the proceedings as partisan. I have the deepest respect for him, but I couldn't more passionately disagree with him. This isn't about partisanship. These are deeply held views of principle—principle that moves us to take these extraordinary measures so we can get a simple majority vote for majority rule. That is what we are simply seeking tonight.

So to the Republican leadership and those who support them, I say it is time to stop filibustering and time to permit a simple majority vote to allow us to change the course in Iraq.

Today we are living with the consequences of the administration's failed policy, and only a minority of the Senate wants to stay that failed course. Over 3,600 troops have been killed in Iraq since the beginning of the war, including 87 servicemembers with ties to my home State of New Jersey. April and May was the deadliest 2-month period of the war for U.S. troops, with 230 servicemembers killed.

We have now spent over $450 billion on the war in Iraq, with a burn rate of $10 billion a month. Frankly, I never believed the administration's estimates that the so-called surge would only cost $5.6 billion. We have been misled time and time again, and these new numbers only prove once again we have been misled.

Each day we read horrific stories about the violence and tragedy on the streets of Iraq. This week officials report that dozens of Shiites were massacred by Sunni extremists during an overnight raid in Diyala Province. Yesterday, suicide car bombs in Kirkuk killed more than 80 people and injured some 150 others. It was the deadliest attack the city had seen since the beginning of the war. In fact, suicide attacks have more than doubled across Iraq from 26 in January to 58 in April.

In terms of reconstruction, measurements we all previously swore ourselves to be listening to, oil production in Iraq is still lower than it was before the war, and Baghdad is getting less than 6 hours of electricity a day, significantly less than before the war.

That is why we must proceed with a vote on the Levin-Reed amendment and bring an end to our military involvement in Iraq which has cost our country so dearly in human lives and national treasure.

Even all of the military personnel tell us we cannot have a military victory in Iraq. When I listen to General Pace say we need the Iraqis to love their children more than they hate their neighbors, that is probably a powerful truism, but it does not come through the power of military might. That is about reconciliation, confidence-building measures, revenue sharing, and participation of all Iraqi society in the Government. It does not come through the barrel of a gun to have the Iraqis love their children more than they hate their enemies.

So to the Republican leadership and those who support them, it is time to stop filibustering and time to permit us a simple majority vote for majority rule.

Let me take a minute to discuss the administration's recent report on benchmarks in Iraq which President Bush is using as a justification for the United States to stay in Iraq.

Just as some were misled into the war, I think this report is misleading. I wish to make sure everyone understands exactly what it says because I have listened to the debate and, boy, has it been mischaracterized, as far as I am concerned. I am sure not intentionally because people read the document different ways. Let me tell what it clearly says to me.

The report did not say that eight of the benchmarks had been met. Instead, the report said that satisfactory progress, a very significant distinction, has been made on only 8 of 18 benchmarks in Iraq, while the rest have not even seen—not even seen—satisfactory progress. In simple terms, none of the benchmarks were met.

Let's make it clear: None of the benchmarks were met. And when this report came out, President Bush said:

> Those who believe that the battle in Iraq is lost will likely point to the unsatisfactory performance on some of the political benchmarks. Those of us who believe that the battle in Iraq can and must be won see the satisfactory performance on several of the security benchmarks as a cause for optimism.

I want to reiterate to the President the fact that none of the benchmarks were actually met. None.

Now, let me be clear. The absolute best version of the story is that the Iraqis made some progress on some of the benchmarks. That is it. But the fact is, zero out of 18 benchmarks were met, and this is after years, and this is after changing the goalposts so that we can continue to suggest that we are making progress. If we kept the goalposts where they were supposed to be, we would have an even greater rate of failure.

So I don't see any cause for optimism for this failed strategy of escalation. Frankly, I think the President's comments represent yet another example of the administration's delusion and denial.

For years, this administration has refused to face the truth about Iraq. Let's take a look at some of the benchmarks the Bush administration told us would be met.

We were told by the end of 2006 that a provincial election law would be approved and new election laws would be put in place. But that benchmark has not been met.

We were told the Iraqis would approve a law for debaathification. But that benchmark has not been met. In fact, the Iraqi Parliament is barely functioning. It is stuck in gridlock. Even worse, one of the Bush administration's best Iraqi allies, Ahmed Chalabi, has been leading the charge—this is one of the administration's best allies who has been leading the charge—to block the debaathification legislation.

We were told the Iraqis would create a law to help restrain sectarian militias. But that benchmark has not been met. In fact, the Iraqi Government hasn't disarmed the Shia militias, and the security situation on the ground continues to rage out of control. The surge hasn't staunched the violence, and civilian casualties were actually higher in June than in February when the surge began.

We were told that the Iraqis would establish a law to regulate the oil industry and share revenues in Iraqi society. But that benchmark has not been met. In fact, the oil law is stuck in parliamentary gridlock, and it is unclear whether it actually addresses even the core issues.

We were told that by March, this past March, that the Iraqi Government was supposed to hold a referendum on constitutional amendments necessary for a government of national unity to possibly exist. But that benchmark has not been met. In fact, 3 years after the United States turned over power to the Iraqi Government, the Iraqis still don't have the constitution finished.

The Bush administration seems to think that ''satisfactory progress'' has been made on performing a constitutional review committee. But in fact this committee has had to keep extending deadlines to get their work done, and it is unclear whether they will even meet the next deadline at the end of this month.

As I said before, it is time that the administration and the President finally face the real facts. And the fact is, by invading Iraq, the President took our focus away from the war in Afghanistan—the birthplace of the Taliban, the home to al-Qaida, the land of Osama bin Laden, and the place where the attacks of September 11 were planned.

Now, nearly 6 years after those terrible attacks on the United States, the most recent National Intelligence Estimate tells us that al-Qaida is operating where? In a safe zone along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. Let me repeat that. Al-Qaida is operating, according to the National Intelligence Estimate, in a safe zone along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border.

In fact, according to the New York Times:

> U.S. officials have warned publicly that a deal between the Pakistani government and tribal leaders allowed al-Qaida to plot and train more freely in parts of western Pakistan for the last 10 months.

It is clear that by shifting our efforts to Iraq, we have taken our eye off the original threat in Afghanistan. We cannot forget that our fight against terrorism started where it should have, in Afghanistan—an engagement that I supported—where it should have remained. But we have not yet been able to end the fight in Afghanistan.

Now, as I listened to the debate here today, some of our Republican colleagues are back to the same parroting of the same old refrains—it won't work—criticizing Democrats as being weak on defense. It is we who have consistently called for finishing the job we started in Afghanistan, and bringing Osama bin Laden and his followers to justice, and as far as I am concerned, to have him meet his maker. It was a Democratic Senator who offered a higher ransom on Osama bin Laden's head. It is Democrats, through the supplemental appropriations bill, who funded the resources for those men and women whom we supposedly are going to stand by so that they would have the plated jackets that they needed, and whom we sent into war without having the resources they needed, the vehicles to protect their lives as they seek to pursue their mission, the opportunity to make sure that a grateful nation says we are grateful not just on Memorial Day, marching in a parade, or on Veterans Day, going to an observance, which we should, but in how we treat those men and women in their injuries, in their disabilities, and for those who commit the ultimate sacrifice, in how we take care of their survivors. That is what Democrats did when they achieved the majority in this institution.

So that old refrain, my friends, that Democrats are weak on defense, that dog won't hunt.

I joined a rally earlier tonight outside the Capitol with Iraqi war veterans. In my mind, no one—no one—has a greater right to question their Government and to say, as they did, that it is time to change the course in Iraq and bring their fellow soldiers home, and that is what they said tonight. They hold the high ground in any debate.

Afghanistan was the right place to pursue the national security of the

United States. It was in Afghanistan that the murderers of September 11 were located. We had Osama bin Laden pinned down in the mountains of Tora Bora. But instead of having a large contingent of the best trained, most equipped, most technologically advanced military in the world go after him, we outsourced the job to the warlords. We gave them money, and they put the money in their pockets and they let bin Laden get away.

Many of us have been horrified as we have watched the resurgence of the Taliban, the new threats of al-Qaida in Afghanistan, and the increasing poppy cultivation. A few years ago, I talked about the possibility of the Iraqitization of Afghanistan, and now we see some of those fears coming true.

Just last month, Afghan security forces found a new type of sophisticated roadside bomb, one that is very similar to that being used in Iraq. Afghans, and our troops in Afghanistan, face the daily horror of roadside bombs targeting civilians or coalition forces.

The Taliban continues its battle to terrorize the Afghan people. As the New York Times article said last week:

> Shootings, beheadings, burnings, and bombings: These are the tools of intimidation used by the Taliban and others to shut down hundreds of Afghanistan's public schools. To take aim at education is to make war on the government.

Afghanistan now produces 92 percent of the world's poppy, and it has a record crop again this year. Again, according to the New York Times:

> Not so long ago, we trumpeted Afghanistan as a success, a country freed from tyranny and al-Qaeda. But as the Taliban's grip continues to tighten, threatening Afghanistan's future and the fight against terrorism, Americans and Afghans are frequently asking what went wrong.

My friends, what went wrong is that instead of finishing the mission in Afghanistan, the President took us to Iraq. Of course, we remember all the reasons why: weapons of mass destruction, uranium from Niger—this in a State of the Union speech before the entire Congress, none of it true. The battle in Afghanistan, the battle against al-Qaida, the Taliban, against terrorism is far from over. Yet the United States is still held hostage by the President's war in Iraq—a war that we were led into based on a false premise, with false promises, with no plan to win the peace and no plan to succeed.

The President is fond of evoking Franklin Roosevelt and our noble mission in World War II when he talks about Iraq. But he must have forgotten that when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt didn't run off and invade China. That would have made no sense. Just like our going to Iraq made no sense because we dropped the ball in Afghanistan. The failures in Iraq, coupled with the reinvigoration of al-Qaida in Afghanistan, underscore the fiasco of the Bush administration's decision to take its focus off Afghanistan, its disastrous war policy, and the consequences of its ''stay the course'' mentality. They took their eye off the ball and created a quagmire in Iraq.

We didn't have al-Qaida in Iraq. We now have elements of al-Qaida in Iraq, but we did not have al-Qaida in Iraq before we invaded. Now we are paying the price in the form of less security and a beefed-up terrorist network. Maybe Secretary Chertoff's infamous gut feeling about an increased terror threat was caused by knowing that Osama bin Laden and his terrorist allies are still out there plotting and planning thousands of miles away from Iraq—thousands of miles away from Iraq.

Madam President, let me conclude by saying that the President says that the only role for Congress is to provide a blank check for his failed war policy. He is so wrong. He is so wrong. Time to reread the Constitution. This body's responsibility is not to blindly sign a blank check to the President for a failed policy. We have a responsibility to the American people as fiduciaries both in terms of national treasure and lives. Most importantly, we have a responsibility to the men and women in uniform to do the right thing and stand up to the President's failed policy so that we may give them a mission worthy—worthy—of their sacrifice. We should honor the troops who continue to sacrifice and shed blood not by being silent, not by being hoarded like sheep, not by signing on to a blank check, and not by being complicit in the President's failed war.

I have heard some of our colleagues on the other side cry that we are fighting for freedom in Iraq, but here in America, here tonight, we have a tyranny of a minority in the Senate who want to use the procedures of the Senate, in my mind in a way that is totally unacceptable, to thwart the will of the majority of the Senate, and, more importantly, the majority of the American people.

We want a vote—not just any vote, a simple majority vote for majority rule. The amendment before us reflects the reality on the ground and the will of the American people. It changes the course in Iraq by setting a responsible timetable for our troops to leave. How many more lives—how many—I hope we all go home before tomorrow's vote and say to ourselves, how many more lives, how many more tens of billions of dollars, how much more chaos? We have heard about chaos. What will happen, how much more chaos can unfold than that which we see unfolding as we have 160,000 troops there?

Years from now, we will come to the same conclusion. Or we can act with courage tomorrow in a vote, a simple majority vote, and by doing so we will be in a position to meet our national security challenges and our national interests. Our brave troops have answered the call of duty. Let's now answer the call to do what is right by them.

It is clear to me that the President continues to live in a world where the reality in Iraq never collides with his fantasy of what is happening there. It is time for the President, and a minority in the Senate who support him, to give the American people a chance for a majority vote, for a majority rule. The American people have awoken way before the Senate, and they want the nightmare to end. The American people know it is time to responsibly withdraw from Iraq. The House of Representatives voted to do so, and it is time for the Senate to finally vote for a responsible withdrawal from Iraq.

And so we close again. It is time for a simple majority vote for majority rule.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 17, 2007:

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SEAN R. MULVANEY, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE JOHN MARSHALL, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT J. CONRAD, JR., OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT, VICE JAMES DIXON PHILLIPS, JR., RETIRED.

CATHARINA HAYNES, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE HAROLD R. DEMOSS, JR., RETIRED.

SHALOM D. STONE, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT, VICE SAMUEL A. ALITO, JR., ELEVATED.

JOHN DANIEL TINDER, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT, VICE DANIEL A. MANION, RETIRING.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT R. ALLARDICE, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL HERBERT J. CARLISLE, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM A. CHAMBERS, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL KATHLEEN D. CLOSE, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL CHARLES R. DAVIS, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL JACK B. EGGINTON, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID W. EIDSAUNE, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL ALFRED K. FLOWERS, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL MAURICE H. FORSYTH, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL MARKE F. GIBSON, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL PATRICK D. GILLETT, JR., 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL FRANK GORENC, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES P. HUNT, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL LARRY D. JAMES, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM N. MCCASLAND, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL KAY C. MCCLAIN, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT H. MCMAHON, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM J. REW, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL KIP L. SELF, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL LARRY O. SPENCER, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT P. STEEL, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES A. WHITMORE, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL BOBBY J. WILKES, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT M. WORLEY II, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

MAZEN ABBAS, 0000
MARIE ADAMS, 0000
SYED AHMED, 0000
EDGARDO ALICEA, 0000
MUSTAFA M. ALIKHAN, 0000
SHANE ANDERSON, 0000
TERRENCE M. ANDERSON, 0000
JARED M. ANDREWS, 0000
GREGORY K. APPLEGATE, 0000
NORRIS A. BALDWIN, 0000
BRIAN R. BARHORST, 0000
DINGANE BARUTI, 0000
ROGER BAUTISTA, 0000
RUSSELL BEAR, 0000
STEPHEN BECKWITH, 0000
JENNIFER L. BELL, 0000
JESSICA L. BELL, 0000
CHAD L. BENDER, 0000
TRISHA K. BENDER, 0000
JASON W. BENNETT, 0000

EDWARD C. BERGEN, 0000
TODD A. BERGLAND, 0000
BRYAN D. BERKEY, 0000
SHANE BEZZANT, 0000
WAYNE A. BLEVINS, JR., 0000
KIM BLUMBERG, 0000
ROBERT C. BONTREGER, 0000
MATTHEW J. BOREN, 0000
NICI E. BOTHWELL, 0000
REBECCA A. BOUCHER, 0000
DAVID M. BRENNEN, 0000
MATTHEW S. BRICE, 0000
CLARK J. BRIXEY, 0000
DAIN BROOKS, 0000
BRANDON D. BROWN, 0000
CARLA A. BROWN, 0000
JAMES M. BROWN, 0000
MICHAEL BROWN, 0000
THERON G. BRYANT, 0000
MICHAEL T. BURTIS, 0000
NYLES BURTON, 0000
JORGE L. CABRERA, 0000
FRANKLIN E. CALDERA, 0000
BRYCE E. CALVIN, 0000
SALVATORE CARBONARO, 0000
MISTY D. CARLSON, 0000
THADDEUS A. CARNINE, 0000
HOBART CARR, 0000
ALISON C. CELIS, 0000
NATHAN C. CHANDLER, 0000
CHIH C. CHANG, 0000
SUYOUNG CHANG, 0000
MELISSA CHIASSON, 0000
SANJAY CHOPRA, 0000
PAUL CHUNG, 0000
AUTUMN CLARK, 0000
FRANCIS A. CLARKSON, 0000
MARK A. CLIFFORD, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. CLINKSCALES, 0000
CLYDE C. CLYBOURN, 0000
KEVIN E. COATES, 0000
JASON COLEMAN, 0000
JACOB F. COLLEN, 0000
TROY COON, 0000
ADRIENA V. COTHRON, 0000
DAVID CRANDALL, 0000
JOHN M. CSOKMAY, 0000
DANIEL CUADRADO, 0000
MICHAEL S. CURTIS, 0000
JEAN C. DALLEYRAND, 0000
DOMINIQUE DAVENPORT, 0000
EVELYN DAVIS, 0000
BRIAN DECASTRO, 0000
PATRICK DEPENBROCK, 0000
BRIAN C. DERRICK, 0000
MARK DOANE, 0000
JUSTIN P. DODGE, 0000
FRANCISCO DOMINGUEZ, JR., 0000
STEVEN DONNELLY, 0000
SHANNON DUBLE, 0000
DAVID DURUSSEL, 0000
JEREMY M. EAGER, 0000
NICOLE M. EHRHARDT, 0000
TRACY L. EICHEL, 0000
VEGA H. ELIZONDO, 0000
DANIEL EMERSON, 0000
DAVID N. ESCOBEDO, 0000
CULPEPPER M. EVANS, 0000
PAUL M. FAESTEL, 0000
BYRON J. FALER, 0000
DEAN R. FELLABAUM, 0000
ALLEN D. FIELDS, 0000
ARTEMUS FLAGG II, 0000
ELIZABETH Y. FLANIGAN, 0000
ANDREW FONG, 0000
DAVID M. FRECCERO, 0000
EVERETT T. FULLER, 0000
WILLIAM R. FULTON, 0000
LEVI FUNCHES, 0000
DANIEL GALLAGHER, 0000
REBECCA A. GARFINKLE, 0000
BENJAMIN J. GEORGE, 0000
MARIA D. GERBER, 0000
ELIZABETH GIESE, 0000
RUSSELL GIESE, 0000
MATTHEW R. GRAFENBERG, 0000
RICHARD M. GRAVES, 0000
ANNE C. GRIEVES, 0000
ADAM GROTH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER GROVE, 0000
REY D. GUMBOC, 0000
JOHN A. GUZZO, 0000
PHILIP W. HAEDGE, 0000
AARON HANEY, 0000
MARK HARRINGTON, 0000
PENELOPE J. HARRIS, 0000
STANSIL T. HARRIS, 0000
PATRICK T. HARRISON, 0000
JOSHUA D. HARTZELL, 0000
SUSAN L. HAWLEY, 0000
BRET R. HAYMORE, 0000
ALAN F. HELMBOLD, 0000
JEFFERY M. HENDERSON, 0000
CHAD S. HENDRICKSON, 0000
PETER M. HENNING, 0000
DAVID C. HILE, 0000
LISA HILE, 0000
JONATHAN HINDMAN, 0000
SEAN J. HIPP, 0000
MICHAEL C. HJELKREM, 0000
MATTHEW H. HOEFER, 0000
ROBERT L. HORNSBY, 0000
JOHN R. HUGHES, 0000
ADAM L. HUILLET, 0000
DAVID M. HURST, 0000
FRANK P. HURST, 0000
ROBERT L. HUTTON, 0000
JENNIFER R. HYDES, 0000
GREGORY IVERSON, 0000
ROSALY W. JIRAU, 0000
GENE JOE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. JOHNSON, 0000
JEREMY N. JOHNSON, 0000
DANIEL W. KANG, 0000
YANG E. KAO, 0000
JASON KARO, 0000
DAVID S. KAUVAR, 0000
KIMBERLY C. KEHOE, 0000
OLGA KENNEDY, 0000
SAMEER D. KHATRI, 0000
STEVEN W. KHOO, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. KING, 0000
KEVIN KING, 0000
RITA L. KOESTER, 0000
DANA M. KOSMALARUNKLE, 0000
SHEPHARD KOSUT, 0000
LYNNE C. KRAMER, 0000
ANJALI N. KUNZ, 0000
JEFFREY S. KUNZ, 0000
CHRISTOPHER KWUN, 0000
BENJAMIN W. LACY, 0000
GREGORY LACY, 0000
SHAWN L. LAFERRIERE, 0000
JASON S. LANHAM, 0000
ALISON L. LATTU, 0000
MATTHEW A. LAUDIE, 0000
DAVID LAYER, 0000
DONALD LAZARUS, 0000
HAMILTON S. LE, 0000
ANDREW B. LEE, 0000
JULIE W. LEMMON, 0000
WILLIAM LEWIS, 0000
JULIA T. LIM, 0000
DEREK LISTON, 0000
HELENA A. LONGIN, 0000
EDWARD M. LOPEZ, JR., 0000
ARGELIO L. LOPEZROCA, 0000
JASON LOWE, 0000
STEVEN LUCAS, 0000
ERIK K. LUNDMARK, 0000
JONATHAN B. LUNDY, 0000
JOSEPH M. LURIA, 0000
MICHELLE L. LUTTER, 0000
STEVEN A. LYNCH, 0000
CHRISTINA J. LYONS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER V. MAANI, 0000
EDWARD MANIGAULT, 0000
RODD E. MARCUM, 0000
PETER K. MARLIN, 0000
JAMES MARTIN, 0000
ANTHONY MARTINEZ, 0000
LUIS J. MARTINEZ, 0000
DAVID A. MASNERI, 0000
SHANNON M. MASNERI, 0000
SARAH MASON, 0000
SHAILI MATTA, 0000
CHARLIE MATTESON, 0000
BRADFORD K. MATTHEWS, 0000
GABRIELLE MAYBEE, 0000
DANIRA H. MAYES, 0000
NEIL A. MCDONALD, 0000
PATRICK MCHUGH, 0000
HARKIRTIN K. MCIVER, 0000
KRISTI MCKINNEY, 0000
JENNIFER A. MCNEAR, 0000
CHRISTOPHER MCNEIL, 0000
JOHN J. MCPHERSON, 0000
GARY E. MEANS, 0000
JEFFERY C. MEINERS, 0000
MIRIAM S. MEKO, 0000
JEFFREY S. MEYER, 0000
CAELA MILLER, 0000
JOSE J. MIRANDA, 0000
MONICA MIRCHANDANI, 0000
MICHAEL A. MOAK, 0000
RUPAL M. MODY, 0000
BEEZER W. MOOLJI, 0000
RYAN T. MOORE, 0000
ANDREW R. MORGAN, 0000
GEORGE R. MOUNT, 0000
THORNTON MU, 0000
TERRY L. MUELLER, 0000
DAWN F. MUENCH, 0000
PETER D. MUENCH, 0000
JAMALAH A. MUNIR, 0000
KEITH P. MYERS, 0000
ANICETO J. NAVARRO, 0000
NAVEED A. NAZ, 0000
REMINGTON L. NEVIN, 0000
DANA R. NGUYEN, 0000
BRETT NIELSON, 0000
MATTHEW J. NIMS, 0000
NICHOLAS J. NOCE, 0000
MICHAEL NUZZO, 0000
ROBERT L. OAK, 0000
KERRY OBRIEN, 0000
JAMES O. OYEKAN, 0000
NICOLE N. PAPA, 0000
LYNN T. PARENTE, 0000
JAMES J. PARK, 0000
MICHAEL H. PARK, 0000
JEFFREY T. PARKER, 0000
JONATHAN R. PARKS, 0000
BRIAN M. PARNES, 0000
JOHN PEASE, 0000
SUZETTE W. PENG, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. PERRY, 0000
TRAVIS PFANNENSTIEL, 0000
JOHN H. PHILLIPS, JR., 0000
RYAN J. PLANK, 0000
TAYLOR POWELL, 0000
TRAN QUAN, 0000
SHANNON R. RAINEY, 0000
WILLIAM RALSTON, 0000
ERIC W. RAWIE, 0000
JEFFREY REA, 0000
WILLIAM RECUPERO, 0000
MICHAEL J. REGAL, 0000
JASON A. REGULES, 0000
LILANE REIFENBERG, 0000
JASON RIGONI, 0000
GERALD RILEY, 0000
JOHN P. RINARD, 0000
JEFFREY L. ROBERTSON, 0000
LARRY ROBINSON, 0000
NIA L. ROBINSON, 0000
MARTHA ROELLIG, 0000
AMY E. ROSS, 0000
CAROL ROWE, 0000
DAVID RUFFIN, 0000
JENNIFER R. RUSSELL, 0000
BRETT SACHSE, 0000
KIRK SAHAGIAN, 0000
DENNIS M. SARMIENTO, 0000
JERMAL SCARBROUGH, 0000
DAVID N. SCHRIER, 0000
BRIAN S. SCHULTZ, 0000
DAVID J. SCHWARTZ, 0000
JAMES T. SCHWARTZ, 0000
JASON SCISM, 0000
DEREK K. SEAQUIST, 0000
JEFF SEEBACH, 0000
ERIN SHAW, 0000
HENRY SHIH, 0000
ROBERT SHIH, 0000
RAJESH K. SHOOR, 0000
WILLIAM J. SHORT, 0000
NATHAN M. SHUMWAY, 0000
JOSEPH SHVIDLER, 0000
CARL G. SKINNER, 0000
RICHARD M. SLUSHER, 0000
MATTHEW C. SMITH, 0000
PATRICK SMOCK, 0000
MICHELE A. SOLTIS, 0000
NICOLE M. SOTO, 0000
SEAN A. SPANGLER, 0000
DARREN C. SPEARMAN, 0000
MICHAEL P. STANY, 0000
JOEL Z. STENGEL, 0000
JOSEPH STERBIS, 0000
JUSTIN J. STEWART, 0000
DARRYL D. STINSON, 0000
KATHLEEN STORNELLI, 0000
BRENDA L. STRYJEWSKI, 0000
TOIHUNTA STUBBS, 0000
MICHAEL A. STUPARICH, 0000
ALEXANDER SUTHERLAND, 0000
SCOTT SWASEY, 0000
TIMOTHY L. SWITAJ, 0000
GUY H. TAKAHASHI, 0000
CHRISTY R. TAOKA, 0000
STEVEN TAYLOR, 0000
ARTIN TERHAKOPIAN, 0000
WESLEY M. THEURER, 0000
JOHN E. THOMAS, 0000
ROY F. THOMAS, 0000
SARA B. THOMSON, 0000
JAIME L. TORRES, 0000
DAVID B. TROWBRIDGE, 0000
SE Y. UM, 0000
VAHAG VARTANIAN, 0000
GANESH R. VEERAPPAN, 0000
JOSEPH VICKARYOUS, 0000
CHARLES WAKEFIELD, 0000
KATRINA E. WALTERS, 0000
AVA B. WALTON, 0000
SCOTT M. WATERMAN, 0000
JAMES A. WATTS, 0000
LUKE WEBB, 0000
RAE A. WEBER, 0000
JOHN WIERZBICKI, 0000
MICHAEL A. WIGGINS, 0000
CASON R. WILKERSON, 0000
RAYMOND S. WILSON, 0000
BRIAN WOEBKENBERG, 0000
KATHARINE E. WOLCOTT, 0000
LIAM M. WONG, 0000
FELICIE G. WYATT, 0000
BRADLEY ZAGOL, 0000
THOMAS B. ZANDERS, 0000
JOHN K. ZAUGG, 0000
TAMATHA F. ZEMZARS, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MICHAEL J. ALLANSON, 0000
EVANGELINE F. ALLEN, 0000
PAUL M. BARFKNECHT, 0000
MARK I. BISBEE, 0000
JEFFREY W. BLEDSOE, 0000
BRADLEY D. BUCHANAN, 0000
LYNN M. CARLTON, 0000
ANN M. CASE, 0000
NOELLE COLLETTA, 0000
KIP L. COWELL, 0000
CAREY L. COX, 0000
DANIEL J. CROSBY, 0000
DAVID R. CRUMBLEY, 0000
EVE D. CURRIE, 0000
KAREN L. ECARIUS, 0000
STACIA L. FRIDLEY, 0000
JEANNETTE I. GARCIA, 0000
KATHLEEN M. GRUDZIEN, 0000
SHARI D. HULBERT, 0000
CAROL B. HURLEY, 0000
AMANDA S. JOHN, 0000

JEFFERY S. JOHNSON, 0000
RAYMOND W. JOHNSON, 0000
MICHELE A. KANE, 0000
JEANA M. KANNE, 0000
SHARI D. KENNEDY, 0000
KRISTIN L. KLIMISCH, 0000
JOSEPH V. KOSHIOL, 0000
DEBORAH A. KUMAROO, 0000
RICHARD F. KUTSCHMAN, 0000
VENNESSA LAKE, 0000
SUSANNE M. LEMAIRE, 0000
KENDRA A. T. MANNING, 0000
BRIAN L. MCCANN, 0000
WENDY M. MCCRAW, 0000
TERRY M. MCGUIRK, 0000
BLAIR T. MILES, 0000
SHIRLEY O. MOONE, 0000
JEAN M. MURRAY, 0000
ROBERT T. OBYRNE, 0000
ALDA M. OCONNOR, 0000
ROBERT D. POLLEY, JR., 0000
BENNY A. POWELL, 0000
CHERYL E. RAY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. REDDIN, 0000
MANUEL SANTIAGO, 0000
DAVID F. SARTORI, 0000
MICHAEL J. A. SERVICE, 0000
PAMELA L. STOUT, 0000
DANIEL M. SWISSHELM, 0000
PATRICIA M. TAYLOR, 0000
SUSAN M. TOYAMA, 0000
ROBERT J. TURSI, 0000
ROBINETTE L. TYLER, 0000
SUSAN A. UNION, 0000
JANINE Y. WOOD, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MARIA L. AGUAYO, 0000
ROLFE E. ASHWORTH, 0000
JEANINE M. AVANT, 0000
ALEXANDER W. BARLAS, 0000
GREGOR S. BO, 0000
CHARLES E. BOWERS, 0000
STEVEN J. BOWSER, 0000
TIM J. DEWITT, 0000
RALPH H. FIELD, 0000
DANIEL W. GRIPPO, 0000
ANDREW M. HASCALL, 0000
ERIC J. HAWN, 0000
RICHARD D. HAYES III, 0000
BRYAN E. HELLER, 0000
PATRICK A. HOCHSTEIN, 0000
MICHAEL D. KENNEY, JR., 0000
DOUGLAS W. KING, 0000
MICHAEL LEWIS, 0000
R. A. Z. LIM, 0000
SCOTT D. LOESCHKE, 0000
GILBERT B. I. MANALO, 0000
JASON T. MATHIS, 0000
JAMES G. MEYER, 0000
JAYSON D. MITCHELL, 0000
FRANCIS S. MULCAHY, 0000
JAY A. MURPHY, 0000
WILLIAM J. PIERCE, 0000
RICHARD L. PRINGLE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER H. REHKOP, 0000
TIMOTHY J. ROGERS, 0000
RUSSELL V. SEIGNIOUS, 0000
MICHAEL R. TASKER, 0000
DANIEL P. TURNER, 0000
GREGORY G. VINCI, JR., 0000
WILLIAM L. WHITMIRE, 0000
STEVEN T. ZIMMERMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ANTONY BERCHMANZ, 0000
RICHARD A. BONNETTE, 0000
ROGER L. BOUMA, 0000
DAVID O. BYNUM, 0000
KEVIN J. DEELEY, 0000
JOHN V. DICKENS III, 0000
CAMERON H. FISH, 0000
STANLEY W. FORNEA, 0000
MICHAEL W. GORE, 0000
JEROME A. HINSON, 0000
DANIEL E. MCKAY, 0000
JOEL S. MORTON, 0000
STEVEN R. MOSES, 0000
TIMOTHY J. OSWALD, 0000
TIMOTHY J. POWER, 0000
CURTIS PRICE, 0000
KIMBERLY SAWATSKY, 0000
FRANK W. SHEARIN III, 0000
JOHN M. SHIMOTSU, 0000
PATRICK W. SMITH, 0000
STEVEN C. SMITH, 0000
BRIAN J. STAMM, 0000
THOMAS R. STEWART, 0000
KEVIN J. SWEENEY, 0000
MELVIN H. UNDERWOOD, 0000
ROGER E. VANDERWERKEN, 0000
GLEN WOOD, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ERIC J. BACH, 0000
BRIAN R. BALDUS, 0000
ANTHONY A. BARGER, 0000
THOMAS P. BASTOW, 0000
WILLIE H. BEALE, 0000
TIMOTHY L. BENESH, 0000
JASON A. BRIDGES, 0000
PATRICK S. BROWN, 0000
PATRICK A. BURSON, 0000
KEVIN N. CARADONA, 0000
JOHN H. CLARK, 0000
DANIEL D. DAVIDSON, 0000
JUSTIN D. DEBORD, 0000
WALTER C. DEGRANGE, 0000
GLENN T. DIETRICK, 0000
ROY A. DRAKE, 0000
TIMOTHY P. DUDLEY, 0000
DION D. ENGLISH, 0000
MARK A. ESCOE, 0000
MARC P. GAGE, 0000
BRIAN J. GINNANE, 0000
PHILLIP A. GIST, 0000
THOMAS E. GRAEBNER, 0000
CODY L. HODGES, 0000
CHONG HUNTER, 0000
CHARLES E. HURST, 0000
JAMES P. INGRAM, 0000
DONALD A. JACKSON, 0000
STEPHEN L. JENDRYSIK, 0000
ROBERT A. KEATING, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D. LIGHT, 0000
JAMES R. MACARANAS, 0000
BRIAN J. MALLOY, 0000
EDWARD J. MCFARLAND, 0000
ERIC A. MORGAN, 0000
MICHELLE D. MORSE, 0000
WILLIAM T. MURRAY, 0000
DAVID F. MURREE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. NELSON, 0000
JAMES A. NEUMAN, 0000
FRANK E. NEVAREZ, 0000
HARRY X. NICHOLSON, 0000
MICHAEL P. OCONNELL, 0000
WILLIAM J. PARRISH, 0000
AARON D. POTTER, 0000
JEFFREY W. RAGGHIANTI, 0000
HERMAN S. ROMERO, 0000
BRIAN V. ROSA, 0000
MARK J. RUNSTROM, 0000
COLLEEN C. SALONGA, 0000
BRIAN G. SCHORN, 0000
BRETT M. SCHWARTZ, 0000
LINDA M. SPANGLER, 0000
ROGELIO L. TREVINO, 0000
BRETT A. WAGNER, 0000
JEROME R. WHITE, 0000
RICARDO WILSON, 0000
WILLIAM B. ZABICKI, JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ELIZABETH M. ADRIANO, 0000
ADDIE ALKHAS, 0000
TRACY T. ALTLAND, 0000
RANDY L. BALDWIN, 0000
SEAN P. BARBABELLA, 0000
RAYMOND R. BATZ, 0000
CHARMAGNE G. BECKETT, 0000
WILLIAM A. BECKMAN, 0000
JERRY L. BERMAN, 0000
RICHARD L. BIGGS, 0000
CHAD BRADFORD, 0000
FREDERICK R. BRANDON, 0000
ROBERT F. BROWNING, 0000
PIERRE A. BRUNEAU, 0000
RALPH E. BUTLER, 0000
MICHAEL E. CARDENAS, 0000
REBECCA S. CARLIN, 0000
HYUNMIN W. CHO, 0000
THOMAS S. CHUNG, 0000
BENJAMIN W. CILENTO, 0000
RICHARD W. CLINE, 0000
STEVEN T. COBERY, 0000
CHRISTINA J. COLLURABURKE, 0000
TERESA M. COX, 0000
DONALD S. CRAIN, 0000
WILLIAM E. CRAMER, 0000
KARA L. CRISMOND, 0000
DAVID L. CUTE, 0000
MICHAEL S. DANFORTH, 0000
KIMBERLY D. DAVIS, 0000
MICHAEL W. DELANEY, 0000
DAVID W. DURKOVICH, 0000
TIMOTHY W. DWYER, 0000
JAMES A. ELLZY, 0000
STEVEN J. ESCOBAR, 0000
DENNIS J. FAIX, 0000
JAMES M. FARMER, 0000
MICHAEL A. FAVATA, 0000
EARL A. FRANTZ, 0000
JAMES J. GEORGE, 0000
JOHN L. GRIMWOOD, 0000
HAROLD L. GROFF, 0000
FRANCIS X. HALL, 0000
TIMOTHY R. HASTINGS, 0000
NEAL A. HEIMER, 0000
REID D. HOLTZCLAW, 0000
SUEZANE L. HOLTZCLAW, 0000
CHEUK Y. HONG, 0000
DENNIS W. JOHNSON, 0000
JOHN J. KEELING, 0000
DERMOT N. KILLIAN, 0000
SHAWN D. KOSNIK, 0000
SHYAM KRISHNAN, 0000
DAVID C. KRULAK, 0000
LAURENCE J. KUHN, 0000
LEONARD J. KUSKOWSKI, 0000
CHRISTOPHER B. LANDES, 0000
MICHAEL D. LAPPI, 0000
JAMES V. LAWLER, 0000
WILLIAM T. LENNARD, 0000
WILLIAM D. LEONARD, 0000
PETER M. LUNDBLAD, 0000
JOHN A. LYNOTT, 0000
KEVAN E. MANN, 0000
JOSEPH J. MARTIN, 0000
PATRICK M. MCELDREW, 0000
NICOLE K. MCINTYRE, 0000
JOSEPH R. MCPHEE IV, 0000
GEORGE W. MIDDLETON, 0000
ERICA K. MILLER, 0000
CATHLEEN S. MILLS, 0000
JOHN E. MOORE, 0000
THOMAS W. MOORE, 0000
TIFFANY S. NELSON, 0000
MARK M. NGUYEN, 0000
JAMES P. OBERMAN, 0000
TIMOTHY W. OHARA, 0000
ANGELIQUE OLSZOWKA, 0000
JAMES R. PATE, 0000
LISA A. PEARSE, 0000
KATHARINA PELLEGRIN, 0000
CHRISTIAN T. PETERSEN, 0000
DOUGLAS E. PETERSON, 0000
TIMOTHY J. PHILLIPS, 0000
MICHAEL E. PICIO, 0000
RALPH H. PICKARD, 0000
EMERICH D. PIEDAD, 0000
BRYN J. H. REINA, 0000
TED E. ROBERTSON, 0000
NANETTE L. ROLLENE, 0000
SARA L. SALTZSTEIN, 0000
TAMARA K. SCALISE, 0000
BRIAN R. SCHNELL, 0000
VERNON F. SECHRIEST, 0000
DAVID P. SHAPIRO, 0000
DONALD W. SHENENBERGER, 0000
STUART H. SHIPPEY III, 0000
ANTHONY N. SILVETTI, 0000
JOHN C. SIMS, 0000
CRAIG R. SPENCER, 0000
JOSEPH J. SPOSATO, 0000
MICHAEL S. SULLIVAN, 0000
MICHAEL G. SWANSON, 0000
SALLY G. TAMAYO, 0000
AARON M. TAYLOR, 0000
KRISTOPHER P. THIBODEAU, 0000
GREGORY T. THIER, 0000
DAVID C. THUT, 0000
JEFFREY A. TJADEN, 0000
JEFFREY M. TOMLIN, 0000
KEITH K. VAUX, 0000
HARVEY B. WILDS, 0000
MICHAEL D. WITTENBERGER, 0000
LAWRENCE J. YENNI, 0000
FREDERICK E. YEO, 0000
SCOT A. YOUNGBLOOD, 0000

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings.

Today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESPONSIBLE REDEPLOYMENT FROM IRAQ ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2007

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, once again the new majority in the U.S. House of Representatives is calling on President Bush to change direction in Iraq and take the steps necessary to bring America's servicemen and women home from an Iraqi civil war we should not be fighting. The Responsible Redeployment from Iraq Act, H.R. 2956, is legislation that directs the President to commence redeploying U.S. troops with April 1, 2008, as a target date for completion of the transition. I strongly support H.R. 2956 and would like to commend the efforts of Chairman SKELTON and his staff for the leadership to bring this bill before the House.

It is clear that the majority of Members of this House, the overwhelming majority of Americans, and most of the world recognize that the on-going war in Iraq has been a disaster for the U.S., for the people of Iraq, and for security and stability in the entire Middle East. It is time for an exit strategy that allows U.S. troops to come home while transferring responsibility to Iraqi political leaders and their security forces to ensure the future of their country.

After 52 months—more than 4 years—of American troops in Iraq there can be no doubt about the commitment and sacrifice these brave men and women have offered our Nation. While their comrades continue to fight in Iraq, some 2,600 Minnesota National Guardsmen and women are now returning home after 15 months of service. They are heroes who have done the job they have been asked to do by their commanders. Our Nation is proud of these Minnesota troops and we are also proud of their families who sacrificed as well.

Unfortunately, while U.S. troops fight for Iraq's future there is a tremendous failure on the part of Iraq's political leadership to make the sacrifices necessary to create a political environment that could lead to stability and security. Sectarian tensions are too often promoted by political leaders which directly or indirectly lead to violence and killings of innocent civilians, far too frequently in the most brutal fashion. If political leadership and institution building on the part of the Iraqis are the essential components that will create an environment in which easing of sectarian tensions and stability can take hold, then the Bush administration has failed completely.

In Iraq, car bombings, suicide bombers, roadside bombs, sectarian executions, kidnappings and assassinations are all daily events that I regret to say are now normal for those of us who read any American newspaper. From the safety of thousands of miles away this is a tragedy for the Iraqi people and for those coalition forces trying to achieve their mission. For many of us it is also a tragedy because the war was manufactured by an American President who now appears to be completely out of touch with the dimension of the disaster he has created. Rather than rationally disengaging from the escalating violence inside Iraq, President Bush has escalated the U.S. presence with a "surge" strategy that in turn has cost more American lives.

Adding 30,000 U.S. troops since the beginning of 2007 has done nothing to change the fact that it is Iraqis who need to take control of their own country and confront the. forces, including terrorists, militias, sectarian police, soldiers and politicians, that continue to eviscerate, day-by-day, their own nation. If President Bush added 100,000 more U.S. troops I am unconvinced that any change in the current situation would take place. Only a political solution can unify Iraqis in a manner that will allow them to focus their energy and resources on building a nation and ending the bloodshed.

The President's refusal to understand that Iraq is now damaging America—our military, our standing in the world, and the lost opportunities at home—is alarming. The fact is the Bush administration's actions in Iraq have resulted in far more harm, cost and pain to the U.S. than Saddam's regime ever could have inflicted on our Nation. Yet, the President's defenders in Congress and in the media continue to urge a "stay the course" strategy while invoking the name of Gen. David Petraeus as if he can singlehandedly erase four years of mistakes and ineptitude. General Petraeus is an excellent soldier and a talented leader, but he is not a miracle worker.

The time has come to for a rational, strategic plan to bring our troops home from Iraq and H.R. 2956 provides sound direction. The U.S. has interests in Iraq and the region which we must defend using our diplomatic, economic and military resources. We need to engage to a much greater extent with neighboring countries and the global powers to affect change inside Iraq. All this can be done while the 160,000 U.S. troops in Iraq are being withdrawn.

While I will vote for H.R. 2956 and I expect it to pass this House) I am also under no illusion that my Republican colleagues will vote against putting in place a strategy to bring our troops home. I have no doubt that President Bush would veto this legislation if it were to pass the Senate and be sent to the White House. Like the situation in Iraq, change cannot occur with regard to our policy in Iraq unless a political solution can be achieved in Congress with a veto proof majority of Members of the House and Senate. The American people must use their voice and put the pressure on House and Senate Republicans to support commonsense, responsible legislation, like H.R. 2956, which will put America's interests ahead of the President's hopelessly uncompromising commitment to a war without end in Iraq.

Finally, I want to commend Speaker Pelosi for her tireless leadership and commitment to ending the war in Iraq while always working to advance America's interests. The Speaker knows our Nation's security is paramount and the policies of the current Administration have put America at risk. Her continued leadership will ultimately result in Americans coming home safer and sooner from Iraq.

IN WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT OF POLAND TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to welcome President Lech Kaczynski of Poland to our nation's capital. After taking office in December of 2005, President Kaczynski has strengthened Poland's already close ties with the United States.

Under the leadership of President Kaczynski, Poland has been one of the United States closest allies in strengthening democracy in Europe. Poland is a partner in the war against terrorism and provides support and stability to American efforts throughout the world.

President Kaczynski is scheduled to meet with President Bush today, and both presidents plan to discuss the possible inclusion of Poland in the Visa Waiver Program. As I have said before, Poland is a first class friend of the United States, and should not be treated like a second-class citizen.

I look forward to working with President Kaczynski and President Bush in modernizing the Visa Waiver Program to provide our closest international partners the opportunity to travel to the United States while simultaneously strengthening our security.

President Kaczynski's leadership has been vital to continuing the dialogue between Poland and the United States on important issues ranging from the war on terror to economic issues, and I look forward to continuing to work with his government.

On behalf of the more than 110,000 residents of the Fifth Congressional District of Polish decent, I welcome President Kaczynski to Washington and thank him for his fine work and commitment to democracy.

HONORING GENERAL MARIANO GUADALUPE VALLEJO

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 200th anniversary of the birth of General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo. General Vallejo was instrumental in the creation of a free California and

the drafting of the State constitution, and was the first great legislator from northern California.

Mariano Vallejo was born on July 4, 1807 in Monterey, then the capital of Spanish California. After Mexico gained independence from Spain in 1821, Vallejo joined the newly formed Mexican Army in California, where he served for the remainder of Mexican rule. As a successful commander, Vallejo was given command of the Presidio in San Francisco, where he was charged with defending northern California and pushing back against Russian advances along the coast. He founded a presidio in Sonoma as a military outpost to extend Mexican influence into the northern Bay Area. He also began construction of a casa grande in the town square, part of which remains today.

In 1835, Vallejo was drawn into politics when his nephew Juan Alvarado, falsely claiming to act on orders from Vallejo, precipitated an uprising against the unpopular Mexican Governor. The uprising was successful, and Vallejo traveled to Monterey where he was appointed Comandante General of the Free State of Alta California. Subsequent recognition by the Federal Government in Mexico City confirmed this, and General Vallejo remained in charge of California's military.

As the military commander of northern California, General Vallejo witnessed firsthand the incompetence of Mexican Federal rule, and he became convinced of the need to remove California from Mexico. His interest in promoting the settlement and development of northern California made him reluctant to enforce the Mexican laws dealing with foreigners moving into the area, and he often issued passports on the spot to new groups of settlers crossing into California. In 1842 General Vallejo was removed from military command in California and replaced by Manuel Micheltorena, who presided over the decline of order in the State, ultimately leading to revolt against Mexican rule.

On June 14, 1846, the Bear Flag Revolt began outside General Vallejo's casa grande in Sonoma, and he was taken prisoner and removed to Sutter's Fort in the Central Valley. He remained there for more than a month, and upon agreeing not to participate in the war with Mexico, he was allowed to return home. In early 1849 during American military rule, spurred by increasing chaos from the Gold Rush and the sudden massive flow of people into the State, Vallejo joined other residents of the area to form a council for governing northern California. This quickly translated into election to represent the Sonoma area at the State constitutional convention in Monterey.

At the State convention, Vallejo pressed the other delegates on a number of key issues, including banning slavery in the State, which succeeded, and voting rights for Native Americans who owned property, which failed. He also gave generously from his personal wealth to offer support for the establishment of a legal commission. Finally, he was part of the delegation that brought the proposed constitution to the military governor, Bennett Riley, for final approval. After voters in California approved the new constitution and California was admitted to the United States as the 31st State, Vallejo was elected as a State senator.

During his time in the State Senate, Mariano Vallejo led a number of initiatives to continue the work he had done at the State's constitutional convention. He sponsored an act which would have allowed better government for the Native American population, and he spoke strongly against a measure which would have excluded free Blacks from the State. He also led the effort to establish a tax to fund free schooling in California. Finally, he donated land for the State Capital to be established at the north end of the Bay Area. This area, now the city of Vallejo, was the site of the capitol from 1852–53, but was moved thereafter to Sacramento.

After his departure from public life, Vallejo oversaw his remaining business ventures even as his lands were eaten away by claims from new settlers moving into the State. Later in his life he finally had the opportunity to travel to the eastern United States, where he saw Washington, DC, Philadelphia, and Boston, satisfying a life-long desire to witness the birthplace of American democracy. His final contribution to California was a vast set of collected writings on Native Americans and californios, which is now in the collections of the University of California.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize the remarkable life of General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, and acknowledge the contributions he made to the establishment of statehood for California.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Food and Drug Administration—FDA Amendments Act. This bipartisan legislation is an important step toward ensuring that the FDA has the authority and the resources it needs to protect the health and safety of American families.

Recent highly publicized tragic events linked to prescription drugs, such as Vioxx, have made clear the importance of the mission of the FDA and the improvements necessary to ensure its effectiveness. This bill strengthens the FDA's oversight of drug safety by establishing a new program within the FDA to monitor the safety of drugs. Under this legislation, the FDA will be able to examine drug safety even after a drug has been approved and is on the market. H.R. 2900 also increases penalties for companies that violate safety standards.

To regain the public's trust, the FDA's advisory committees must be medically qualified, independent, and acting on behalf of the health and safety of the American people. This is why it is important that the FDA Amendments Act addresses concerns about the potential for conflict of interest because members of FDA advisory committees are frequently involved in the drug and device industry. This bill requires each member of an advisory committee to disclose financial interests to the Secretary of Health and Human Services prior to a meeting on a particular matter. It also requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit reports to Congress on the membership of FDA advisory committees.

In order to increase transparency and accountability, this legislation requires that all drugs, devices, and biologics be included in a clinical trials registry and in a results database. All registry data on the safety and effectiveness of drugs and devices will be posted on an Internet site accessible to the public.

Additionally, H.R. 2900 reauthorizes through 2012 both the Prescription Drug User Fee Act—PDUFA and the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act—MDUFMA. These programs are essential in expediting FDA's review of new drug and medical device application and help avoid backlogs, which negatively impact both patients and manufacturers. This bill also reauthorizes the Pediatric Research Equity Act to encourage drug manufacturers to develop products to meet the specific and unique needs of children.

I am disappointed that this bill was not able to address direct-to-consumer—DTC—advertising of prescription drugs. Studies have shown that spending on DTC advertising from pharmaceutical companies has tripled in recent years and plays a role in the unsustainably increasing cost of health care. DTC advertising has also changed the doctor-patient relationship, with an increased number of patients requesting a specific drug or treatment, even in cases where a less expensive or different medication would be appropriate. H.R. 2900 is a good step forward, but I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address DTC advertising of medications.

The safety of the drugs and devices on which so many Americans rely must be a priority for Congress. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 2900.

CONDEMNING THE DECISION BY THE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE UNION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM TO SUPPORT A BOYCOTT OF ISRAELI ACADEMIA

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker. I rise in support of H. Res. 467, condemning the decision by the University and College Union of the United Kingdom to support a boycott of Israeli academia. It appears that this boycott reflects the views of only a small minority of this esteemed union. This small minority is tarnishing the reputation of a union whose membership includes professors of some of the most historic and enlightened academic institutions in the world. This boycott unfairly targets Israeli academics; it is both biased and destructive and should be opposed.

Academic and cultural exchange is a critical bridge between societies and cultures that have no other means of interacting with each other. Free exchange of ideas has been shown to be a very positive force in bringing people together to overcome their differences. Universities should not be conduits for espousing ethnically, religiously, or racially biased political ideologies. Throughout history universities have been bastions of progressive thinking and cross cultural collaboration and they should remain unfettered by such base and thoughtless ideas as bigotry.

I would like to join with others to support this resolution urging government and educators throughout the world to reaffirm the importance of academic freedom and open dialogue and to condemn measures that would prevent the sharing and exchange of knowledge.

COLLEGE COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, much of the $18 billion in new spending in the College Cost Reduction Act doesn't reduce the cost of college, but instead consists of new entitlements targeted at people who aren't even students. The bill cuts loan interest rates for those who have graduated from college—to the tune of $6.2 billion. This is less than the amount the bill allocates towards Pell Grants—a form of aid that actually goes to students.

With so many new entitlements in this bill, I am concerned about the direction we are headed. Most of these new entitlements are given to institutions and to college graduates. The bill creates new TEACH Grants at a cost to taxpayers of $375 million. This new entitlement gives grants to colleges and universities. It doesn't cut the cost of college for students—instead it moves towards creating a system that discourages personal responsibility and has no congressional accountability.

For instance, this bill expands a government program to repay the education loans of public sector employees. Public sector jobs include those in emergency management, government, public safety, law enforcement, public health, education, public social work, and public interest legal work. The current program repays loans remaining after 25 years of payment, but the expanded program grants loan forgiveness after 10 years of repayment, dramatically decreasing borrowers' incentive to pay off their loans.

Take for example a college graduate working in the public sector and making $35,000 a year. If he or she has $20,000 in debt upon graduation, this debt would be paid off within 25 years and the Federal Government would not have to pay off any remaining balance. But under the new terms the federal loan forgiveness comes at 10 years, which in this case means a payoff of more than $10,000.

This is a new $10,000 entitlement that creates incentives which directly discourage people in public service jobs from investing their own money in college debt. Why would someone pay off his debt at a rate any faster than the absolute minimum if he or she knows that in 10 years the Federal Government will come along and erase the remaining balance?

I want Americans to have access to education, but I don't want this access to come at the cost of a new entitlement mentality and increased dependence on the Federal Government for meeting the cost of education. At a time when we face massive increases in the cost of entitlement programs, I question the responsibility of constructing a whole new set of entitlements that will saddle future generations with new layers of government spending and the higher taxes needed to fund these entitlements.

Education is important for the success of this nation, but giving entitlements to institutions and college graduates is not the way to lower the cost of college. In fact, heaping helpings of new entitlements will do much to undermine our national success as we face an impending entitlement crisis in the coming decades.

SCENARIO 1: INCOME-CONTINGENT REPAYMENT FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES UNDER H.R. 2669, THE COLLEGE COST REDUCTION ACT (10 YEAR PERIOD)

REPAYMENT PLAN FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Secretary shall forgive the balance due on any loan for a borrower who makes 120 payments (monthly payments over a ten year period) on such loan pursuant to income-contigent repayment. And who is employed, and was employed for the 10-year period in which the borrower made the 120 payments, in a public sector job. This includes full-time jobs in emergency management, government, public safety, law enforcement, public health, education (including early childhood education), social work in a public child or family service agency, or public interest legal services (including prosecution or public defense).

Loan amount	AGI	Borrower payments (over 10 year period)	Forgiveness [1] (after the 10 years)
$20,000	$35,000	$20,887 ($174 monthly, 5.9%)	$10,026 ($30,913 total)
20,000	50,000	24,426 ($204 monthly, 4.9%)	5,183 ($29,609 total)
20,000	65,000	26,140 ($218 monthly, 4.0%)	2,838 (28,978 total)
50,000	35,000	28,700 ($239 monthly, 8.2%)	57,138 (85,838 total)
50,000	50,000	58,700 ($489 monthly, 11.7%)	16,194 ($74,894 total)
50,000	65,000	$65,350 ($545 monthly, 10.0%)	7,093 (72,443 total)

SCENARIO 2: UNDER CURRENT LAW (25 YEAR PERIOD)

Loan amount	AGI	Borrower payments (over 25 year period)	Forgiveness [1] (after the 25 years)
$20,000	$35,000	$33,433 ($111 monthly, 3.8%) [12,546 more than 10 yr]	$0 ($33,433 total)
20,000	50,000	30,230 ($100 monthly, 2.4%) [5,804 more than 10 yr]	0 ($30,230 total)
20,000	65,000	29,198 ($97 monthly, 1.8%) [3,058 more than 10 yr]	0 ($29,198 total)
50,000	35,000	71,751 ($239 monthly, 8.2%) [43,051 more than 10 yr]	70,188 ($141,939 total)
50,000	50,000	77,263 ($257 monthly, 6.2%) [18,563 more than 10 yr]	0 ($77,263 total)
50,000	65,000	72,996 ($243 monthly, 4.5%) [9,646 more than 10 yr]	0 ($72,996 total)

[1] Covers interest incurred, no cap on forgiveness (however, there if a threshold where you would be able to pay off your loan during the 10 year period and the forgiveness would not apply)

NATIONAL HOMELESS YOUTH AWARENESS MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 527 to recognize the month of November as "National Homeless Youth Awareness Month."

Addressing youth homelessness needs to be a priority for Congress. As many as 1.6 million youth in our country experience homelessness each year, and in my home State of Minnesota, each night, 500 to 600 people under the age of 18 are unaccompanied and homeless. Many times these young people have been mistreated or abused, and without a permanent home, they face increased vulnerability to mental illness, drug use, and sexual abuse.

Establishing a National Homeless Youth Awareness Month is an important step toward bringing awareness to this serious problem and highlighting the work that is being done to address it.

I commend and will continue working with the organizations in the St. Paul/Minneapolis area that are dedicated to reducing and eliminating youth homelessness. For example, the Lutheran Social Service Rezek House is a Transitional Living Program, TLP, providing youth with a safe place to live for up to 2 years while they stabilize and learn the critical life skills they need to support themselves. Additionally, SafeZone is an organization helping low-income, runaway, and homeless youth to meet their basic needs by providing them with food, clothing, HIV testing, and referrals to safe housing. It also offers tutoring, independent living skills training, and a support group for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender, GLBT, youth, who are disproportionately represented among homeless youth.

Also, because our communities and our youth are diverse and have culturally specific needs, Ain Dah Yung, which means "our home" in the Ojibwe language, supplies a safe, culturally-relevant space for American Indian youth in the Twin Cities. Providing services for approximately 500 youth and families, services available through Ain Dah Yung include emergency shelter, crisis intervention, counseling, case management, and medical care.

Ensuring that all young people have access to safe, supportive housing is essential. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of establishing November as "National Homeless Youth Awareness Month."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 625, 626, 627, 628, and 629. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 625, "no" on rollcall vote 626, "no" on rollcall vote 627, "no" on rollcall vote 628, and "yea" on rollcall vote 629.

A TRIBUTE TO GILDA BOJORQUEZ-GJURICH

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding

member of the Los Angeles-area business and civic community and a woman of true distinction, Gilda Bojorquez-Gjurich.

Raised in east Los Angeles, Gilda graduated from Garfield High School and Woodbury University in Burbank, where she majored in accounting. Following graduation, she put her education to work, pursuing a career as a general contractor and becoming a partner in an Alhambra-based construction firm. It was a successful and top-rated venture, reflecting her keen business sense and her ability to break through the glass ceiling as a woman in the construction industry.

Complementing her success in the business community, Gilda has spent decades making extensive civic contributions, serving on the board of directors for various nonprofit organizations and working to improve the lives of those less fortunate in the greater Los Angeles community.

For many years, Gilda has been a key member of Las Madrinas, an informal group of dedicated advocates mentoring the young women at Ramona Continuation High School in east Los Angeles. She has provided financial resources, and recruited volunteers and role models to help inspire and guide these young women working to turn their lives around in the school's alternative learning environment.

In 1989 Gilda became a founding member of Hispanas Organized for Political Equality, HOPE, and she continues to play a dynamic and influential role in the organization. Over the past two decades, HOPE has become a vibrant nonprofit, nonpartisan organization committed to ensuring political and economic parity for Latinas through leadership, advocacy, and education.

In 1991 Gilda cofounded HOPE's annual symposium entitled, A Proud Past . . . A Powerful Tomorrow. To date, the symposium has welcomed more than 3,000 Latinas who have come together to learn about issues important to our community. Gilda was also instrumental in getting local, county, and State officials to declare the annual symposium date as Latina History Day, celebrated on the second Friday in March to commemorate the historic achievements of Latinas.

Gilda was also pivotal in the growth and success of the Mexican American Opportunity Foundation, established in 1963 to serve disadvantaged individuals and families in the Los Angeles area. She was chair of the foundation's National Hispanic Women's Conference, and is credited with helping the group become a multi-million dollar organization that serves more than 100,000 low-to-moderate income Latinos throughout seven counties in California providing high quality social services and programs to those communities where need is the greatest. Gilda continues to serve on the board of directors for the organization.

While her advocacy on behalf of Hispanics has made her a loved and well known figure throughout Los Angeles, Gilda has also served with distinction and earned recognition at the State and national level. Over the years, she has served three Presidents in appointed positions, including her appointments to the Commission on International Women's Year, the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, and as an emissary to evaluate the revolution in Nicaragua. California Governor Gray Davis presented her with a commendation for exemplary community service in recognition of her years of service on behalf of her fellow Angelenos.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Gilda as she celebrates her 80th year and a lifetime of commitment to the economic empowerment of Los Angeles communities and Latinas across the Nation. Gilda exemplifies what it is to be a role model—not just for Latinas, but for all Americans. Latino families in Los Angeles, the State and the Nation are truly fortunate to have such a devoted advocate, and I am equally blessed by her friendship that I look forward to cherishing for many years to come.

COLLEGE COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the College Cost Reduction Act and congratulate Speaker PELOSI and Chairman MILLER for keeping our promise to students and their families by bringing this legislation to the floor.

H.R. 2669 is the largest investment in higher education since the G.I. Bill. Currently, 200,000 potential students do not attend college because of the cost. Many more are unable to attend a four-year college and millions more graduate with an unsustainable level of debt. Democrats have made access to higher education a priority because it is a critical investment in the future of students and families, and because we recognize that our economy and our global competitiveness depend on this country maintaining a highly skilled workforce.

In Minnesota, tuition at public universities has increased 57 percent since 2000. However, incomes for middle class families have not kept up with this growth. H.R. 2669 makes several important changes to make sure that students are not priced out of higher education. Every qualified student who wants to attend college should have that opportunity. And importantly, with this legislation we are able to do so without increasing the national debt burden for the students we are helping today.

The College Cost Reduction Act will raise the maximum Pell Grant scholarship by $500. Along with the work of the Appropriations Committee this year, the maximum grant award will reach $5,100 by 2011. This is a critical increase for students after several years of this grant level remaining frozen at $4,050 while tuition costs soared.

H.R. 2669 cuts interest rates on student loans in half which will reduce debt for millions of student borrowers. The average student savings will be $4,400 over the life of the loan. The bill also increases Federal loan limits, reducing the need for the more-expensive private loans, and requires that student loan payments are manageable for borrowers by ensuring that no one pays more than 15 percent of their discretionary income in loan repayments.

H.R. 2669 recognizes that the salaries for some of the most important jobs in our communities—teachers, first responders, early childhood educators, law enforcement officers and others—do not always match the value of their work. This bill provides loan forgiveness and some upfront tuition assistance for students interested in a career in public service.

By reducing very generous lender subsidies, this bill gives priority to students over profits without creating an undue burden for lenders. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this critical legislation.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2007

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 556. As I have previously stated on this subject, more foreign investment in America, rather than less, is good for the country. But I share the belief we must have a robust review process to screen the few investments that threaten our security. The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States—CFIUS—was established to ensure such transactions that require greater scrutiny are evaluated in light of these concerns. I believe it is our responsibility to make sure the review process is working as intended and make changes where appropriate to enhance this process.

There is no denying the benefits of foreign investment. Our culture of innovation and risk taking has positioned many of our industries at the forefront of global innovation. Foreign investors recognize potential in U.S. companies and risk their capital on companies because our country welcomes foreign investment. When domestic investment bypasses U.S.-based companies, we should be grateful the gap is often filled by foreign investment. The money provided by foreign investors creates jobs, growth and opportunity here at home, and we will only benefit by encouraging more investment. Shutting off foreign investment will hurt us more than it helps us.

But we must be sure that the need to attract investments is balanced with our obligation to ensure they will not pose a danger or national security threat to our Nation. The foreign investment review process is not new, but the highly publicized proposed transactions involving CNOOC and Dubai Ports last year highlighted to Congress, and the public, a process in dire need of review. Many observed this process by which our government sorts out good investment from bad can be rather opaque. Congress and the relevant Committees—including the Energy and Commerce Committee, which has original jurisdiction dating back to the Exon-Florio Amendment—need to be aware of the criteria used to evaluate the transactions and which transactions should be subject to more rigorous review.

Last Congress we acted on the need to clarify the review process and improve transparency. Through the Congressional process, the House passed legislation, but the Senate did not act. I am pleased the Senate has acted this Congress and we will pass this legislation to become law, but I am disappointed in several changes made to the original House-passed version.

Regardless of the imperfections, this will be an improvement over current law. The legislation will provide consistent criteria with appropriate discretion for foreign investment reviews. The triggers for mandatory reviews will also improve the process without impairing our ability to attract significant and needed foreign investment. The legislation also expands the membership of the review board and will now include additional expertise, including the Secretary of Energy, which can only benefit the review process.

Finally, I am pleased the reporting requirements will provide meaningful information to Congress. More robust information will provide a better understanding of the transactions and the criteria CFIUS evaluated to reach their decisions.

I support the legislation because these changes collectively improve the process for foreign investment reviews and increase the transparency of the process.

STATEMENT BY DR. NORMAN E. BORLAUG

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

HON. LEONARD L. BOSWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, Mr. BOSWELL and I would like to submit the following statement from Dr. Norman E. Borlaug for the Congressional Record.

NORMAN E. BORLAUG: STATEMENT ON THE OCCASION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL CEREMONY, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, JULY 17, 2007

It is a great honor to be awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, in recognition of my work to feed a hungry world. I thank members of Congress for giving me an opportunity to comment on the challenges and complexities of feeding a world of 10 billion people who I expect will be living on the planet Earth sometime this century.

When I was born—in 1914—there were only 1.6 billion people on Earth. Today, we are 6.5 billion and growing by 80 million per year. The task of feeding this growing population has been made more complex, since agriculture is now being asked not only to produce food, feed and fiber, but also raw materials for bio-fuels. Thus, there is no room for complacency for those of us working on the food front.

I am now in my 63rd year of continuous involvement in agricultural research and production in low-income, food-deficit developing countries. I have worked with many scientists, political leaders, and farmers to transform food production systems. Any achievements I have made have been possible through my participation in this army of hunger fighters. There are too many to name, but you know who you are. I thank you for your dedication and assistance all of these years. I also thank my family, and my late wife Margaret, for the understanding and unselfish support you have given me.

The Green Revolution was a great historic success. In 1960, perhaps 60 percent of the world's people felt hunger during some portion of the year. By the year 2000, the proportion of hungry in the world had dropped to 14 percent of the total population. Still, this figure translated to 850 million men, women and children who lacked sufficient calories and protein to grow strong and healthy bodies. Thus, despite the successes of the Green Revolution, the battle to ensure food security for hundreds of millions of miserably poor people is far from won.

THE GREEN REVOLUTION

The breakthroughs in wheat and rice production in Asia in the mid-1960s, which came to be known as the Green Revolution, symbolized the beginning of a process of using agricultural science to develop modem techniques for the Third World. It began in Mexico with the ''quiet'' wheat revolution in the late 1950s. During the 1960s and 1970s, India, Pakistan, and the Philippines received world attention for their agricultural progress. In the 1980s and 1990s, China, home to one fifth of the world's people, has been the greatest success story. China today is the world's biggest food producer and its crop yields are approaching those of the United States with every successive year. However, it is almost certain, that China and India—home to one third of the world's people—will become the largest agricultural importers in the coming decades, as their economies shift from being agrarian to industrial.

Critics of modem agricultural technology invariably turn a blind eye on what the world would have been like without the technological advances that have occurred, largely during the past 50 years. For those whose main concern is protecting the ''environment,'' let's look at the positive impact that the application of science-based technology has had on land use. If the global cereal yields of 1950 still prevailed in 2000 we would have needed nearly 1.2 billion ha of additional land of the same quality—instead of the 660 million ha that was used—to achieve the global harvest of that year. Obviously, such a surplus of land was not available, and certainly not in populous Asia, where the population had increased from 1.2 to 3.8 billion over this period. Moreover, if more environmentally fragile land had been brought into agricultural production, the impact on soil erosion, loss of forests and grasslands, biodiversity and extinction of wildlife species would have been enormous and disastrous.

At lest in the foreseeable future, plants—and especially the cereals—will continue to supply much of our increased food demand, both for direct human consumption and as livestock feed to satisfy the rapidly growing demand for meat in the newly industrializing countries. It is likely that an additional 1 billion metric tons of grain will be needed annually by 2025, just to feed the world, let alone fuel its vehicles. Most of this increase must come from lands already in production through yield improvements. Fortunately, such productivity improvements in crop management can be made all along the line—in plant breeding, crop management, tillage, water use, fertilization, weed and pest control, and harvesting.

AFRICA'S FOOD PRODUCTION CHALLENGES

More than any other region of the world, African food production is in crisis. High rates of population growth and little application of improved production technology during the last two decades resulted in declining per capita food production, escalating food deficits, deteriorating nutritional levels, especially among the rural poor, and devastating environmental degradation. While there are more signs since 2000 that smallholder food production is beginning to turn around, this recovery is still very fragile.

Sub-Saharan Africa's extreme poverty, poor soils, uncertain rainfall, increasing population pressures, changing ownership patterns for land and cattle, political and social turmoil, shortages of trained agriculturalists, and weaknesses in research and technology delivery systems all make the task of agricultural development more difficult. But we should also realize that to a considerable extent, the present food crisis is the result of the long-time neglect of agriculture by political leaders. Even though agriculture provides livelihoods to 70–85 percent of the people in most countries, agricultural and rural development has been given low priority. Investments in food distribution and marketing systems and in agricultural research and education are woefully inadequate. Furthermore, many governments pursued and continue to pursue a policy of providing cheap food for the politically volatile urban dwellers at the expense of production incentives for farmers.

In 1986 I became involved in food crop technology transfer projects in sub-Saharan Africa, sponsored by the Nippon Foundation and its Chairman, the late Ryoichi Sasakawa, and enthusiastically supported by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter. Our joint program is known as Sasakawa-Global 2000, and has operated in 14 sub-Saharan African countries the past 20 years. We have assisted several million small-scale farmers to grow extension demonstration plots for basic food crops: maize, rice, sorghum, millet, wheat, cassava, and grain legumes.

The recommended production technologies come from national and international agricultural research organizations, and include: (1) the use of the best available commercial varieties or hybrids (2) proper land preparation and seeding to achieve good stand establishment, (3) proper application of the appropriate fertilizers and, when needed, crop protection chemicals, (4) timely weed control, and (5) moisture conservation and/or better water use if under irrigation. We also work with participating farm families to improve on-farm storage of agricultural production, both to reduce grain losses due to spoilage and infestation and to allow farmers to hold stocks longer to exploit periods when prices in the marketplace are more favorable. Virtually without exception, farmers obtain grain yields that are two to three times higher on their demonstration plots than has been traditionally the case. Farmers' enthusiasm is high and political leaders are taking much interest in the program.

Despite the formidable challenges in Africa, the elements that worked in Latin America and Asia will also work there. With more effective seed, fertilizer supply and marketing systems, hundreds of millions of smallholder farmers in Africa can make great strides in improving the nutritional and economic well being of their populations. The biggest bottleneck that must be overcome is lack of infrastructure, especially roads and transport, but also potable water and electricity. In particular, improved transport systems would greatly accelerate agricultural production, break down tribal animosities, and help establish rural schools and clinics in areas where teachers and health practitioners are heretofore unwilling to venture.

CROP RESEARCH CHALLENGES

Crop productivity depends both on the yield potential of the varieties and the crop management employed to enhance input and output efficiency. Agricultural researchers and farmers worldwide face the challenge during the next 25 years of developing and applying technology that can increase the global cereal yields by 50–75 percent, and to do so in ways that are economically and environmentally sustainable. Much of the yield

gains will come from applying technology ''already on the shelf' but yet to be fully utilized. But there will also be new research breakthroughs, especially in plant breeding to improve yield stability and, hopefully, maximum genetic yield potential.

While we must continue to push the frontiers of science forward, we also must be mindful of the need to protect the gains already made. Agriculture is a continuing struggle against mutating pathogens and insects. A clear example is the new race of stem rust that has emerged in East Africa, which is capable of devastating most of the world's commercial bread wheat varieties. Ironically, I began my career in agricultural science combating stem rust some 60 years ago and I am now in the twilight of my life, once again facing my old nemesis. There hasn't been a major stem rust epidemic for more than 50 years, since the virulent race called 15B devastated much of the North America wheat crop during 1950–54. Out of that crisis came new forms of international cooperation in plant breeding, which led to accelerated development around the world of high-yielding, disease-resistant, broadly adapted wheat varieties. However, in the ensuing years, complacency, increasing barriers to international exchange of plant breeding materials, declining budgets, staff retirements and discontinuity in training programs, has resulted in a much weakened system. This has been evident in the slow international response to a very serious new stem rust race, called Ug99, first spotted in Uganda and Kenya in the late 1990s. Ug99 has now escaped from Africa and begun its migration to North Africa and the Middle East. It won't be long before it reaches South Asia and later China, North America and the rest of the wheat-growing world. Wheat scientists are now scrambling to control this disease before it gains a foothold and causes catastrophic losses to the livelihoods of several hundred million wheat farmers and widespread global wheat shortages that will affect prices and the welfare of several billion consumers. Since 2005, excellent collaboration has been forthcoming from the USDA, key land grant universities, and USAID. A far-reaching research program is being considered by a major U.S. foundation located in Seattle that if approved could solidify and accelerate the progress to date. As part of this research effort we also hope to identify why rice, alone among the cereals, is immune to the rust fungi, and then use biotechnology to transfer this genetic immunity from rice to wheat and other cereals. If we are successful in this quest, the scourge of rust, mentioned in the bible, could finally be banished from the Earth.

WHAT CAN WE EXPECT FROM BIOTECHNOLOGY?

During the 20th Century, conventional plant breeding has produced—and continues to produce—modern crop varieties and hybrids that have contributed immensely to grain yield potential, disease and insect resistance, stability of harvests and farm incomes, while sparing vast tracts of land for other uses, such as wildlife habitats, forests, and outdoor recreation.

The majority of agricultural scientists including myself anticipate great benefits from biotechnology in the coming decades to help meet our future needs for food, feed, fiber, and bio-fuels. Promising work, now utilizing the powerful new tools of biotechnology, is also under way to develop greater tolerance of climatic extremes, such as drought, heat, and cold. Such research is likely to become more important in the future as the world experiences the effects of climate change. We must also persist in scientific efforts to raise maximum genetic yield potential to increase food production on lands currently in use while protecting against serious negative environmental impacts.

Seventy percent of global water withdrawals are used for irrigating agricultural lands, which account for 17 percent of total cultivated land yet contribute 40 percent of our global food harvest. Expanding the area under irrigation is critical to meeting future food demand. However, competing urban demands for water will require much great efficiencies in agricultural water use. Through biotechnology we will be able to achieve ''more crop per drop'' by designing plants with reduced water requirements and adoption of improved crop/water management systems.

Developing country governments need to be prepared to work with—and benefit from—the new breakthroughs in biotechnology. Regulatory frameworks are needed to guide the testing and use of genetically modified crops, which protect public welfare and the environment against undue risk. They must be cost effective to implement yet not be so restrictive that science cannot advance.

Since the private sector patents its life science inventions, agricultural policy makers must be vigilant in guarding against too much concentration of ownership and also be concerned about equity of access issues, especially for poor farmers. These are legitimate matters for debate by national, regional and global governmental organizations.

Even with private sector leadership in biotechnology research I believe that governments should also fund significant public research programs. This is not only important as a complement and balance to private sector proprietary research, but is also needed to ensure the proper training of new generations of scientists, both for private and public sector research institutions.

U.S. agriculture is being asked to produce more food, feed, fiber and now biofuels, while protecting the environment and not greatly increasing land use. Science is ready for the task, but science will not succeed without wise and adequate support from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and its congressional committees. Traditional programs of research and education at USDA and in the land grant universities must continue. Congress must also invest more generously in fundamental research to learn more about the cellular and molecular events that determine how plants and animals reproduce, grow and fight off stresses such as drought, cold and disease. Most of these major innovations will start first with acquiring deeper fundamental understanding.

Getting the most from fundamental research will require changes in the culture of decision making in public agricultural institutions. Leading scientists must be involved in deciding which programs have scientific merit and in setting realistic scientific priorities. There should be a council, like those of the National Institutes of Health, where scientists and stakeholders can pool their wisdom in recommending research priorities. Building such changes into the current farm bill is a high priority.

EDUCATING URBANITES ABOUT AGRICULTURE

The current backlash against agricultural science and technology evident in some industrialized countries is hard for me to comprehend. How quickly humankind becomes detached from the soil and agricultural production! Less than 4 percent of the population in the industrialized countries (less than 2 percent in the USA) is directly engaged in agriculture. With low-cost food supplies and urban bias, is it any wonder that consumers don't understand the complexities of re-producing the world food supply each year in its entirely, and expanding it further for the nearly 80 million new mouths that are born into this world annually? I believe we can help address this ''educational gap'' by making it compulsory in secondary schools and universities for students to take courses on agriculture, biology, and science and technology policy.

One exciting high school program, in which I am personally involved, is the World Food Prize Youth Institute program originated by Des Moines philanthropist Juan Ruan and led by the World Food Prize Foundation. Each year, more than a 100 high school students, mainly from Iowa but now expanding to other states and countries, convene at the George Washington Carver auditorium at Pioneer Hybrid Company headquarters in Johnston, Iowa, with teachers and parents, to present their well-researched essays on about how to increase the quantity, quality, and availability of food around the world. They make these presentations in front of past and present World Food Prize laureates and other experts, and lively discussions ensue. Each year, a select few graduating seniors win travel fellowships to go to a developing country where they live and work at an agricultural research institute, and learn first hand about hunger and poverty, and the role that science and technology can play to alleviate these calamities. It is especially gratifying to see the growth and development of these young, mostly female, summer interns. It literally is a life-changing experience for them, and it shows in their performance at university and in career selections. More programs like this are needed, so that future generations of Americans have a better sense about the complexities and challenges of feeding a growing world.

AGRICULTURE AND THE ENVIRONMENT

As the pace of technological change has accelerated the past 50 years, the fear of science has grown. Certainly, the breaking of the atom and the prospects of a nuclear holocaust added to people's fear, and drove a bigger wedge between the scientist and the layman. Rachel Carson's book Silent Spring, published in 1962, which reported that poisons were everywhere, also struck a very sensitive nerve. Of course, this perception was not totally unfounded. By the mid 20th century air and water quality had been seriously damaged through wasteful industrial production systems that pushed effluents often literally into ''our own backyards.''

We all owe a debt of gratitude to environmental movement in the industrialized nations, which has led to legislation over the past 40 years to improve air and water quality, protect wildlife, control the disposal of toxic wastes, protect the soils, and reduce the loss of biodiversity. However, these positive environmental trends are not found in the developing countries, where environmental degradation, especially in Africa, threatens ecological stability if not reversed.

There is often a deadlock between agriculturalists and environmentalists over what constitutes ''sustainable agriculture'' in the Third World. This debate has confused—if not paralyzed—many in the international donor community who, afraid of antagonizing powerful environmental lobbying groups, have turned away from supporting sciencebased agricultural modernization projects still needed in much of smallholder Asia, subSaharan Africa, and Latin America. This deadlock must be broken.

We cannot lose sight of the enormous job before us to feed 10 billion people, 90 percent of whom will begin life in a developing country, and many in poverty. Only through dynamic agricultural development will there be any hope to alleviate poverty and improve human health and productivity, and reducing political instability.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Thirty seven years ago, in my acceptance speech for the Nobel Peace Prize, I said that the Green Revolution had won a temporary success in man's war against hunger, which if fully implemented, could provide sufficient food for humankind through the end of the 20th century. But I warned that unless the frightening power of human reproduction was curbed, the success of the Green Revolution would only be ephemeral.

It took some 10,000 years to expand food production to the current level of about 5 billion tons per year. By 2050, we will likely need to nearly double current production again. This cannot be done unless farmers across the world have access to high-yielding crop production methods as well as new biotechnological breakthroughs that can increase the crop yields, dependability, and nutritional quality. Indeed, it is higher farm incomes that will permit small-scale farmers in the Third World to make desperately needed investments to protect their natural resources. As Kenyan archeologist Richard Leakey likes to reminds us, ''you have to be well-fed to be a conservationist.'' We have to bring common sense into the debate on agricultural science and technology and the sooner the better!

The United States is the greatest agricultural success story of the 20th Century. Through science and technology and farmer ingenuity, American agriculture has achieved levels of productivity second to none. We also have a great tradition, especially in earlier decades, of helping low-income; food-deficit nations to get their own agricultural systems moving. Our private agri-businesses have invested heavily in the development of productivity-enhancing technology, not only to the benefit of this country but also around the world. American public institutions—the land-grant universities and colleges, the USDA, and the U.S. Department of State—have play key roles in the transformation of subsistence agriculture, especially in Asia and Latin America. This has been good for the American people and the world. Lest we forget, world peace will not be built on empty stomachs or human misery.

I would be remiss if I did not thank the Administration for establishing the USDA Borlaug Fellows program in 2004, in my honor, at the time of my 90th birthday. This is an international program that actively engages universities like my own Texas A&M University, my alma mater, the University of Minnesota, and many other of our fine land grant universities and colleges. The Borlaug fellows program also has links to the international agricultural research centers located abroad and to private agro-industry.

The aim is to provide relatively young scientists from developing countries with opportunities to travel to the USA to gain practical experience and upgrade their technical skills at advanced agricultural laboratories. So far, USDA has been able, with the assistance of USAID, to piece together funding for about 150 Borlaug fellows to come to the United States each year. With more permanent funding, along the lines of the Fulbright program, USDA and the partner universities could implement a more substantial range of learning and personal development opportunities for young scientists and agricultural leaders from developing countries. This would be good for the individual recipients, their sponsoring institutions and countries, and also, I believe, for America. Texas A&M University and Ohio State University have been working through the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) to prepare a more substantial proposal for consideration by Congress.

My plea today to the members of Congress and to the Administration is to re-commit the United States to more dynamic and generous programs of official development assistance in agriculture for Third World nations, as was done in the 1960s and 1970s. Evershrinking foreign aid budgets in support of smallholder agriculture, and especially to multilateral research and development organizations such as the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) where I have worked for 40 years, as well as its sister research institutes under the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), are not in our nation's best interest, nor do they represent our finest traditions.

As you chart the course of this great nation for the future benefit of our children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, I ask you to think more boldly and humanely about the Third World and develop a new version of the Marshall plan, this time not to rescue a war-torn Europe, but now to help the nearly one billion, mostly rural poor people still trapped in hunger and misery. It is within America's technical and financial power to help end this human tragedy and injustice, if we set our hearts and minds to the task.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2007

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2381, the Upper Mississippi River Basin Protection Act, which improves the management of sediment and nutrient loss in the Upper Mississippi River Basin by establishing a coordinated public-private strategy.

Water quality in the Upper Mississippi River is critical to the ecological health of the system and is intricately linked to the basin's vast drainage. The Mississippi River is a multi-use resource where commercial navigation, water supply, and recreational demands co-exist with natural resources. Millions of tons of commodities are transported on the river annually. More than 30 million residents rely on the river water to supply their communities with water. And the river hosts about 12 million recreational visitors annually. At the same time, the Mississippi River is home to a wide variety of wildlife.

Unfortunately, the health of the Upper Mississippi River Basin has deteriorated over the years as a result of nonpoint source runoff from land. While agriculture is the lifeblood of many economies along the river, it has contributed to sediment and nutrient buildup that has been detrimental to the health of the river. These sediments and nutrients are transported downstream creating a zone of low dissolved oxygen in the Gulf of Mexico called the ''Dead Zone.''

We must find ways to harmonize our economy with our environment in order to preserve the Upper Mississippi River Basin. H.R. 2381 take steps in that direction by supporting a sediment and nutrient monitoring and data collection system for the Upper Mississippi River Basin. This Act will provide much-needed objective data to help manage the increasing sediment and nutrient crisis this river faces.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID B. WHITMORE

HON. JOHN M. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. McHUGH. Madam Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to note the recent passing of David B. Whitmore, who not only was an invaluable member of my staff but also an irreplaceable friend, and to extend my deepest sympathies to his wife, Rosan, and the rest of their family.

Dave was born and raised in Watertown, New York, which is also my hometown. After we graduated from Watertown High School together in 1966, Dave went to Grahm Junior College in Boston, Massachusetts, where he earned his bachelors degree in broadcasting.

Thereafter, Dave worked in film production and sales before returning to the North Country. At that time he and Rosan were wed in 1969 and began to raise three beautiful children, Scott, Kristin, and Kerry. Dave then began working for the New York State Farm Bureau and eventually became the organization director before he took up his duties to serve the people of northern New York as a regional representative of my congressional office.

It is hard to overstate the excellence of Dave's public service. In addition to his deep knowledge of agriculture, which is vitally important to northern New York's economy, Dave understood and loved people as he worked hard to use his experience and talents to help them on a daily basis.

Likewise, words are inadequate to express how much his family and I will miss him nor how much we appreciated his integrity, work ethic, ability, generosity, and the contributions he made during his life. All of us in central and northern New York have lost a tireless advocate and a dear friend. He will be deeply missed by many.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Speaker, I was unable to make the following rollcall votes on July 16, 2007:

H.R. 1980, to authorize appropriations for the Housing Assistance Council. On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, I would have voted ''aye.''

H.R. 1982, the Rural Housing and Economic Development Improvement Act of 2007. On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, I would have voted ''aye.''

H.R. 799, Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments. On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, I would have voted ''nay.''

TRIBUTE TO NEW VETERANS AND PURPLE HEART RECIPIENTS MEMORIAL

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a new memorial in my district that honors our veterans and Purple Heart recipients.

The new memorial was unveiled July 9, 2007 at the Veterans Affairs Hospital in Martinsburg, WV. The ceremony was officiated by the Martinsburg Chapter 646 of the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

The Purple Heart and Veterans Memorial is 1 of 2 in West Virginia and 1 of 110 throughout the whole Nation to honor our military men and women. Former Martinsburg VA Director Fernando Rivera came up with the idea after he visited a similar memorial in the neighboring State of Maryland. The Martinsburg Chapter 646 of the Military Order of the Purple Heart worked with the VA center to build the memorial at the main entrance of the facility.

Cy Kammeier, commander of the Martinsburg Chapter 646 of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, dedicated the memorial to ''those who gave some, and for the next of kin, those who gave all.''

As this year brings the 75th anniversary of the revival of the Purple Heart, it gives me a great privilege to recognize those who helped make this memorial a success. I am honored to serve the citizens of the Second District of West Virginia, many of whom continue to proudly represent our State in the Armed Forces. Memorials like the one in Martinsburg are a reminder of the sacrifices that so many men and women have made in order to protect our freedoms and liberties throughout our Nation's history.

HONORING DAVID CLARENBACH

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, as the State of Wisconsin celebrates the 25th anniversary of the Nation's first Gay and Lesbian Civil Rights Act, I rise today to honor the courageous individual who authored this historic legislation, David Clarenbach.

David Clarenbach is a seasoned veteran of local, state, and national politics. He won his first term as a Dane County Supervisor at the age of 18, and was elected to the Madison Common Council in 1974. He served in the Wisconsin State Assembly from 1975 to 1993, and was Speaker pro tem from 1983 to 1993. In 1992 David was a Democratic Congressional candidate from Wisconsin's Second District.

Throughout his career, David Clarenbach has been intimately involved in the growth and development of the LGBT civil rights movement. During his tenure in the Wisconsin Legislature he wrote the Gay and Lesbian Civil Rights Act of 1982, the first in the Nation to include gay and lesbian people in statewide anti-discrimination laws. He authored Wisconsin's Hate Crimes Act, which was upheld unanimously by the U.S. Supreme Court. He sponsored a Bill of Rights for people with AIDS and HIV infection. And, in 1983, he authored the Consenting Adults Act, legalizing all sexual activity between consenting adults in private, thus repealing the state's sodomy prohibitions. He has served as a consultant and mentor to openly gay and lesbian candidates throughout the country.

Bringing together his vast experience in policy development, legislative relations, and grassroots organizing, on February 3, 1981, then Wisconsin State Representative David Clarenbach introduced Assembly Bill 70 to include discrimination based on sexual orientation in the state's prohibition on discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations. At the time only 41 municipalities and 8 counties in the United States offered limited protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation. In explaining the bill, Representative Clarenbach stated that ''the right of private sexual preference among adults should be considered inherent . . . he or she should be guaranteed the basic human right to live without harassment or discrimination.'' The bill was endorsed by a broad coalition of clergy, religious denominations, and medical and professional groups.

In October 1981, Assembly Bill 70 was approved by the Wisconsin State Assembly by a vote of 50 to 46, and in February 1982, the Wisconsin State Senate approved the proposal by a vote of 19 to 13. Later that month, Republican Governor Lee Sherman Dreyfus signed Assembly Bill 70 into law, making Wisconsin the first in the Nation to enact a civil rights statute covering sexual orientation.

For his tenacity, his skills, and most of all, his courage, I join with all of Wisconsin in saluting David Clarenbach.

FREEDOM FOR CARLOS MANUEL HERNÁNDEZ REYES

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about Carlos Manuel Hernández Reyes, a political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

Mr. Carlos Manuel Hernández Reyes is a member of the John Paul II Peace and Justice Movement and a member of the Pedro Luis Boitel Civic Resistance Movement, an organization named for a legendary, heroic Cuban political figure who died in a hunger strike in 1972. The primary objective of the movement is to urge the Cuban tyranny to grant amnesty to all prisoners of conscience and to abolish ''political'' crimes in totalitarian Cuba. Because of Mr. Hernández Reyes' steadfast belief in human liberty and his dream of freedom for the people of Cuba, who have for too long been enslaved by the nightmare that is the totalitarian regime, he has been a constant target of the tyranny's repressive machinery.

Because of his belief in inalienable rights and his dream that the people of Cuba deserve freedom and democracy, Mr. Hernández Reyes was arrested by state security thugs on March 15, 2007 on grotesque charges of ''disrespect,'' which amounted to nothing more than refusing to live out the regime's mandated propaganda. For his supposed ''crime'' Mr. Hernández Reyes was maliciously ''sentenced'' to one year in the totalitarian gulag.

I remind my colleagues that, under the Cuban totalitarian regime, any freedom of expression or effort to display truth or opinion that is not in step with the regime's mandated lies, is met with swift and violent repression. Upon his ''sentencing'' Mr. Hernández Reyes was moved by mule to the Tres Veredas concentration camp in Guantanamo, Cuba. Madam Speaker, Tres Veredas is an infernal dungeon where men are herded and treated as animals, with little if any contact with the outside world, the camp being a three to four hour walk from the nearest town and almost only reachable by mule.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Hernández Reyes languishes in an unventilated, dank, and rancid smelling room without water, electricity, or sunlight. Recently, Mr. Hernández Reyes was able to communicate to human rights activist Francisco Hernández Gomez that there was a rampant outbreak of diarrhea among the prisoners. No one bothered to investigate the source of their illness or make the minimal effort of transporting prisoners to a hospital or clinic for diagnosis. Instead they were ''treated'' by a nurse at the facility itself without access even to electricity.

Madam Speaker, this is only one episode of the criminally abhorrent injustices continually carried out on countless innocent Cubans just 90 miles from our shores. And yet, though the tyranny has attempted to destroy Mr. Hernández Reyes, he will never cease in his commitment to freedom for Cuba. My Colleagues, we must demand the immediate release of Carlos Manuel Hernández Reyes and all prisoners of conscience in totalitarian Cuba.

HONORING SERGEANT NICHOLAS WALSH

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of SGT Nicholas Walsh and pay tribute to his patriotic service to our Nation.

As a team leader with Charlie Company, 1st Reconnaissance Battalion, 1st Marine Division, Sergeant Walsh bravely led fellow Marines on special operations missions in Iraq's Al Anbar Province. On May 26, while on a mission in Fallujah, Sergeant Walsh tragically lost his life.

After graduating from John Carroll High School in Birmingham, Alabama, Nicholas Walsh followed in the footsteps of a number of his family members and joined the Marines. Sergeant Walsh served four years before leaving the Marines. He married his wife Julie and started a family. Two years after leaving the Marines, Sergeant Walsh re-enlisted in the Corps he loved so much.

Like so many of our brave men and women in uniform, Sergeant Walsh often demurred at being identified as a hero. When asked if he would like to be buried at Arlington he responded: ''No way; that place is for people better than me. That place is for heroes.'' Madam Speaker, Sergeant Walsh is a hero.

He is a hero for his selfless service to our Nation. He is a hero for paying the ultimate price for freedom and liberty.

Today, I echo the words written by neighbors of Sergeant Walsh's parents, Maggie and Jerry: "We know that no words we could say can comfort you, but our thoughts are with you and our hearts ache for you." Our hearts ache for Sergeant Walsh's wife Julie, his sons Triston and Tanner, and the many loved ones and friends Sergeant Walsh leaves behind.

Madam Speaker, Sergeant Walsh is a true hero. Today, with a heavy heart, I extend to Sergeant Walsh's family my deepest sympathies. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the patriotism and selfless sacrifice of SGT Nicholas Walsh.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JACK KESSLER

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of a constituent of mine, Mr. Jack Kessler; specifically his forty-two years of service as President of the Putnam County Library Board.

As the board's founding President, Jack oversaw the birth of the county's library which in 1961 consisted of little more than a bookmobile and storage house. From those humble beginnings, however, the library blossomed. By the time Jack retired, after four decades of leadership, the Putnam County Library had grown to comprise five buildings, including four branches servicing communities across the county.

Jack left another, more direct, legacy when he retired. His daughter Jackie now serves as the library's director. Noting the family connection, Jack jokes he always has more than enough books to read.

Madam Speaker, for much of American history local libraries have provided communities with opportunities for advancement through education. Putnam County Library's branches, summer programs and volume after volume of books has benefited generations of West Virginia residents. The most enduring aspect of Jack Kessler's legacy is the benefit for generations yet to come.

I thank Jack for his years of service and Putnam County is fortunate to call Jack one of its own.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, unfortunately yesterday, July 16, 2007, I was unable to cast my votes on H.R. 1980, H.R. 1982, and H.R. 799.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 630 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1980, to authorize appropriations for the Housing Assistance Council, I would have voted, "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 631 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1982, the Rural Housing and Economic Development Improvement Act of 2007, I would have voted, "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 632 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 799, the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments, I would have voted, "aye."

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REFORM FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE GUARD CONTRACTING OPERATIONS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today I introduce a bill that I believe Congress must pass forthwith to assure that Federal Protective Service, FPS, guard contractors are capable, responsible, and ethical as required by the Federal Acquisition Regulations. It was clear to me that this bill was necessary when a vital security contractor issue emerged from our Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management hearing on June 21, 2007. A security guard contractor had failed to pay its guards from FPS funds. At the hearing we learned that Weldon Waites, who had served five years in prison for money laundering and fraud, was the de facto owner, with his wife, of STARTECH, despite federal law barring felons from owning companies that do business with the federal government. In fact, it was Waites, not his wife, who came forward to defend the company after it failed to pay its 600 D.C.-based guards despite receipt of funds from FPS for payment. Mr. Waites' testimony concerning his operational control of the company was nothing short of a case study in evasion of existing law by merely taking advantage of obvious loopholes. Today I am filing the Federal Protective Service Guard Contracting Reform Act to prohibit FPS from contracting with any security guard service that is "owned, controlled or operated by an individual who has been convicted of a felony." My bill would eliminate proxy ownership of vital FPS contracting operations by relatives or spouses. The bill would be effective immediately upon passage and therefore would mean that FPS would be required to dismiss any felon exercising control over any FPS contracting operation now, not merely future contractors.

My bill reminds us that we must not lose sight of the mission of private contract guards who serve the federal government—to guard federal employees and sites as vital as nuclear plants and military posts against terrorism and crime, and in the case of Jenkins Security, two secure federal power plants here. The STARTECH example of unpaid contract guards and apparent misuse of federal funds directed to pay guards demonstrated why federal law requires these businesses have a "satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics."

Contract security officers are a critical component of federal strategies to protect the safety and security of federal employees and vital federal facilities. In the federal sector, security guards, many of whom carry guns, are as essential to protecting federal employees and sites as members of FPS. Although not a replacement for public law enforcement officers, whether local police officers, or FPS law enforcement officers, private security guards, like peace officers, are engaged in counter-terrorism activities in the post 9/11 environment. It was 9/11 and the creation of the Department of Homeland Security that led to the transfer of the FPS from the General Services Administration to the new Department of Homeland Security. Since the transfer, however, FPS has become even more dependant on contract guards, who have grown rapidly to 15,000, while the number FPS guards is down from an authorized 1,450 to about 1,000. In passing appropriations for FPS this year, the Appropriations Committee indicated that the administration is seeking to totally eliminate FPS, the official police force for federal government work sites and facilities. The Appropriation Committee took action that assures that FPS officer levels as of 2006 will remain in place unless certain strong conditions are met. Today's legislation concerning the vitality and integrity of contracting operations assume even greater importance in light of FPS downsizing.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO JOAN CACCAMO

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Brooklyn resident Ms. Joan Caccamo. Joan received her bachelor of science degree in Management from St. Francis College in Brooklyn in 1983; she later earned a master's degree with a specialty in Administration and Supervision from Fordham University.

Joan taught Business Education and Computer Science for 12 years and worked as a high school director of development and is currently employed as the assistant director of recreation, intramurals and athletics as well as a senior woman administrator at Brooklyn College.

Joan continues to give back to her community. She is currently the department president of the American Legion Auxiliary who has chosen for her special project the Special Olympics of New York. Under her leadership, members of the American Legion have donated more than $40,000 to the project. Joan has traveled throughout New York State visiting 62 counties promoting Special Olympics, veterans', children's, and community issues.

Joan's accomplishments are many and include; the Empire Girl's Program service as housemother, vice-chair and chair of the Veterans' Affairs and Rehabilitation, certified leadership instructor, and the winner of the Public Relations Chair National Award.

Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize Ms. Joan Caccamo who has given more than 40 years of volunteer service. I'd also like to honor her for her accomplishments as a teacher and caring member of the American Legion Auxiliary.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Ms. Joan Caccamo.

INTRODUCTION OF COLORADO FOREST MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the Colorado Forest Management Improvement Act of 2007, legislation intended to facilitate a coordinated response to beetle infestation in Colorado's forest lands. In shaping it, we have also attempted to develop a model that could be useful as a response to similar problems in other States.

This bill is cosponsored all my Colorado colleagues here in the House, and Senator SALAZAR is introducing an identical bill that is cosponsored by Senator ALLARD. So this is legislation supported by our entire delegation in Congress.

As we are daily reminded, in Colorado and other Rocky Mountain States the risk of severe wildfires is very real. Partly, this is because of drought. But there are other contributing factors.

One is that for many years, the Federal Government's policy emphasized fire suppression, even though fire is an inescapable part of the ecology of western forests like those in Colorado. Today, in many parts of the forests there is an accumulation of underbrush and thick stand of small diameter trees that is greater than would be the case if there had been more, smaller fires over the years. They provide the extra fuel that can turn a small fire into an intense inferno. The problem has been made worse by our growing population and increasing development in the places where communities meet the forests—the so-called ''wildland-urban interface.'' And when you add the effects of widespread infestations of insects, you have a recipe for even worse to come.

I have put a priority on reducing the wildfire risks to our communities since I was elected to Congress. In 2000, with our then colleague, Representative Hefley, I introduced legislation to facilitate reducing the buildup of fuel in the parts of Colorado that the Forest Service, working with State and local partners, identified at greatest risk of fire—the so-called ''red zones.'' Concepts from that legislation were included in the National Fire Plan developed by the Clinton administration and were also incorporated into the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003. As a member of the Resources Committee, I had worked to develop the version of that legislation that the committee approved in 2002, and while I could not support the different version initially passed by the House in 2003, I voted for the revised version developed in conference with the Senate later that year—the version that President Bush signed into law.

Since then, in Colorado there has been very welcome progress in developing community wildfire protection plans and focusing fuel-reduction projects in the priority ''red zone'' areas, two important aspects of the new law. But at the same time nature has continued to add to the build up of fuel in the form of both new growth and dead and dying mature trees. And now there is an additional factor—increasingly widespread infestations of bark beetles.

Many species of bark beetles, such as the mountain pine beetle, are native to our forests. They place stress on trees by burrowing through the bark. If a tree is healthy, it can defend itself by producing sap to repel and expel the invaders. But if the defense fails, the insects lay their eggs in the woody material below the bark. Once the eggs hatch, they feed on the tree's fiber and disrupt the flow of water and nutrients from the tree's roots to its needles and branches. In addition, the invading insects bring in fungi and other invaders that further damage the tree. If enough insects are able to penetrate the tree and lay eggs, the tree dies. The offspring then mature and fly to another tree and the cycle begins anew.

These insects are a natural component of forest ecosystems. They help to balance tree densities and set the stage for fires and thereby the generation of new tree growth. And when forests are healthy and there are adequate supplies of water, the insects' effects are relatively low-scale and isolated. But under the right conditions—such as during drought conditions or when there are dense stands of even aged trees—the insects can cause large-scale tree mortality, turning whole mountainsides and valleys rust red.

That is what has been happening in many mountainous areas in Colorado. And more and more our mountain communities find themselves in uncomfortable proximity to acres of dead trees, turned rust red by the insects and adding to their concerns about the danger of catastrophic wildfires.

Last year, I worked to develop a response, starting with a meeting in Winter Park that was attended by local elected officials, homeowners, timber industry representatives, Forest Service officials, ski area employees, and other Coloradans. They offered observations on the extent of this problem and proffered suggestions on ways to better respond to it. Based on information gathered at that meeting, consultations with experts, and other conversations, draft legislation was developed that Representative SALAZAR and I circulated widely so we could obtain further comments and suggestions. And in March 2006, we introduced the Rocky Mountain Forest Insects Response Enhancement and Support Act, also called the Rocky Mountain FIRES Act.

After that, other Members of Colorado's delegation in Congress, in both chambers, also proposed legislation. Senator SALAZAR introduced a measure similar to the Rocky Mountain FIRES Act, and other legislation was proposed by other delegation members.

Then, recognizing that this is an issue affecting the entire State and best addressed by a unified approach, we all agreed to work together to attempt to develop a single bill that all of us could support.

After very lengthy discussions, that consensus has now been achieved and the result is the bill being introduced today.

Its goal is not to eradicate insects in our forests—nor should it be, because insects are a natural part of forest ecosystems. Instead, it is intended, first, to facilitate more rapid responses to the insect epidemic where that is needed to reduce the wildfire threats to our communities; and second, to promote research on ways to improve the health of our forest lands.

The bill includes a variety of provisions intended to further facilitate both the development and implementation of community wildfire protection plans and to enable the Forest Service and Interior Department, in cooperation with State and local authorities and other partners, to do more to reduce the threat of very severe wildfires. It also includes provisions to support research aimed at improving the long-term health of our forests as well as provisions to make it easier for Coloradans—including both small businesses and individual property owners—to assist the Federal, State, and local agencies in working toward the reduction of fire risks and improvement of forest health.

Madam Speaker, I want to express my personal appreciation for the cooperative and collaborative approach of my Colorado colleagues—in the Senate as well as here in the House of Representatives—as we have worked together to develop this legislation.

The result is not perfect. Not every provision is equally desirable to each of us, and the bill does not include all that it might if anyone of us had been the sole author. For example, I strongly supported requiring that in Colorado the federal agencies must continue to give at least the same priority to funding fuel-reduction projects in the wildland-urban interface as they are doing now. However, that was not acceptable to all, so I reluctantly agreed to its omission in order to reach a delegation consensus.

But this is a good, strong bill that I think deserves enactment, and I will do all I can to achieve that result.

Madam Speaker, for the information of our colleagues, here is a more detailed description of the bill:

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT

The Healthy Forests Restoration Act, enacted in 2003, includes provisions to expedite fuel-reduction—that is, removal of vegetation (including trees) that provide fuel for severe wildfires—from Federal lands, Title I of the new Colorado bill includes these changes to that law:

Sec 101. Community Wildfire Protection Plan Assistance—This section, based on a provision of the Udall-Salazar ''Rocky Mountain FIRES'' bill of 2006, would authorize grants to at-risk communities in Colorado for preparing, revising, or implementing community wildfire protection plans. Grant funding is provided through part of the Federal share of the receipts from leases of federal minerals. Funding under this section is set at $5,000,000 per year for fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2012.

Section 102. Central Collection Points—This section, based on a provision of the Udall-Salazar Rocky Mountain FIRES bill of 2006, would amend the establishment of collection points for vegetative material from hazardous fuels treatment projects. Material placed at one of these points can be sold, donated, or otherwise made available to anyone who will remove it. If any of the material is sold, the money will go to help pay for thinning work to reduce fire risks.

Section 103. Biomass Commercial Utilization Grant Program—This section, based on a provision of the Udall-Salazar Rocky Mountain FIRES bill of 2006, would reauthorize and broaden a program of grants for owners and operators of facilities that use biomass for energy production, or other commercial purposes. The authorization level is $5,000,000 per year for fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

Section 104. Healthy Forest Partnerships—This section is based on a recent Administration legislative proposal. It would authorize

the Forest Service or the Department of the Interior to designate Healthy Partnership Zones in Colorado at the request of the State or local governments. These zones would include both Federal land and adjacent nonfederal land at risk of uncharacteristically severe damage from wildfire or an outbreak of insects or diseases that requires multiple activities to reduce the threat. Designation of a partnership would be done with public participation and would last for no more than 5 years.

Within Partnership Zones the relevant Federal agency could partner with the State, a local government, or an Indian Tribe to prepare and implement eligible projects. Projects covered include hazardous fuel reduction projects; treatment of insect-infested trees; and the restoration of forest lands, rangelands, or watersheds.

Contracts under this section could be implemented under streamlined procedures. Priority would be given to projects that have been developed with collaborative community input and that are consistent with community wildfire protection plan. A Federal agency could not act on private land without the owner's consent.

TITLE II—COLORADO FOREST HEALTH MEASURES

Section 201. Research and other Activities—This section is based on provisions of Senator Allard's and Rep. Musgrave's ''Headwaters Protection and Restoration Act'' of 2006. It provides for grants to support research regarding—(1) marketing of forest products; (2) treatments for high elevation forests, and (3) steps to increase utilization of science and consideration of community needs in development of treatment strategies. The section also provides incentives for building infrastructure capacity such as; length of stewardship contracts, identifying markets for non-traditional forest products, grants and low-cost loans for small business that utilize wood from forests in Colorado. Directs the Secretary to examine the possible utilization of biomass as a renewable fuel source and how this could affect the Clean Air Act.

Section 202. Colorado Forest Health Fund—This section is also based on the Allard-Musgrave 2006 ''Headwaters Protection and Restoration Act.'' It would establish a Colorado Forest Health Fund to which would be credited part of federal receipts from federal timber sales in Colorado—$2 million or half of all such receipts, whichever is greater—as well as any funds specifically appropriated for the fund. The funds would be deposited in an interest bearing account and up to $2 million per year would be available to pay for measures to improve forest health and to reduce hazardous fuels in Colorado. The section authorizes appropriation of up to $2,000,000 per year.

Section 203. Grants for Colorado Fuels for Schools Program—This is also based on the Allard-Musgrave bill. It would authorize grants to the State of Colorado for feasibility studies regarding the use of biomass boilers to heat schools and other public buildings in Colorado and to assist with the installation and operation of these boilers. This section authorizes appropriations of up to $5 million per year for fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

Section 204. Stewardship Contracts in Colorado—This is a new section. It would authorize longer-term Stewardship Contracts—up to 20 years in duration—for fuel-reduction projects in Colorado. It also includes technical provisions requested by the Forest Service regarding the implementation of requirements related to potential cancellation liability.

Section 205. Good Neighbor Agreements in Colorado—This is also based on the Allard-Musgrave bill. It would make permanent existing authority for ''good neighbor'' agreements between Federal agencies and private land owners in Colorado and Utah.

Section 206. Preparation of Fire-Danger Maps—This is a new section. It would direct the Forest Service to work with the State Forest Service to map fire threatened areas in Colorado using geospatial technologies.

Section 207. Truck Weights—This is a new section. It would allow the State of Colorado to permit vehicles with a gross weight in excess of 80,000 pounds (but not more than the state's overall maximum gross weight limit) to haul dead or diseased timber and other forest materials removed from Colorado forests in order to reduce fire hazards.

TITLE III—TAX PROVISIONS

Section 301. Extension of Tax Credit for Electricity Produced From Biomass—This section is based on legislation introduced by Rep. Beauprez and is also similar but not identical to a provision of the 2006 Udall-Salazar ''Rocky Mountain FIRES Act.'' It would extend an existing biomass electricity production tax credit (now scheduled to expire on January 1, 2009) until January 1, 2030.

Section 302. Partial Exclusion from Gross Income Payments Received for Certain Hazardous Fuel Reduction Projects—This section is similar to a provision of the 2006 Udall-Salazar ''Rocky Mountain FIRES Act.'' It would allow a taxpayer to exclude from taxable income money received from the Federal Government as compensation for hazardous fuel reduction work. The exclusion would be for up to $10,000 for a single return, $20,000 for a joint return.

Section 303. Deduction of Certain Expenditures in Connection with Implementation of Community Wildfire Protection Plans—This is a new section. It would allow individuals to deduct funds they expend for hazardous fuel reductions that are done as part of a wildfire protection plan from their income taxes. It allows for the exclusion of up to $10,000 for a single return or $20,000 for a joint return.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. ARMY PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JOSHUA S. MODGLING

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a hero from my congressional district, U.S. Army Private First Class Joshua Stephen Modgling. Today I ask that the House of Representatives honor and remember this incredible young man who died in service to his country.

Joshua, born January 3, 1985 in Rapid City, South Dakota, was the son of Air Force parents. Joshua grew up all around the country, including my congressional district. His mother, Julie Montano, resides in Mira Lorna, California where Joshua attended high school. Joshua was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 30th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team of the 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Stewart, Georgia. His unit conducts missions out of Forward Operating Base Falcon to find improvised explosive devices. Joshua was driving an armored Buffalo mine sweeper on June 19, 2007, when he was killed by a bomb. On July 6, 2007, he was laid to rest next to his brother, Ryan, at Riverside National Cemetery.

In reading about Joshua's life, I was impressed by his devotion to family and love of sports. Joshua's father, Keith, describes a young man who developed an early interest in explosives; an interest that found a home as a combat engineer in the Army. He is survived by his parents; his sisters Kellilynn, Courtney and Michelle; brothers, Christopher and Kenneth; stepfather, Serefino; and grandmother, Virginia.

As we look at the incredibly rich military history of our country we realize that this history is comprised of men, just like Joshua, who bravely fought for the ideals of freedom and democracy. Each story is unique and humbling for those of us who, far from the dangers they have faced, live our lives in relative comfort and ease. The day the Modgling family had to lay Joshua to rest was probably the hardest moment the family has ever faced and my thoughts, prayers and deepest gratitude for their sacrifice goes out to them. There are no words that can relieve their pain and what words I offer only begin to convey my deep respect and highest appreciation.

Private First Class Modgling's mother, father, sisters, brothers and all his relatives have given a part of themselves in the loss of their loved one and I hope they know that their son, brother, and grandson, the goodness he brought to this world and the sacrifice he has made, will be remembered.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF JOHN H. CHRISTENSEN

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Mr. John H. Christensen of Reston, VA, for his service to the Defense Logistics Agency, DLA, as Chief of Logistics Research and Development at DLA Headquarters. He has served one of this Nation's most important agencies admirably, administering virtually all of the DLA's Research and Development initiatives and Industrial Base programs that have supported our soldiers in combat.

A graduate of the University of Florida, Mr. Christensen received his bachelor's degree in environmental engineering in 1979. Additionally, he has obtained two master's degrees, one from Virginia Tech in systems engineering and the other from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces in national resource strategy.

Prior to his current assignment, Mr. Christensen served as the first Program Manager of the Department of Defense, DOD, Electronic Mall, a single point acquisition center for off-the-shelf goods found in the commercial marketplace. His leadership helped bring a set of competing prototypes into a single operating system to provide for easy access, multiple searches, and cross-store shopping and ordering among millions of items from over hundreds of sources, all of which can accept credit card orders. The DOD Electronic Mall now generates millions of dollars each month in support of agency missions.

As chief of the Logistics Research and Development at Headquarters, Mr. Christensen is responsible for two major program elements; Manufacturing Technology Research and Development, and also Logistics Research and Development. The Manufacturing Technology

element consists of programs in Castings, Forgings, Industrial Plant Equipment, Operational Rations, and Military apparel. Logistics Research and Development includes a drive in Medical Readiness, Aging Aircraft, Supply Chain Management, and Competitive Sustainment. Additionally, the Industrial Base responsibilities include Waterstoppers, Surge and Sustainment, the Rapid Manufacturing Initiative, and all statutory programs related to the Industrial Base.

Having been in federal service for nearly 30 years, Mr. Christensen's career has been marked by sustained progression. Having served a 3-year tour as the Assistant Officer in charge of the Naval Fuel Depot in Yokusha, Japan, with the United States Navy, he then went on to serve 2 years as the first Program Manager of the Department of Defense E-Commerce Program, and lastly served 7 years as the Chief of the Logistics Research and Development Division with DLA. Mr. Christensen has remained a committed member of the Naval Reserves, and he holds the rank of Commander with over 26 years of combined service.

Madam Speaker, I wish to commend Mr. Christensen for his many years of service to our Nation and I am proud to have him live in Virginia's 8th Congressional District. The Nation will lose a proud servant when he leaves office on August 31, 2007. I wish him and his wife, Mary, Godspeed in his retirement.

CONGRATULATING FETZER VINEYARDS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to a proud corporate citizen from California's First Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Fetzer Vineyards, an environmentally conscious grower, producer and marketer of wines, has been named a 2007 Brand With a Conscience in recognition of its sustainable practices and social responsibility in winemaking.

Candidates for this award, given annually by the Medinge Group, an international think-tank on branding and business, are evaluated on the basis of reputation, accountability and an assessment of expressed values of sustainability. Fetzer has long been known as an environmentally responsible brand and joins companies such as Whole Foods and the Virgin Group in receiving this honor.

Initiatives to improve the winery's energy efficiency and sustainability practices began in the 1980's with the Fetzer family and have continued to thrive with the support of Brown-Forman Corporation, its parent company since 1992. Among its many accomplishments, the vineyard has reduced its waste by 93 percent since 1991, is annually recognized as one of the top ten recycling companies in California and has been using 100 percent renewable power since 1999. Fetzer is also known for its extensive use of solar power, bio-fuel and its adoption of company-wide recycling programs. Fetzer has the largest solar array in the wine industry, consisting of 4,300 solar panels covering 75,000 sq ft.

This most recent accolade compliments a collection of awards recognizing Fetzer's commitment to environmentally conscious practices. In 1999 Fetzer received the Business Ethics Magazine Award for Environmental Excellence and the United States Environmental Protection Agency Climate Wise Partnership Award. In 2003, California's Environmental Protection Agency selected Fetzer to receive the Governor's Award for Environmental and Economic Leadership. Fetzer Vineyards has been acknowledged as Salmon Safe and touted for Fish Friendly Farming practices. In 2007, Fetzer received its 13th WRAP (Waste Reduction Awards Program) award.

Fetzer is renowned for its triple-bottom line business approach, evaluating the impact of business decisions upon the employees and the environment along with economic considerations. As the largest grower of organic wine grapes in northern California, Fetzer carries on its tradition of using healthier vines and a more natural wine making process to produce wines that are recognized as being good for the planet and good for the palate.

With this award, Fetzer will serve as a model for companies striving to establish environmentally conscious business practices both locally and on a wider national and international scale.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Fetzer on its recognition as a 2007 Brand With a Conscience and to applaud its tireless efforts as a world-class organization and champion of sustainable business practices. I am proud to represent them.

TRIBUTE TO NORMAN BORLAUG

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, it is with great humility that I rise today to honor Norman Borlaug, the noted agricultural scientist and plant pathologist. Mr. Borlaug's contribution to humanity cannot be overstated. No one can be entirely certain how many lives he is responsible for saving, but the number often noted is well over 1 billion people—an unprecedented feat in world history. The honorary titles and acclimations Mr. Borlaug has received throughout his illustrious career are too many to enumerate, and such a list would be too prestigious to truncate. Instead, I simply request that the record state how pleased and honored I am to be able to stand here today and recognize the occasion of Mr. Borlaug's receiving the highest honor this body can bestow, the Congressional Gold Medal. It's doubtful that this institution could find a more deserving recipient.

Mr. Borlaug came from humble roots, working on his family farm until the age of 19. After some prodding from his grandfather, Nels Olson Borlaug, he enrolled at the University of Minnesota. One cannot help but wonder whether his grandfather knew when he advised his grandson, ''you're wiser to fill your head now if you want to fill your belly later on,'' how literally Mr. Borlaug would take it.

Affording a college education can be difficult, and was especially so for Mr. Borlaug, who obtained his undergraduate degree during the Great Depression. Despite the best efforts of the federal government towards relief and recovery, times were still rough, and many of the men he worked with were literally starving. Mr. Borlaug would later recall how much food meant to the young men he worked with—17- and 18-year-olds who had for months and months been unsure where their next meal would come from. Mr. Borlaug later noted how he ''saw how food changed them . . .'' and how ''. . . all of this left scars on me.''

There is no doubt that Mr. Borlaug understood the importance of something as simple as food in peoples lives, how it brought hope as well as nourishment to the impoverished and less fortunate. Toward the end of World War II, he rejected offers that would double his salary so he could research wheat in Mexico. Devastating crop yields in the early 1940s had led the country to resort to importing up to 60 percent of its wheat. Various plant diseases decimated entire crops, bringing discouragement and fear to the lives of Mexico's farmers. Mr. Borlaug was determined to make sure that Mexico could feed itself through a new kind of strong, high yield wheat.

Wheat is naturally long-stemmed, and if the wheat is too heavy, the stem cannot bear the load and the crop collapses and spoils. This spoilage was common, especially if a farmer attempted to use modern fertilizers. After numerous attempts and years of trial and error, Mr. Borlaug was able to cross a strain of dwarf wheat—which is shorter and has a thicker, stronger stalk—with regular wheat. Due to the prevention of losses from disease and top-heavy spoilage, yields tripled. By 1956, Mexico was able to be totally self-sufficient in wheat production.

In the sixties and seventies, demographers and environmentalists were predicting that India and Pakistan would inevitably face widespread hunger, resulting in millions upon millions of deaths due to famine and starvation. As India and Pakistan raced towards deadly conflict over the Kashmir region, both countries were headed toward an even more deadly famine. Rather than dodge the war zone, Mr. Borlaug headed toward the conflict, his team working fields in sight of falling artillery shells. As Borlaug's ''Green Revolution'' swept across Asia, tensions of famine and instability eased. Due to Mr. Borlaug's ingenuity and perseverance, both countries are now self-sufficient producers of cereals.

The environmental benefits of Mr. Borlaug's techniques have saved 100 million acres of untouched land from being plowed to grow crops, preserving the natural habitat of an area equivalent to that of the entire State of California. Since 1961, worldwide land devoted to growing wheat has increased by only 4 percent, while output has increased 2.3 times over, saving countless acres of natural habitat worldwide for future generations.

As Mr. Borlaug receives the Congressional Gold Medal, we are recognizing both his previous accomplishments as well as those yet to come. Mr. Borlaug is continuing his efforts to end famine and hunger in the developing world by spreading his efforts to African nations long plagued by food insecurity. There are further mountains to move, further horizons to reach, further fear to extinguish and further hope to bring. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to honor Mr. Borlaug not just as a product of the University of Minnesota, or as a great scientist or instructor, or as a great American, though he is all of these

things. It's a bigger honor to recognize him as a man who saw people starving when they didn't have to—who in the process of an act of human compassion, single-handedly changed the world. Mr. Borlaug, on behalf of the State of Minnesota, the United States of America, and a grateful world, I thank you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, July 12, 2007, the House of Representatives voted on H.R. 1851, the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act of 2007. I was present for the series of Roll Call Votes 625 through 629. However my "AYE" vote on final passage of H.R. 1851 (Roll Call Vote No. 629) was not recorded.

Had the electronic voting tabulator recorded my vote, the record would have demonstrated an aye vote on final passage of H.R. 1851 (Roll Call Vote No. 629).

IN RECOGNITION OF THE APPLING COUNTY BULLDAWG BB GUN TEAM

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, the Appling County Bulldawg BB Gun Team won 1st Place in the International BB Gun Championship Match in Bowling Green, KY this past weekend. Jordan Vaughn won First Place in the Jaycee international BB Gun Championship. Trevor Causey won second and the NRA World Record in the sitting position shooting a perfect 100 with 8 center shots.

The team won National Champion with the most points averaged together. The team won the special BB Gun trophy that is being held at the 4H office, and will be passed to each Donor Business for recognition. There were a total of 33 teams representing 22 different states. They won by a huge margin of 53 points with an overall total of 2382. (As I understand it, you have to sit, stand, kneel, or lay down to shoot for points.) The team members were Jordan Vaughn, Trevor Causey, Dustin Stipe, Brittany Hardwick, Jordan Roberson with two alternates: Wade Edwards and Hallie Hardwick. The team coaches were Tim Toler, Bob McDonald and Daniel Edwards.

The senior members have worked very hard to accomplish this goal. This is the first time a Georgia team has ever won the International Match and we are very proud of these kids!

FREE THE ISRAELI SOLDIERS

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2007

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call for the immediate and unconditional release of Eldad Regev and Ehud Goldwasser, Israeli soldiers held captive by Hezbollah for the past year. On July 12, 2006, Hezbollah terrorists crossed into Israel and attacked two Israel Defense Forces (IDF) armored jeeps as they were patrolling Israel's northern border. One year ago today, those terrorists killed three Israeli soldiers and kidnapped Eldad and Ehud, as mentioned above.

We mourn the passing of the three Israeli soldiers who were killed a year ago, and to honor their legacies, we must continue in our work to secure the release of Eldan Regev and Ehud Goldwasser. As their families pray for their swift return, the United States must continue to forge ahead in our efforts to bring about their release.

Madam Speaker, Hezbollah has tried to make Eldad and Ehud into bargaining chips. But they are not political chess pieces, things that can be swapped for political gain. They are human beings with names, lives, and families who miss them. They have families who wait every day for news of their circumstances, who have waited every day for a year now without receiving word that Eldad and Ehud are safe.

Unfortunately, Eldad and Ehud are not alone among Israel's missing soldiers. Three weeks before their capture, Hamas kidnapped IDF soldier, Gilad Shalit. The Shalit family has met with many communities across the United States, urging people to remember their son and speak out on his behalf.

To honor those who died a year ago, and the soldiers held captive, we must let the perpetrators of these terrible acts know that we have not forgotten what they have done. In March we passed H. Res. 107, calling for the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldiers held captive by Hamas and Hezbollah, and now we continue to express our deepest sympathies to the families of the missing soldiers, and we must pledge to continue the fight to bring them home.

I join with those across Israel and the United States to call for the immediate and unconditional release of Eldad, Ehud and Gilad. As the leader of the democratic world, America stands with Israel in its refusal to let these soldiers be forgotten.

AMERICA NEEDS MORE ENERGY

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America needs more energy.

Today we import around 60 percent of our oil from OPEC countries, many of which shield our enemies and disagree with our way of life. But we find ourselves dependent on these countries to supply the energy we need. We continue to import a lion's share of our energy from these countries, while refusing to increase our domestic energy supply.

Much of the energy legislation being proposed by my Democratic colleagues turns a blind eye to the reality that our economy depends on fossil fuels. Opponents of oil and gas continue to sponsor legislation to raise taxes on our domestic energy producers and refiners. Making American energy more expensive than foreign sources defies logic.

Comprehensive energy solutions must include provisions to promote all sources of energy. We must invest in research and development for technologies to promote the use of renewable and alternative sources of energy for the future, but at the same time we must also support the domestic oil and gas industry in order to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

The oil industry works just like other sectors of the economy, through the laws of supply and demand. Demand is increasing and has been for years, yet we are not increasing our domestic output. Refineries are operating at near-capacity and we haven't built any new ones since 1976. Congress needs to start realizing that fossil fuels are going to continue to be our major source of energy for decades to come, and make policy to reflect this reality.

As Ranking Member of the Science and Technology Committee, I strongly support a diverse portfolio of investments in both short-term and long-term energy R&D. I believe that one day, renewable and alternative sources of energy will provide America with energy on a widespread scale.

However, it will be years, if not decades, before these investments can help America achieve energy independence. In the meantime, we must be realistic about what makes our cars run and our light bulbs glow. We must not legislate to make headlines. We need to build on comprehensive energy policies that recognize the importance of all energy sources, including fossil fuels, to ensure national energy security.

IT'S TIME TO SET A DATE TO BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam speaker, I would like to submit this insightful editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times for the record. The Sun-Times has accurately and incisively captured the frustrations of the residents of the Chicagoland area, and of Americans around the country. They are tired of this ill-planned and ill-executed war, and they believe that it is time to "set a date to bring our troops home."

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, July 16, 2007]

DEADLINE IN IRAQ: IT'S TIME TO SET A DATE TO BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

Americans of all political leanings want to understand when our involvement in Iraq will end. We have waited patiently for the positive results the president has repeatedly promised. We have looked for improvements following shifts in military strategy, the approval of benchmarks, the last-ditch surge.

No matter how much wishful thinking President Bush indulged in last week in finding "a cause for optimism" in the White House report on progress in Iraq, Americans heard little to give them confidence that things are improving. The president should face reality and put before the American people a plan to conclude our direct involvement in Iraq. We need to understand the end game.

Are Iraq's political leaders any closer to resolving their deep, divisive differences? Are they any closer to providing security and basic services for the people? No, on both

counts. There has been no real progress toward meeting eight of 18 crucial benchmarks.

There is, however, progress in Congress toward forcing Bush's hand. The Democratic controlled House voted to require the United States to withdraw most combat troops from Iraq by April 1. Then two leading Republican senators, John Warner of Virginia and Richard Lugar of Indiana, called for Bush to present a contingency plan for Iraq to Congress by Oct. 16.

Threatened with opposition from more Republicans, the president is pulling out all political stops to keep ahead of that trend. At his worst, he has resorted to recycling cheap scare tactics—warning that the terrorist threat to Americans, on American soil, will increase dramatically the minute we pull soldiers from Iraq.

In lashing Congress for trying to ''run the war,'' Bush might have been lashing Americans who expressed their ardent opposition to the war at the polls last November. He wants us to wait until Gen. David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker release their progress report on Iraq in September before reaching any conclusions. Our concern is if their findings don't jibe with his policy, the president will come up with more reasons for Americans to withhold judgment. To wait some more.

Some have argued that setting a deadline will give the enemy a target date, allowing the enemy to lie in wait. But not having a plan risks further inciting Americans against the war. It could lead an exasperated Congress to make rash ultimatums that would put soldiers more at risk than if the president initiated a rational plan now.

The president has had more than enough time to develop and articulate an exit strategy in Iraq. Everyone wants to minimize the mess we'll leave behind. If April 1 doesn't work for the president, what date will? How long does he envision that we'll have to stay? The answer can no longer be ''indefinitely.'' The American people need a plan, and they need it now.

NORMAN BORLAUG AND THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, today Norman Borlaug received the Congressional Gold medal, the highest civilian award that Congress may bestow. I'm extremely proud to be able to celebrate this great honor with Dr. Borlaug, a native Iowan and a true humanitarian.

Dr. Borlaug was born on his grandparent's farm in Saude near Cresco, Iowa. The lessons he learned there stayed with him throughout his life.

His desire for knowledge and his dedication to helping those in need led him to Mexico after his studies. There he worked tirelessly and created high yield wheat varieties which enabled the country to become self-sufficient and improved the lives of countless poor farmers.

Dr. Borlaug became the ''Father of the Green Revolution,'' and in 1970 he was recognized for his extraordinary advancements in agriculture and received the Nobel Peace Prize.

He continues to work to alleviate hunger across the world and has saved countless lives. He is truly deserving of the Congressional Gold medal. Dr. Borlaug is an inspiration to us all.

PATSY T. MINK FELLOWSHIPS ACT

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Patsy T. Mink Fellowships Act. This bill continues the legacy of our dear colleague from Hawaii and is in honor of her work on behalf of equal opportunities in education.

Patsy Mink faced many challenges as a woman in higher education and she was a leader promoting equal opportunities for all women. The situation is better today, but there is still a long way to go.

Thirty-two percent of doctoral-age Americans are African-American or Hispanic, but only 11 percent of doctoral degrees awarded to Americans are awarded to African-Americans or Hispanics.

In such critical fields as engineering and science, that number is nine percent.

Women earn only about one-quarter of doctoral degrees in math and physical sciences and only one-sixth in engineering.

Only 38 percent of full time faculty are women, and that percent decreases as women seek advancement.

For example, only 30 percent of tenured faculty and 21 percent of full professors are women. In engineering, math, and physics, only about five percent of full professors are women.

Similarly, African-Americans represent only four percent of full or associate professors and Hispanics represent only two percent.

The Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation recently cited fewer institutional fellowships for minority students as a primary reason for the decline in the number of minority students pursuing doctorates.

The lack of minority and women professors, especially in math, science, and engineering, is the result of fewer of these individuals studying those subjects in high school, college, and graduate school.

The Patsy T. Mink Fellowships will increase diversity among college professors by authorizing fellowships for minorities and women doctoral students who agree to teach in higher education for one year for each year of their fellowship.

I ask my colleagues to support the Patsy T. Mink Fellowships Act, both to keep America's promise of equal educational opportunity and to protect our economic and national security.

COMMENDING THE WATERS FAMILY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the 1.5 million families who are living with autism in this country today. The Waters family, from my district is one of those families. They know firsthand about the difficulties of raising a child with autism. They have risen to the challenge, however, raising a beautiful, 6-year-old daughter, Candace. They have also dedicated their work to raising awareness about their daughter's condition and building a support network for other families around the country living with autism.

Robert and Sandy Waters have created a radio show on Autism One Radio, a nonprofit, charity organization that was created by a small group of parents of children with autism. The Waters' radio show, ''The Candy Store,'' provides music, art, inspiration, and information to inspire, educate, and help parents guide their children. They have written a song titled ''Faith, Love, and Hope'' for their daughter. The song has inspired and influenced parents, organizations, and politicians around the world.

People like Robert and Sandy Waters play an increasingly important role, as autism is one of the fastest-growing developmental disabilities in the world, and affects 1 in every 150 children born today. With proper education, training, and community living options, however, individuals with autism can lead productive lives, contribute to their communities, and reach their fullest potential. Unfortunately, however, understanding, services, and research lag behind the needs of our Nation's families.

With further research, scientists hope to establish biomedical markers and environmental links that will allow for earlier diagnosis and treatment. Additionally, researchers intend to look into the possibility of a vaccine and attempt to find the treatment programs that are most successful. As research opens up new treatment possibilities, we must also provide education in order to change public perception of autism and those individuals living with the disease.

Again, I would like to commend the work of the Waters family. I urge all citizens to become educated about autism and join in the effort to increase awareness and support for those living with this condition.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOWELL AND CAROLYN DAUGHTRY

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2007

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, today I would like to honor the 50th wedding anniversary of Lowell and Carolyn Daughtry.

Lowell was born in Titus County, Texas. He attended Mt. Pleasant High School and graduated from University of Texas at Tyler. After college, Lowell worked in the accounting office at the Continental Can Plant for fourteen years. He then worked in sales at Tyler Pipe for three years. Lowell rounded out his career working at the United States Post Office in Azalea Station, finally retiring in 2002.

Carolyn is a native of Tyler, Texas. She graduated from Tyler High School in 1957 and went on to the University of Texas at Tyler. Carolyn worked for Coca Cola in the marketing department, where she advanced from head bookkeeper to Manager of Automatic Buffet/Coca Cola, becoming the first female

manager. She then went to work for Buford Television/Friendship Cable as Vice President and General Manager, responsible for building over 40 television systems for Buford. While there, she bought, sold, and managed over 60 franchised areas. In 1991, Carolyn left Buford to work for Harron Cablevision as their Texas manager, overseeing 60 systems. Through Harron, she negotiated and bought the rights to Direct Television in 13 counties.

Lowell and Carolyn had two daughters; Rhita and Mikki. Rhita lives with her family in Canton, Texas. Sadly, Mikki passed in March, 1993 leaving behind her husband Kyle and their two sons Ross and Luke. Her memory is cherished by all those she left behind.

Lowell and Carolyn can be found working on their farm, happily tending their garden and traveling. I might note that Lowell now serves as Elder at the Chandler Church of Christ and Chaplain for the VanZandt AARP, for whom Carolyn is President.

As the Congressional representative of Ben Wheeler, Texas, it is my distinct pleasure to honor the 50th wedding anniversary of Lowell and Carolyn Daughtry today in the United States House of Representatives.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S9293–S9368

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1793–1808. **(See next issue.)**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S9301–10, S9317–66**

Adopted:

By 94 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. 248), Cornyn Amendment No. 2100 (to Amendment No. 2011), to express the sense of the Senate that it is in the national security interest of the United States that Iraq not become a failed state and a safe haven for terrorists. **Pages S9317–21**

Withdrawn:

McConnell Amendment No. 2241 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 2011), relative to a sense of the Senate on the consequences of a failed state in Iraq. **(See next issue.)**

Pending:

Nelson (NE) (for Levin) Amendment No. 2011, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S9301**

Levin Amendment No. 2087 (to Amendment No. 2011), to provide for a reduction and transition of United States forces in Iraq. **Page S9301**

Reed Amendment No. 2088 (to Amendment No. 2087), to change the enactment date. **Page S9301**

Dodd (for Levin) Amendment No. 2274 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 2011), to provide for a reduction and transition of United States forces in Iraq. **Pages S9301–02**

Levin Amendment No 2275 (to Amendment No. 2274), to provide for a reduction and transition of United States forces in Iraq. **Pages S9302–10**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

The McConnell motion to invoke cloture on McConnell Amendment No. 2241 (listed above), was withdrawn. **Page S9301**

Durbin Amendment No. 2252 (to Amendment No. 2241), to change the enactment date, fell when McConnell Amendment No. 2241 (listed above) was withdrawn. **Page S9301**

By 44 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 249), Senate did not agree to the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators, but a quorum was present. **Pages S9350–51**

By 41 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. 250), Senate agreed to the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. **(See next issue.)**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Levin Amendment No. 2087 (listed above) at 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, July 18, 2007. **(See next issue.)**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order blocking the property of persons determined to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, an act or acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of threatening the peace or stability of Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–21) **(See next issue.)**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Sean R. Mulvaney, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Robert J. Conrad, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Catharina Haynes, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Shalom D. Stone, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

John Daniel Tinder, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

24 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army, Navy. **Pages S9366–68**

Messages from the House: **(See next issue.)**

Measures Referred: **(See next issue.)**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **(See next issue.)**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **(See next issue.)**

Executive Communications: **(See next issue.)**

Additional Cosponsors: **(See next issue.)**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **(See next issue.)**

Additional Statements: **(See next issue.)**

Amendments Submitted: **(See next issue.)**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **(See next issue.)**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **(See next issue.)**

Privileges of the Floor: **(See next issue.)**

Quorum Calls: Two quorum calls were taken today. (Total—5) **Page S9350, (See next issue.)**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—250) **Pages S9321, S9350–51**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 18, 2007 and continued in session on Wednesday, July 18, 2007. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in the next issue of the Record.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies approved for full committee consideration an original bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008.

AIR SERVICES

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security concluded a hearing to examine improving air services to small and rural communities, after receiving testimony from Andrew B. Steinberg, Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Aviation and International Affairs; John Torgerson, Alaska Department of Transportation, Anchorage; Karen Miller, Boone County Commission, Columbia, Missouri, on behalf of the National Association of Counties; Mark F. Courtney, Lynchburg Regional Airport, Lynchburg, Virginia; and Faye Malarkey, Regional Airline Association, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing on the nominations of Robert Boldrey, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation, Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, who was introduced by Senators Warner and Craig, and R. Lyle Laverty, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife.

DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENTS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs concluded a hearing to examine the efficacy of democratic developments in Sub-Saharan Africa, after receiving testimony from Barry F. Lowenkron, Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor; Michael Hess, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, United States Agency for International Development; Princeton N. Lyman, Council on Foreign Relations, Chris Albin-Lackey, Human Rights Watch, Akwe Amosu, Open Society Institute, and Dave Peterson, National Endowment for Democracy, all of Washington, D.C.

TREATIES

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protocol Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Finland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Helsinki May 31, 2006 (the ''Protocol'') (Treaty Doc.109–18), protocol Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income signed at Copenhagen May 2, 2006 (the ''Protocol'') (Treaty Doc.109–19), protocol Amending the Convention Between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital and to Certain Other Taxes, Signed on August 29, 1989, signed at Berlin June 1, 2006 (the ''Protocol''), along with a related Joint

Declaration (Treaty Doc.109–20), convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and accompanying Protocol, signed on November 27, 2006, at Brussels (the ''proposed Treaty'') (Treaty Doc.110–03), patent Law Treaty and Regulations Under the Patent Law Treaty (the ''Treaty''), done at Geneva on June 1, 2000, between the Governments of 53 countries including the United States of America (Treaty Doc.109–12), the Geneva Act of the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs (the ''Agreement''), adopted in Geneva on July 2, 1999, and signed by the United States on July 6, 1999 (Treaty Doc.109–21), the Singapore Treaty on the Law of Trademarks (the ''Treaty'' or ''Singapore Treaty'') adopted and signed by the United States at Singapore on March 28, 2006 (Treaty Doc. 110–02), and protocol to the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation Between the United States and Denmark of October 1, 1951, signed at Copenhagen on May 2, 2001 (Treaty Doc. 108–08), after receiving testimony from Thomas A. Barthold, Acting Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Taxation, United States Congress; John Harrington, International Tax Counsel, Department of the Treasury; Lois E. Boland, Director, Office of International Relations, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce; Wesley S. Scholz, Director, Office of Investment Affairs, Department of State; and William A. Reinsch, National Foreign Trade Council, and Janice Lucchesi, Organization for International Investment, both of Washington, D.C.

FEDERAL ACQUISITION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine federal acquisition and contracting, focusing on ways to strengthen competition and accountability, including S. 680, to ensure proper oversight and accountability in Federal contracting, after receiving testimony from David M. Walker, Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office; Marcia G. Madsen, Mayer Brown Rowe and Maw, LLP, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the Acquisition Advisory Panel; and Stan Soloway, Professional Services Council, Arlington, Virginia.

CENSUS BUREAU

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security concluded an oversight hearing to examine the readiness of the Census Bureau for the 2010 census, after receiving testimony from Charles Louis Kincannon, Director, United States Census Bureau; Mathew J. Scire, Director, Strategic Issues, and David A. Powner, Director, Information Technology, both of the Government Accountability Office; Andrew Reamer, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.; and Maurice P. McTigue, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Arlington, Virginia.

ALZHEIMER'S

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Retirement and Aging concluded a hearing to examine the federal response and advances being made toward defeating the epidemic of Alzheimer's disease, after receiving testimony from Elias A. Zerhouni, Director, and Richard J. Hodes, Director, National Institute on Aging, both of the National Institutes of Health, Julie L. Gerberding, Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Andrew C. von Eschenbach, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, all of the Department of Health and Human Services.

PROSECUTION OF BORDER PATROL AGENTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the prosecution of Border Patrol agents Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean, after receiving testimony from Representatives Hunter and Rohrabacher; Luis Barker, former Chief Patrol Agent, El Paso Border Patrol Sector, and David V. Aguilar, Chief, both of the Office of Border Patrol, United States Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Johnny Sutton, United States Attorney for the Western District of Texas, Department of Justice; T.J. Bonner, AFL–CIO, Campo, California; and David L. Botsford, Austin, Texas.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 3056–3072; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 552–554, were introduced. **Pages H7981–82**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H7982–84**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows: Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2008 (H. Rept. 110–236). **Page H7981**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Solis to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H7855**

Recess: The House recessed at 9:02 a.m. and reconvened at 10 a.m. **Page H7855**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Dr. Billy F. Hudgins, Cross Creek Community Church, Hokes Bluff, Alabama. **Page H7855**

Suspension: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007: H.R. 980, amended, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 314 yeas to 97 nays, Roll No. 633. **Pages H7859–66, H7871–72**

Improving America's Security Act of 2007—Motion to go to Conference: The House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 1, to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, and agreed to a conference. **Pages H7868–73, H7878**

Agreed to the Blackburn motion to instruct conferees on the bill by a yea-and-nay vote of 354 yeas to 66 nays, Roll No. 635. **Pages H7869–71, H7873**

Later, the Chair appointed the following Members of the House to the conference committee on the bill: from the Committee on Homeland Security for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Thompson (MS), Loretta Sanchez (CA), Dicks, Harman, Lowey, Jackson-Lee (TX), Christensen, Etheridge, Langevin, Cuellar, Al Green (TX) Perlmutter, King (NY), Smith (TX), Souder, Tom Davis (VA), Daniel E. Lungren (CA), Rogers (AL), McCaul (TX), Dent, and Ginny Brown-Waite (FL). **Page H7878**

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of secs. 1202, 1211, 1221, 1232, 1233, and 1241 of the House bill, and section 703 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Skelton, Spratt, and Saxton. **Page H7878**

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of Title I, Title II, secs. 743 and 901 of the House bill, and Title III, secs. 1002, 1481, 1482, 1484, and Title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Dingell, Markey, and Barton (TX). **Page H7878**

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of secs. 601, 1202, 1211, 1221, 1222, 1232, 1233, 1241, 1302, 1311, 1312, 1322, 1323, 1331–1333, 1412, 1414, 1422, 1431, and 1441–1443 of the House bill, and secs. 502, 1301, Title XVIII, secs. 1911–1913, and 1951 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Lantos, Ackerman, and Ros-Lehtinen. **Page H7878**

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs. 406, 501, 601, 702, and Title VIII of the House bill, and secs. 123, 501–503, 601–603, 1002, and 1432 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Conyers, Zoe Lofgren (CA), and Sensenbrenner. **Page H7878**

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sec. 408 and subtitle A of title VIII of the House bill, and secs. 114, 601, 602, 903, 904, 1203, 1205, and 1601 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Waxman, Clay, and Issa. **Page H7878**

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of secs. 601, 712, 723, 732, 733, 741, 742, and subtitle A of title VIII of the House bill, and secs. 111–113, 121, 122, 131, 502, 601, 602, 703, 1201–1203, 1205, 1206, and 1606 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Reyes, Cramer, and Hoekstra. **Page H7878**

From the Committee on Science and Technology, for consideration of secs. 703, 1301, 1464, 1467, and 1507 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Gordon (TN), Wu, and Gingrey. **Page H7878**

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of Titles I–III, sec. 1002, and Title XI of the House bill, and secs. 202, 301, Title IV, secs. 801–803, 807, 901, 1001, 1002, 1101–1103, 1422–1424, 1426, 1427, 1429, 1430, 1433, 1436–1438, 1441, 1443, 1444, 1446, 1449,

1464, 1473, 1503, and 1605 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Oberstar, DeFazio, and Mica.

Page H7878

For consideration of Title II of the House bill, and Title III and subtitle C of title XIV of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representative Larson (CT). **Page H7878**

Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008: The House passed H.R. 2641, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, by a yea-and-nay vote of 312 yeas to 112 nays, Roll No. 641. Consideration of the measure began on Tuesday, June 19th. **Pages H7873–77, H7878–98**

Agreed by unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2641 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 481, no further amendment to the bill will be in order except those provided on a list at the desk. **Page H7873**

Agreed to:

Rothman amendment that prohibits funds from being used for the Green Maintenance Building in North Bergen, New Jersey. **Page H7874**

Rejected:

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used for the Achieving a College Education Program at Maricopa Community Colleges;

Pages H7875–76

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used for the Alliance for NanoHealth;

Pages H7876–77

Hensarling amendment (No. 36 printed in the Congressional Record of July 16, 2007) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the Environmental Science Center at the University of Dubuque, Iowa;

Pages H7880–81

Hensarling amendment (No. 38 printed in the Congressional Record of July 16, 2007) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for Roosevelt University Biology Laboratory equipment; **Pages H7882–83**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used for the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure in Pennsylvania (by a recorded vote of 98 ayes to 326 noes, Roll No. 636);

Pages H7893–94

Hensarling amendment (No. 35 printed in the Congressional Record of July 16, 2007) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the South Carolina HBCU Science and Technology Initiative (by a recorded vote of 70 ayes to 357 noes, Roll No. 637);

Pages H7878–80, H7894

Hensarling amendment (No. 37 printed in the Congressional Record of July 16, 2007) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership (by a recorded vote of 79 ayes to 337 noes, Roll No. 638);

Pages H7881–82, H7894–95

Hensarling amendment (No. 39 printed in the Congressional Record of July 16, 2007) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for Nanosys, Inc. (by a recorded vote of 81 ayes to 348 noes, Roll No. 639); and **Pages H7883–84, H7895–96**

Campbell (CA) amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds for any earmark listed in the bill (by a recorded vote 39 ayes to 388 noes, Roll No. 640). **Pages H7884–93, H7896**

H. Res. 481, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on Tuesday, June 19th.

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress of the issuance of an Executive Order blocking property of persons determined to be in a position to threaten the peace and stability of Iraq or to undermine efforts to promote economic reconstruction and political reform in Iraq or to provide humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed (H. Doc. 110–47). **Page H7898**

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008: The House began consideration of H.R. 3043, to make appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008. Further consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, July 18th. **Pages H7866–68, H7898–H7958**

Agreed to:

Reichert amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Health Resources and Services Administration by $2,500,000; **Pages H7939–40**

McCaul (TX) amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Special Education by $2 million;

Page H7941

Shays amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the National Labor Relations Board by $500,000; **Pages H7941–42**

Wasserman Schultz amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Health Resources and Services Administration by $3.5 million; **Page H7948**

Smith (NJ) amendment that increases funding for the National Cord Blood Stem Cell Program by $11,037,000; and **Pages H7949–50**

Musgrave amendment that reduces funding for the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and Tuberculosis by $175,000. **Pages H7954–55**

Rejected:

McKeon amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, under the Education for the Disadvantaged heading by $75 million; **Pages H7930–31**

Shays amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Corporation for National and Community Service by $8,300,000 (including $1,500,000 for the National Service Trust); **Page H7943**

Kline (MN) amendment that sought to increase funding for the Employment Standards Administration by $2,016,000 and to reduce funding under the Departmental Management heading in Title I by $3 million (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 642); **Pages H7933–38, H7955–56**

Platts amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, under the Education for the Disadvantaged heading by $50 million (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 643); **Pages H7938–39, H7956**

Marchant amendment that seeks to reduce funding under the Departmental Management heading in Title I by $58,419,000 (by a recorded vote of 149 ayes to 277 noes, Roll No. 644); **Pages H7940–41, H7956–57**

Jindal amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention by $50 million (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 645); and **Pages H7942–43, H7957–58**

Sessions amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of July 16, 2007) that seeks to strike section 111 of the bill (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 251 noes, Roll No. 646). **Pages H7944–46, H7958**

Point of Order sustained against:

Garrett (NJ) amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the National Cancer Institute by $10 million. **Pages H7953–54**

Proceedings Postponed:

Stearns amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for the Health Resources and Services Administration by $12.5 million and to increase funding, by offset, for Higher Education by $12.5 million; **Pages H7946–48**

Jindal amendment that seeks to redirect $37,200,000 in funding within the Health Resources and Services Administration account; and **Pages H7948–49**

Barton (TX) amendment that seeks to strike the proviso on page 36, beginning at line 5, relating to funding for metropolitan or transitional areas under part A of title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act. **Pages H7950–53**

H. Res. 547, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 634, after agreeing to order the previous question. **Page H7872**

Board of Directors of the Vietnam Education Foundation—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Directors of the Vietnam Education Foundation: Upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, Representative Blumenauer and upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader, Representative Pitts. **Pages H7958–59**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H7855.

Senate Referrals: S. Con. Res. 41 and S. Con. Res. 27 were referred to the Committee on Armed Services. **Page H7980**

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H7984–95.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and ten recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7871–72, H7872, H7873, H7893–94, H7894, H7895, H7895–96, H7896, H7897–98, H7955–56, H7956, H7956–57, H7957–58 and H7958. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at midnight.

Committee Meetings

FARM BILL EXTENSION ACT

Committee on Agriculture: Began consideration of H.R. 2419, Farm Bill Extension Act of 2007.

Will continue tomorrow.

BUDGETING TO FIGHT WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on Budgeting to Fight Waste, Fraud, and Abuse. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Michael O. Leavitt, Secretary; and Timothy B. Hill, Chief Financial Officer, Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services; Linda Stiff, Deputy Commissioner, Operations Support, IRS, Department of the Treasury; Stephen C. Goss, Chief Actuary, SSA; and M. Patricia Smith, Commissioner, Department of Labor, State of New York.

FDA FOOD SUPPLY SAFETY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Diminished Capacity: Can the FDA Assure the Safety and Security of the Nation's Food Supply?—Part 2." Testimony was heard from the following officials of the FDA, Department of Health and

Human Services: Andrew C. Von Eschenbach, M.D., Commissioner; Richard M. Jacobs, Chemist/Toxic Element Specialist, District Laboratory, San Francisco; Ann M. Adams, Director, District Laboratory, Kansas City; and Carol A. Heppe, Director, Cincinnati District; William K. Hubbard, former Associate Commissioner, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

MONETARY POLICY AND STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Held a hearing on Monetary Policy and State of the Economy. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

MULTIPLE PERIL INSURANCE ACT OF 2007

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing on H.R. 920, Multiple Peril Insurance Act of 2007. Testimony was heard from Representatives Baker, Taylor, Melancon, and Jindal; David I. Maurstad, Assistant Administrator, Mitigation, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security; Phillip Swagel, Assistant Secretary, Economic Policy, Department of the Treasury; and public witnesses.

U.S. POLICY OPTIONS IN IRAQ CRISIS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Held a hearing on U.S. Policy Options in the Iraq Crisis. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S-ASIA FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment held a hearing on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migrating Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Oceans, and Other International Fisheries Agreements of U.S. Interest in Asia and the Pacific. Testimony was heard from David A. Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Oceans and Fisheries, Department of State; and public witnesses.

HOMEGROWN TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2007

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 1955, Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007.

FAMILIES MEDICAL DEBT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing on Working Families in Financial Crisis: Medical Debt and Bankruptcy. Testimony was heard from Clifford J. White, Director, Executive Office for U.S. Trustees, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

DOE'S SAVANNAH RIVER ECOLOGY LABORATORY SUPPORT

Committee on Science and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight and the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment held a joint hearing on the Department of Energy's Support for the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory (SREL), Part I. Testimony was heard from Representative Barrow; and public witnesses.

PATENT AND TRADE ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Science and Technology: Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation held a hearing on Amendments to the Patent and Trade Act of 1980—the Next 25 Years. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Held a hearing on the Status of the Nation's Waters, including Wetlands, Under the Jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Testimony was heard from Brian Schweitzer, Governor, State of Montana; Ron Curry, Secretary, Environment Department, State of New Mexico; and public witnesses.

Hearings continue July 19.

FALSIFIED AIRMAN MEDICAL CERTIFICATE APPLICATIONS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on FAA's Oversight of Falsified Airman Medical Certificate Applications. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Transportation: Calvin L. Scovel, III, Inspector General; and Nicholas A. Sabatini, Associate Administrator, Aviation Safety, FAA; Mitchell A. Garber, M.D., Medical Officer, National Transportation Safety Board; and a public witness.

VETERANS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 2623, To amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the collection of co-payments for all hospice care furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 2874, Veterans' Health Care Improvement Act of 2007; H.R. 1315, amended, To amend title 38, United States Code, to provide specially adaptive housing assistance to certain disabled members of the Armed Forces residing temporarily in housing owned by a family member; H.R. 760, amended, Filipino Veterans Equity Act of 2007; and H.R. 23, amended, Belated Thank You to the Merchant Mariners of World War II Act of 2007.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 2007

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine modernization of Federal Housing Administration programs, 9:30 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the federal response to ensuring the safety of Chinese imports, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Finance: business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''The Children's Health Insurance Reauthorization Act'', 1:30 p.m., SD–219.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1145, to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform, S. Res. 248, honoring the life and achievements of Dame Lois Browne Evans, Bermuda's first female barrister and Attorney General, and the first female Opposition Leader in the British Commonwealth, S. Res. 236, supporting the goals and ideals of the National Anthem Project, which has worked to restore America's voice by re-teaching Americans to sing the national anthem, S. 1060, to reauthorize the grant program for reentry of offenders into the community in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to improve reentry planning and implementation, S. Res. 261, expressing appreciation for the profound public service and educational contributions of Donald Jeffry Herbert, fondly known as ''Mr. Wizard'', a bill entitled, ''School Safety and Law Enforcement Improvements Act'', and the nominations of Roslynn Renee Mauskopf, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, William Lindsay Osteen, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina, Martin Karl Reidinger, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, Timothy D. DeGiusti, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, Janis Lynn Sammartino, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Rosa Emilia Rodriguez-Velez, to be United States Attorney for the District of Puerto Rico, and Joe W. Stecher, to be United States Attorney for the District of Nebraska, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine increasing government accountability and ensuring fairness in small business contracting, 2 p.m., SR–428A.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine abuse of elderly citizens, focusing on prevention methods, 10:30 a.m., SD–628.

House

Committee on Agriculture, to continue consideration of H.R. 2419, Farm Bill Extension Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, to consider the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Bill, Fiscal Year 2008, 9 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on Iraq: Trends and Recent Security Developments, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to continue hearings on A Third Way: Alternatives for Iraq's Future, Part 2, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on U.S. nuclear weapons policy, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, to mark up H.R. 1424, Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, to continue hearings on Monetary Policy and State of the Economy, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, and Global Health, to mark up H.R. 2003, Ethiopia Democracy and Accountability Act of 2007, 10:15 a.m., followed by a hearing on Food Security in Africa: The Impact of Agricultural Development, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment, hearing on the Impact of Coup-Related Sanctions on Thailand and Fiji: Helpful or Harmful to U.S. Relations? 3 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia and the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight, joint hearing on Reconstruction in Iraq's Oil Sector: Running on Empty? 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, to mark up H.R. 1908, Patent Reform Act of 2007, 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 673, Cocopah Lands Act; H.R. 1696, To amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to allow the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Tribe to determine blood quantum requirements for membership in that Tribe; H.R. 2120, To direct the Secretary of the Interior to proclaim as reservation for the benefit of the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians a parcel of land now held in trust by the United States for that Indian Tribe; H.R. 2863, To authorize the Coquille Indian Tribe of the State of Oregon to convey land and interests in land owned by the Tribe; H.R. 2952, To authorize the Saginow Chippewa Tribe of Indians of the State of Michigan to convey land and interests land owned by the Tribe; S. 375, A bill to waive application of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to a specific parcel of real property transferred by the United States to 2 Indian tribes in the State of Oregon, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Management, Organization, and Procurement, hearing on Federal Contracting: Do Poor Performers Keep Winning? 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing entitled ''Medicaid Drug Reimbursements: Are CMS Cuts Bad Medicine for Small Businesses and Beneficiaries?'' 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 3046, Social Security Number Privacy and

Identity Theft Prevention Act of 2007; and the H.R. 3056, Tax Collection Responsibility Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, hearing entitled ''Voluntary Carbon Offsets—Getting What You Pay For,'' 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Wednesday, July 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 1585, National Defense Authorization Act and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Levin Amendment No. 2087 at 11:00 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 18

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Continue consideration of H.R. 3043—Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E1542
Barton, Joe, Tex., E1538
Boswell, Leonard L., Iowa, E1539
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1545
Capito, Shelley Moore, W.Va., E1542, E1543
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E1542
Ellison, Kieth, Minn., E1546
Emanuel, Rahm, Ill., E1535
Fox, Virginia, N.C., E1537
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E1541
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E1547
Hensarling, Jeb, Tex., E1548
Johnson, Timothy V., Ill., E1543
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E1547
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E1539
Loebsack, David, Iowa, E1548
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1535, E1536, E1537, E1538, E1541
McHugh, John M., N.Y., E1541
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1536
Moran, James P., Va., E1545
Musgrave, Marilyn N., Colo., E1542
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1543
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1537
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1547
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1547, E1547, E1548
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1537
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1535, E1546
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1543
Udall, Mark, Colo., E1544
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1548

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.