



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2007

No. 158

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 18, 2007.

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

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Hear us, O God, as we call upon Your holy name and bend our heads in prayer. You can inspire us as You have inspired others throughout the ages.

Make us instruments of peace and towers of strength because of our practice of self-control. Give to Your people, both in government here in this Chamber and living across the Nation, the wisdom to see that no good life can come to us without good discipline. Give us the grace to discipline our speech so that we may speak with honesty and clarity that will only benefit others and not confuse or ridicule others.

Help us to discipline our thinking and our actions so that others may be edified by the way democracy works, accomplishes the will of the people for the lasting good of the people, and gives You glory now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF COGGON, IOWA

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

Mr. CARNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the town in which I grew up, Coggon, Iowa. Coggon's motto is, "The

One and Only." Indeed, there is only one Coggon, but like so many small towns across our country, it is a place people are proud to call home.

I know that the people of Coggon appreciate the genial nature and the proud history of the town. The name Coggon was agreed upon at a banquet held at the Clemons House in 1888. Superintendent T. Spaulding suggested it. He had received a letter from his cousin, William Coggon, and thought the name would be appropriate. At that time, Superintendent Spaulding was supervising the construction of the Illinois Central Railroad through the town. This railroad would later prove to be an economic engine for Coggon, bringing in economic development and encouraging the growth of businesses. And on July 24, 1888, the settlement became Coggon, Iowa.

Today, this small, wonderful town is populated by 745 people. Small towns have been the lifeblood of America. Even now, my own family and I live in Dimock, Pennsylvania, a town with a population of about 70. We take the time to get to know our neighbors, we are a community of values and we work hard to support our families.

Coggon, Iowa is the small town that lives in all of us. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Coggon's 150th anniversary.

COMMENDING GARY LLOYD KNIGHT, DEPUTY GARRISON COMMANDER OF FORT BRAGG, NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate and praise an exceptional individual who has dedicated himself to serving our Nation and the men and women of Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Gary Knight is a remarkable

□ 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.

H11731

person, and I want to acknowledge his accomplishments and efforts as he retires on November 1, 2007 after over 40 years of public service. I am proud to have had the opportunity to work with him closely as Deputy Garrison Commander of Fort Bragg and am honored to call him my friend.

A native of New York, New York, who grew up in rural Georgia, Gary Knight was assigned to Garrison Command as the Deputy Garrison Commander in 1998, where he continues to serve today.

Gary's personal commitment to supporting our soldiers, Army civilians and families in the Fort Bragg community cannot be underestimated. As Deputy Garrison Commander at Fort Bragg, Gary Knight runs the day-to-day operations of the largest military installation in the world. Through his efforts and exceptional performance in support of the Army's finest warfighters, he has forged the Epicenter of the Universe into a more efficient Army installation, which is playing a central role in the global war against terrorists.

Gary Knight is a veteran of the United States Air Force. His many awards include selection as the 1989 Fort Bragg Executive of the Year, the Meritorious Civilian Service Award, the Superior Civilian Service Award, the Commanders Award for Civilian Service, and the Achievement Medal For Civilian Service.

Mr. Knight and his wonderful wife, Diana, an Army veteran and career Civil Servicemember, have four children, Gary, Bobby, Stacey and Melissa, and four grandchildren, Lindsey, Trey, Diana and Madiline.

Madam Speaker, I wish Gary Knight the best on his upcoming retirement and thank him for all he has done for our soldiers and this great Nation.

CHIP PROGRAM IS COST EFFECTIVE

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, President Bush rejected the wishes of the American people, 68 Senators, 43 Governors, and 265 Members of this body when he vetoed the children's health bill.

The reason that so many Democrats and Republicans support the CHIP Reauthorization Act is that it is consensus legislation that was crafted in a bipartisan fashion.

Over the last 10 years, the children's health program has proven to be a popular and successful program, with 6 million children currently receiving quality private health care. It costs less than \$3.50 per day to cover a child through the CHIP program. Insuring kids is also cost effective for taxpayers who end up picking up the tab for indigent care in emergency rooms, the most expensive way to care for a

child's health. A child is also more likely to succeed in education and life if they have access to health care at an early age, and it certainly benefits our Nation in the long run.

Madam Speaker, I would hope more of my Republican colleagues would work together to recognize the success story of CHIP, and would join us today in overriding the President's veto. We need to ensure that more children have access to quality health care.

HEALTHY HOSPITALS ACT

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, yesterday's headlines stated that more people will die from MRSA infections than die from AIDS, but that's just the beginning of the story, for actually some 90,000 people will likely die this year from an infection they pick up in a hospital or receiving health care. Tragic news. We also hear about students in school who have died from MRSA infections. But the point is hospitals are taking actions to reduce its infection rates, and yet Congress is not doing anything to help address this issue.

We can do something about it by passing legislation I've introduced, H.R. 1174, the Healthy Hospitals Act. My legislation would require hospitals to report infection rates. After all, people can find out if their airline is on time; why not be able to find out if your hospital is infection free. Nineteen States currently require reporting, and several other States are considering legislation. Medicare earlier this summer began denying hospitals reimbursement for hospital-related infections.

It is long overdue that Congress act. Let's standardize hospital reporting practices and fight hospital-related infections. I ask my colleagues to please cosponsor the Healthy Hospitals Act.

OVERRIDE SCHIP VETO

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

Mr. WYNN. Good morning, Madam Speaker.

Today, the House will vote to override the President's veto of the SCHIP bill.

At the beginning of this debate some months ago, I said that if America is the greatest country in the world, then we ought to guarantee that all of our children have health insurance. Greatness is not measured by the size of our military industrial complex. Greatness is measured by whether we can provide health insurance for 10 million American children.

Now, the President has said no, but according to all the polls, the American people say yes. Majorities in both

Houses have said yes. Governors have said yes. Private charities have said yes, that we ought to provide health insurance for children in America.

This is not a matter of a market fix. Small businesses cannot afford to provide health insurance. Working families, many of them, cannot afford to buy health insurance on the private market.

In addition, this bill provides a guarantee of dental coverage, because in America, the greatest country, children should not die because they don't have dental coverage. The bill provides dental coverage and mental health coverage. It's simple: We're the greatest country. We ought to provide health insurance for all our children.

NATIONAL SAVE FOR RETIREMENT WEEK

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, October 21 through October 27 will be National Save for Retirement Week. I hope folks take a few moments next week to look at their personal savings to see what more they can do to save for retirement. Saving for retirement can be an overwhelming task if left to the last minute. Just like most things in life, if you fail to plan, you plan to fail. Retirement doesn't have to be that way. You can choose to save.

To learn retirement planning tips and to complete a ballpark estimate on how much it will cost you to live in retirement, go to the Web site choosetosave.org. It's time for you to start planning your future retirement today. Do it now.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS SHOULD JOIN US IN OVERRIDING THE PRESIDENT'S CHIP VETO

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

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, 10 years ago, the Children's Health Insurance Program was created in a strong bipartisan fashion to ensure more low-income children have access to quality health care. Today, thanks to CHIP, 6 million children who would otherwise be uninsured can see the doctor of their family's choice any time they want.

For the first 8 years of the CHIP program, the number of uninsured children fell significantly, but that changed 2 years ago, and the trend continued last year when 700,000 more children joined the ranks of the uninsured. That was simply unacceptable to many of us here in Congress, and that's why we crafted a final bipartisan agreement that not only continues to provide health care access to 6 million kids who are already in the program, but also to 4 million others who are also eligible for CHIP. If the President had

his way, the number of uninsured children would go up by at least 800,000 over the next year. That is why we need to override his veto today.

SUSTAIN THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, today the liberal leadership of this House will attempt to override the President's veto of SCHIP.

For weeks, they have been taking to the airwaves and talking about anybody that opposes this bill is against disadvantaged children. Well, that's just not what this bill is about.

Their bill would change a block grant program to an entitlement; it would provide taxpayer-funded health care to illegal immigrants; it would add more adults and what the IRS calls high-income families to the government health care rolls. It would even remove people from private insurance rolls and place them on the government rolls. And, most important, it's going to move that decision between a doctor and a patient to a bureaucrat. Well, that is what they are for.

I suggest that we show respect for the children of the working poor that this bill was initially set up to address, that we sustain the President's veto. Let's start over. Show the issue the respect it deserves.

□ 1015

OVERRIDE THE SCHIP VETO

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, today we have the opportunity to right a wrong, the President's wrong in vetoing SCHIP reauthorization. Rather than admit that this veto is in error, the Bush administration has embarked on this misinformation campaign.

This legislation does not expand SCHIP eligibility. It does not extend coverage to households with incomes up to \$83,000 a year. It does not promote government-run health insurance.

Rather, this legislation has targeted uninsured American children living in poverty, children who already qualify for SCHIP but that don't have health care due to a lack of funding.

One of the most important reforms in this legislation is the creation of an incentive fund, a fund for States to enroll the 4 million children who currently are eligible for the program but are not enrolled.

Further, this legislation phases out the use of SCHIP funds to cover adults. Let's not forget it was the administration who allowed States to put adults into this program. Please, let's get this right. Override this veto.

BROADCASTER FREEDOM ACT DISCHARGE PETITION

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

Mr. PENCE. This summer, some of the most powerful Members of Congress, the House and the Senate, advocated a return of censorship to the airwaves of America in the form of the so-called Fairness Doctrine. I, along with more than 200 of my colleagues, introduced the Broadcaster Freedom Act. It would ensure that no future President could regulate the airwaves of America without an act of Congress.

Yesterday, House Republicans introduced a discharge petition to bring the Broadcaster Freedom Act to the floor of Congress. In 1 day, Madam Speaker, over 125 Members of Congress signed this petition.

The American people should know, if 218 Members of Congress sign this petition, we can have an up-or-down vote on legislation that would keep the Fairness Doctrine from ever coming back.

I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, if you believe in broadcast freedom, if you believe in the freedom of the press, if you believe that freedom of the press is not a partisan issue, sign the petition. Bring the Broadcaster Freedom Act to the floor of the Congress and freedom will win again in Congress.

Herseth Sandlin	McCollum (MN)	Sarbanes
Higgins	McDermott	Schiff
Hinchey	McGovern	Schwartz
Hinojosa	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Hirono	McNerney	Scott (VA)
Hodes	McNulty	Serrano
Holden	Meek (FL)	Sestak
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Shea-Porter
Honda	Melancon	Sherman
Hoyer	Michaud	Shimkus
Inslee	Miller (NC)	Shuler
Israel	Moore (KS)	Simpson
Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)	Sires
Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)	Skelton
(TX)	Murphy (CT)	Slaughter
Jefferson	Murphy, Patrick	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Murtha	Snyder
Johnson (IL)	Nadler	Solis
Kagen	Napolitano	Space
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Spratt
Kaptur	Oberstar	Stark
Kildee	Obey	Sutton
Kilpatrick	Olver	Tanner
Kind	Ortiz	Tauscher
Kirk	Pallone	Taylor
Klein (FL)	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)
Kucinich	Pastor	Tierney
Kuhl (NY)	Paul	Towns
Lampson	Payne	Udall (CO)
Langevin	Perlmutter	Udall (NM)
Lantos	Pomeroy	Van Hollen
Larsen (WA)	Porter	Velázquez
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Lee	Rahall	Walberg
Levin	Rangel	Walz (MN)
Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Wasserman
Lipinski	Rodriguez	Schultz
Loeback	Ross	Waters
Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman	Watson
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	Watt
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Welch (VT)
Mahoney (FL)	Rush	Wexler
Maloney (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Whitfield
Markey	Salazar	Woolsey
Matheson	Sánchez, Linda	Wu
Matsui	T.	Wynn
McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth

NAYS—187

Aderholt	Doolittle	Latham
Akin	Drake	LaTourette
Alexander	Dreier	Lewis (CA)
Altmire	Duncan	Lewis (KY)
Bachmann	Ehlers	Linder
Bachus	Ellsworth	LoBiondo
Baker	English (PA)	Lucas
Barrett (SC)	Everett	Lungren, Daniel
Barrow	Fallin	E.
Bartlett (MD)	Feeney	Mack
Barton (TX)	Ferguson	Manzullo
Biggert	Flake	Marchant
Bilbray	Forbes	McCarthy (CA)
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	McCaul (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Fossella	McCotter
Blackburn	Fox	McCreery
Blunt	Franks (AZ)	McHenry
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	McHugh
Bonner	Gallegly	McKeon
Bono	Garrett (NJ)	McMorris
Boustany	Gilchrest	Rodgers
Brady (TX)	Gingrey	Mica
Brown (GA)	Goode	Miller (FL)
Brown (SC)	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Gordon	Miller, Gary
Ginny	Graves	Mitchell
Burgess	Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)
Burton (IN)	Hastert	Murphy, Tim
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Musgrave
Calvert	Hayes	Myrick
Camp (MI)	Heller	Neugebauer
Campbell (CA)	Hensarling	Nunes
Cannon	Herger	Pearce
Cantor	Hill	Pence
Carney	Hobson	Peterson (MN)
Carter	Hoekstra	Petri
Chabot	Hooley	Pickering
Coble	Hulshof	Pitts
Cole (OK)	Inglis (SC)	Platts
Conaway	Issa	Poe
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Pryce (OH)
Culberson	Jordan	Putnam
Davis (KY)	Keller	Radanovich
Davis, David	King (IA)	Regula
Deal (GA)	Kingston	Rehberg
Dent	Kline (MN)	Reichert
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Renzi
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaHood	Reynolds
Donnelly	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)

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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 187, answered "present" 2, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 981]
YEAS—219

Abercrombie	Capito	DeGette
Ackerman	Capps	Delahunt
Allen	Capuano	DeLauro
Andrews	Cardoza	Dicks
Arcuri	Carnahan	Dingell
Baca	Castle	Doggett
Baird	Castor	Edwards
Baldwin	Chandler	Ellison
Bean	Clarke	Emanuel
Becerra	Clay	Engel
Berkley	Cleaver	Eshoo
Berman	Clyburn	Etheridge
Berry	Cohen	Farr
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Fattah
Bishop (NY)	Costa	Filner
Blumenauer	Costello	Frank (MA)
Boozman	Courtney	Gerlach
Boren	Cramer	Giffords
Boswell	Crowley	Gillibrand
Boucher	Cuellar	Gonzalez
Boyd (FL)	Cummings	Granger
Boyd (KS)	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Bralley (IA)	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Brown, Corrine	Davis, Lincoln	Hare
Buchanan	Davis, Tom	Harman
Butterfield	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)

Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Upton
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)	Walden (OR)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Walsh (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Wamp
Roskam	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Royce	Stearns	Weller
Ryan (WI)	Stupak	Westmoreland
Sali	Sullivan	Wicker
Saxton	Terry	Wilson (NM)
Schmidt	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Sensenbrenner	Thornberry	Wolf
Sessions	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
Shadegg	Tiberi	
Shays	Turner	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert Tancredo

NOT VOTING—23

Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad
Conyers	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Doyle	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Emerson	King (NY)	Waxman
Gutierrez	Marshall	Weiner
Hall (NY)	Miller, George	Wilson (OH)
Hunter	Mollohan	Young (AK)
Jindal	Peterson (PA)	

□ 1044

Mr. BURTON of Indiana changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. William Francis Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held October 16, 2007, the Honorable Nicola S. Tsongas was elected Representative to Congress for the Fifth Congressional District, Massachusetts.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH,

Boston, MA, October 17, 2007.

Hon. LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. MILLER: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special State Election held on Tuesday, October 16, 2007, for the office of Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts, show that Nicola S. Tsongas received 54,328 votes out of 105,985 total votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Nicola S. Tsongas was elected as Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts.

To the best of my knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by those municipalities located within the Fifth Congressional District, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE NIKI TSONGAS, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the Honorable NIKI S. TSONGAS, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and members of the Massachusetts delegation present themselves in the well, including the United States Senators.

Ms. TSONGAS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 110th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE NIKI TSONGAS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished dean of the Massachusetts delegation, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the entire Massachusetts congressional delegation, it is my great pleasure and privilege to introduce the newest Member of the 110th Congress, the gentlelady from the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts, NIKI TSONGAS.

NIKI TSONGAS is the eldest of four sisters who grew up in a military family bouncing between air bases all across the United States, Europe, and Japan. In 1967, while her father was stationed at the Pentagon, she met her future husband, our late distinguished House colleague, Paul Tsongas, while he was working just across the street as an intern in the office of then Fifth District Congressman Brad Morse.

NIKI was Paul's soul mate and his strongest supporter when he ran successfully to join us here in the House of Representatives in January of 1975 and

for the Senate in 1978. She was at Paul's side when he ran for the Presidency in 1992 and when he fought so valiantly against the cancer that finally claimed him in 1997.

Over the years, NIKI TSONGAS has been a social worker, a community leader in Lowell, a lawyer, and an educator. As a community leader, she has had a passion for social and environmental justice, which she brings with her as she arrives in Congress. And through it all, she was an amazing mother to three daughters, Ashley, Katina and Molly.

Lowell and the Merrimack Valley has a strong industrial past, and nobody will better represent the roll-up-your-sleeves, hard work persona of this area like NIKI TSONGAS.

In January, our delegation was proud to cast our votes for the first female Speaker of the House. Today, I am proud to introduce the first female Member of the Massachusetts congressional delegation in 25 years.

I give you the distinguished gentlelady from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Congresswoman NIKI TSONGAS.

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, it has been a real honor and pleasure and treasure to be sworn in by the first female House Speaker. Thank you so much.

And I want to thank ED MARKEY and the members of the delegation who have been so supportive of me as I have journeyed through this most remarkable campaign. It was hard fought, but here we are. Thank you so much for all of the help you provided. It is my great honor to be part of this most remarkable institution. Thank you.

My race was about a lot of things. But as we approached the end, it was so valuable to me to be able to say that I want to come here and have my first vote cast to be around children's health.

There is nothing more fundamental to the long-term capacity of this country than to take care of its most vulnerable citizens. And so for me to arrive on this day and cast my vote to override the President's veto is something I will always remember, that I was part of this great debate around the future of our country, the generational responsibility we have both to our young and to our old, and to be here on this most remarkable day.

I am going to keep this short. We have a lot of work to do. That is one thing I learned throughout this campaign; people want change. They want us to come to the table, solve problems and move this country forward, and I am happy to be here to be part of that most remarkable opportunity. Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentlewoman

from Massachusetts, the whole number of the House is 433.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 976) to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

I will also yield 15 minutes of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Today we face an awesome responsibility to do what is right for America's children. The debate here is about one thing only: health care for kids. Some have tried to change the subject, obfuscating this debate with misconceptions, half-truths, and outright lies. Whether this is ignorance or malfeasance, allow me to help them understand the legislation.

First, the bill terminates the coverage of adults under the CHIP program. I repeat, terminates.

Second, the bill prohibits the use of Federal funds for illegal aliens. Section 605 plainly states, "No Federal Funding for Illegal Aliens."

Third, the bill is fully paid for and will not increase the national debt. In fact, CBO estimates this bill, if enacted, will return money to the Treasury.

The legislation before us would provide health care and health insurance coverage for 10 million needy American children. It provides funding for States

to enroll millions of low-income children who are already eligible for benefits yet remain uninsured. Under current law, these boys and girls are entitled to their benefits. Continuing this situation of not providing coverage is a travesty.

I am not alone in this view. Former Surgeons General for Presidents Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton and for the current President recently wrote in support of this legislation the following: "We implore you to not put off the health needs of our Nation's children. Please act today."

This legislation has the strong backing of the entire medical community, children advocates, educators, school administrators and school boards, as well as insurance companies across the country, and 43 of the Nation's Governors want SCHIP enacted because they know children cannot learn if they are not well.

□ 1100

They also know something else. These are the most vulnerable people in our society. We will be judged how we care for them; but beyond that, this is an investment in the future of the country. More than 300 organizations and a long list of distinguished Americans support this bill.

I urge my colleagues to join in overriding the veto.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, of the 30 minutes that I control, I yield 15 minutes of that to the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCCRERY of Louisiana, to control.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Health Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

All of us would like to see an extension of the SCHIP program, and I think there are some very basic principles on which all of us should agree, principles that should be embodied in a bipartisan piece of legislation. I would suggest there are five.

First of all, we should put the poorest children at the front of the line. That means we should require States actually to enroll 90 percent of their SCHIP and Medicaid-eligible children under 200 percent of the poverty line before they start enrolling children at higher income levels.

Two, no families with incomes above 250 percent of the Federal poverty level should be eligible for Federal SCHIP funds. States that want to go above that should feel free to do so with their own funds; but hardworking, tax-paying families in the Midwest and the

Southeast shouldn't be forced to subsidize the health care for children and families in the richer States who are making over \$82,000 per year.

Third, no Federal SCHIP funds for adults other than pregnant women beginning in 2009. We should give the States a year to transition their low-income adults to Medicaid, which is where they belong, and stop taking away limited resources from needy children and giving them to childless adults.

Fourth, keep the existing Federal requirement that States actually document the citizenship and identity of all of the applicants for Medicaid and clearly state in the bill that illegal immigrants are prohibited from receiving Medicaid or SCHIP benefits. Being able to write down a Social Security number doesn't actually prove you're a United States citizen. Federal benefits should not go to illegal immigrants.

Fifth, no millionaires in SCHIP. We should simply put a \$1 million net asset cap on eligibility for Federal SCHIP funds. If you have over \$1 million in net assets, you should be able to afford to pay for your children's health insurance.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes. After my 2 minutes, I ask unanimous consent to turn the remaining time to Chairman STARK to be able to yield to other people as he sees fit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, let me stand in a sense of bipartisanship, especially to my Republican friends, and remind you that come the next election, President Bush is going to be there at his ranch in Texas, and he will not be with you at the polls.

I say that because by that time the truth will have caught up with the message that the President is giving and most of you are using to sustain the President's veto.

Let me get to the one that I'm most familiar with, this \$83,000 ability of people to enjoy SCHIP. No one is more familiar with this than I am. It was the great State of New York that exercised its request for a waiver to ask the President of the United States whether or not a family of four would be allowed to buy in, even though they were making \$83,000. And guess what, under existing law, not new law, the President of the United States says, hell, no, you can't do it.

So we've got to emphasize over and over again, you could ask for it for \$1 million because it's not an entitlement, it's a block grant, and the Governors can ask for anything they want over 200 percent over poverty, and the President, Republican or Democrat or whoever she might be, will be able to say, no, you're not going to be able to do it. So knock that out.

And for all of the people that are upset with immigrants, legal or illegal,

we're just going to put in big letters so that by the time November gets here that in the bill that the President has vetoed it says no illegal alien can receive the benefits of the bill.

And since you're so against adults receiving benefits, the bill is eliminating adults.

So if you can't be with us today, try to think of yourself in November, and maybe we can work out something.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

Ten years ago, Republicans and Democrats came together to create an SCHIP program with a stable funding source. It was a truly paid-for program. Throughout the process this year, we've been talking about the fact that this SCHIP reauthorization that's before the House today is not paid for. It's paid for only if you accept the budget gimmick that is used to make it appear on paper over the 10-year budget window that the program is paid for.

But I don't think any of us realized just how steep that cliff in the bill is until today, because last night my staff received from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office new numbers that show very clearly that under the bill that's before us today, total enrollment in SCHIP is expected to drop by 6.5 million children in the second five years of the program. Does anybody believe that is going to happen? Of course not. But the way the bill is designed, that's what would happen. We know that's not going to be reality.

Under this bill, the way it's designed, Democrats would have people believe that SCHIP enrollment, kids enrolled in this program, will drop to only 1.3 million by 2017.

Under a realistic expansion of the program, which the President has proposed and we support, there would be 2.9 million kids enrolled in the program in 2017. So under this bill that's before us today, you'd have 1.6 million fewer kids enrolled in SCHIP than you would under the President's budget. That's not realistic. We know that's not going to happen.

So how does that problem get fixed after 5 years? Massive tax increases. That's how it gets fixed. This House will be back here having to finance the real costs of the then-existent SCHIP program over the next 5 years, which CBO estimates will require about another \$40 billion in revenues over and above the new \$35 billion that this bill would impose on the American taxpayers.

So there is a better way. It's the way we created for this program in the first place, a bipartisan, fiscally responsible, truly fiscally responsible program to help kids in need.

I hope that the majority will be willing to join with us, all of us, to create that bipartisan program again when this veto is sustained.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the chairman of the subcommittee, a great expert on the business of health.

Mr. PALLONE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just keep hearing inaccurate information on the other side of the aisle in an effort to try to sustain this veto, and it's simply not right.

First of all, this bill is totally paid for with a tobacco tax increase. Now, you may not like that if you don't like your tobacco taxed, but that's how it's paid for and it's a good way to pay for it.

Secondly, this idea that the President's alternative will not take kids off the rolls, that is simply not true. With the President's alternative, 800,000 children that are now covered by SCHIP will not have SCHIP anymore.

The President's veto of this bill was a slap in the face not only to this Congress but to the millions of children who, without this bill, will continue to be uninsured or, worse, lose the insurance they currently have.

And this is the truth about CHIP. Just listen up. The bipartisan CHIP proposal is supported by 72 percent of the American people, two-thirds of the Senate, the majority of the House, 43 State Governors, and more than 300 organizations nationwide.

The President is deluding himself if he doesn't think this veto is going to hurt millions of children; and unless we override, there are just going to be a lot of kids who simply cannot go to the doctor and would have to go to the emergency room.

What we sent to the President was a reasonable, bipartisan bill that would cover 4 million previously uninsured low-income children, most of whom are in working families, a total of 10 million. The vast majority of these kids are the very lowest income children who have no other options for care.

The President claims this bill covers rich kids, but it's not true. Senator HATCH who helped write this bill said 92 percent of the kids will be under 200 percent of the poverty level.

The President has also said that this bill opens the door to government-sponsored health care because it encourages families to drop their coverage. Simply not true. CBO said that that is not the case.

The best way to avoid crowd-out is to basically pass this bill. The problem is we continue to get inaccurate information from the other side of the aisle.

I would urge my Republican colleagues today to vote with their conscience, instead of with this misguided loyalty to the President who is out of touch with America's families.

Vote to override.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me and ap-

preciate the privilege to address this issue again here on the House floor.

I think we miss the point sometimes on what this is about. This isn't about sometimes the nuances of all of this. This is about where we take this Nation, and I'm seeing this debate in Iowa and across this country.

And what this is about, SCHIP stands for Socialized, Clinton-style Hillarycare for Illegals and their Parents. That's what happens, and it is illegals that are being funded by this because all they have to do is write down a Social Security number.

The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, has given us a number, \$6.5 billion in additional costs that flow over to people that are not citizens because we've lowered the standards. Whatever gets said, that's the language that's in there, and the cost is there, \$6.5 billion.

So this is SCHIP, Socialized Clinton-style Hillarycare for Illegals and their Parents. This is the cornerstone of socialized medicine. It's put in place. That's what this debate is about: make people dependent so they don't have individual responsibility and you can have more people dependent upon your votes on the floor of this Congress and less vitality in America.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds for purposes of responding to the comments just made.

I want my colleagues to take a careful look at the remarks just made and the poster just presented. Every one of those statements is false. There is no treatment in this for illegals. There is no treatment in this for their parents. This is not socialized medicine.

It is supported by the health care industry. It is also supported by the insurance industry. It has no relationship to and it doesn't even look like the Hillarycare thing about which the gentleman complains.

I would note something else. This is a proposal which is a block grant to the States. It is not an entitlement.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, I'm just amazed that the Republicans are worried that we can't pay for insuring an additional 10 million children. They sure don't care about finding \$200 billion to fight the illegal war in Iraq. Where are you going to get that money? You are going to tell us lies like you're telling us today? Is that how you're going to fund the war?

You don't have money to fund the war or children, but you're going to spend it to blow up innocent people if we can get enough kids to grow old enough for you to send to Iraq to get their heads blown off for the President's amusement.

This bill would provide health care for 10 million children; and unlike the President's own kids, these children can't see a doctor or receive necessary care. Six million are insured through the Children's Health Insurance Program, and they'll do better in school and in life.

□ 1115

In California, the President's veto will cause the legislature to draw up emergency regulations to cut some 800,000 children off the rolls in California and create a waiting list. I hope my California Republican colleagues will understand that if they don't vote to override this veto, they are destroying health care for many of our children in California.

In his previous job as an actor, our Governor used to play make-believe and blow things up. Well, the Republicans in Congress are playing make-believe today with children's lives. They claim they can't afford health care. They say the bill will socialize medicine. Tell that to ORRIN HATCH, CHUCK GRASSLEY, and TED STEVENS, those socialists on the other side of the Capitol. The truth is, the CHIP program allows States to cover children primarily through private health care plans.

But President Bush's statements about children's health shouldn't be taken any more seriously than his lies about the war in Iraq. The truth is that Bush just likes to blow things up in Iraq, in the United States, and in Congress.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override his veto. America's children need and deserve health care despite the President's desire to deny it to them.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCCRERY. I thank the Speaker for that admonition.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. BRADY.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, that gentle reminder is not enough. It is despicable to have a Member of this Congress accuse this President, any President, of willfully blowing the heads, quote, blowing the heads off our young men and women over in Iraq and Afghanistan. Having a brother who is an Army medic and served in Iraq, having spent this weekend with a family who lost their son in Iraq, it is beneath contempt, beneath contempt, to have a Member of Congress stand here and accuse the President of, in effect, assassinating our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is dead wrong. And it is beneath contempt as well that we will sit here silently and allow such a remark to be tolerated, accepted if not embraced. And I will guarantee you, no Member on this side will stand up here and disavow those remarks, unfortunately, today.

It is bad enough that we are playing politics with the war. Now we are playing politics with our kids. The claim that the Republicans don't support this program is equally untrue. We created it. This is a great program. It keeps kids healthy. It helps their families avoid serious illness, keeps them out of

our emergency rooms. It is a great program.

When we created it, we did it the right way. We sat down with the President, President Clinton, and we worked out a good plan for kids. And then, more importantly, we believed in it enough to pay for it. We paid for the whole 10 years. This plan does not. It is only half paid for. It is only half paid for. It is just like these predatory loans; the first years are affordable, and then it balloons beyond what we can pay for it. If we believe in it, let's pay for it now. It allows abuses to continue. It doesn't cover the poor kids first.

My question is, why don't we sit down, why don't we quit playing political games with our kids, sit down with Republicans and Democrats with the White House and find a solution that is right for our children.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) 1 minute.

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Speaker, I have long stated that caring for our children is always the right thing to do. Every parent in my State of Utah and in this country knows that access to health care and preventive medicine for our kids is the right thing to do.

It has been 10 years ago that we passed this program. It has helped insure more than 6 million children, and that is a good thing. And we have made that type of progress even as health care costs have gone up and the number of people struggling to get and to pay for health insurance has increased. We made that progress through the Children's Health Insurance Program because it is a model that works. The States do their part, the Federal Government does its part, private insurance does its part, and the families through copays and premiums do their part as well.

At a time when it is often tough to make progress on important issues, why would we want to turn our backs on our kids and stop progress in its tracks?

As Members of Congress, none of us have to worry about this. We all have insurance for our kids. We don't need to worry about being one huge medical bill away from facing bankruptcy. Let's think about the folks who aren't in the same situation that we all have as Members of Congress. The best investment we can make is in our kids. I urge Congress to override the President's veto.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There has been a lot of rhetoric today and a lot of talk about polling and how Americans everywhere support this, Governors support this, people at the local level support it.

We have in this country something called representative government. We

are sent here and we are given access to figures and numbers that perhaps others don't have. What figures and numbers I am talking about tell us that we cannot sustain the trend that we are on, particularly ramping up a program like this and spending more than we have in the past. We simply can't sustain it, particularly when gimmicks are used in the outyears to pay for it. We know that. Perhaps those who are responding to the polls do not.

George Washington once said: If to please the people we do what we ourselves disapprove, how will we afterwards defend our work?

That is what we are here for, to do what we know is right. When I am told you have got to do what your conscience says, my conscience says that we can't afford this. If we have to use gimmicks in the outyears to pay for it, we simply can't afford to expand this program.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize for 1 minute a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) who, unlike the Republicans, has had some experience with the truth and knows that occasionally it hurts.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. The President has rejected legislation to strengthen and expand CHIP for 10 million children of hardworking American families. The President's veto makes it clear that he has chosen to ignore the financial struggles of working families in this country who are unable to afford health care for their children. His veto makes clear that health care for America's children simply is not a priority for him; and the Republicans in this Chamber who support his veto today illustrate that they, like the President, does not understand or have chosen to ignore how well CHIP has worked and how positively it has impacted the lives of millions of American families.

The Nation's Governors, health care providers, children's advocates, insurance executives, labor unions, religious leaders, parents and grandparents all support CHIP's affordable coverage for millions of American children. They know the President's veto is shortsighted, it is callous, and it is wrong.

Today is the day of decision to stand with the President or to stand with America's children. Ten million American children and their families are waiting.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I recognize for 1½ minutes the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), the ranking member on the Trade Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, all of us support SCHIP and we all want to reauthorize it, but we need to put low-income kids first.

This bill would expand the program to families making more than \$60,000 a year. That is not low income. It is a majority of the households in America. There is a better way. Reauthorize

SCHIP and keep it focused on truly needy children, and then tackle rising health care costs that are squeezing middle-class families.

Tax credits could help 10½ million kids from middle-income families gain or keep their health care coverage. Millions more would benefit if families could purchase less expensive health plans from across State lines. Let's defeat this motion and get to work on making health care more affordable for all Americans.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, at this time it is my privilege to show the bipartisanship of this bill which is supported by one of every four of our Republican colleagues, including our dear friends Mr. GRASSLEY and Mr. HATCH in the Senate. At this time, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) 1 minute.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Ten years ago, the Children's Health Insurance Program passed with a Republican Congress and a Democratic President. Now we are trying to reauthorize it with a Democratic Congress and a Republican President. We should be able to do this, and we should be able to do it in a bipartisan way.

The Children's Health Insurance Program has reduced the number of uninsured children in this country and has given them access to primary care. They live healthier lives because of it. This is not a great bill, but it is a good bill; and I have supported this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it again today.

In particular, it phases out the participation of adults in this program. This program is for kids, for low-income kids, not for adults. And successive administrations have been approving the admission of adults to the program, and that was not its intent.

New Mexico in particular will benefit from this program because it allows lower income kids to be participants in the program. Because of an anomaly of the original law, New Mexico's lowest income kids are not eligible for this program. I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill today.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, we do all know what this debate is about, but I think there is still confusion about the context of this bill and the content of this bill. We have heard our colleagues across the aisle saying that it has to do with supporting health care for disadvantaged children. But, unfortunately, that is not exactly what this bill does.

We are all for health care for children of the working poor, but some of the things that this bill is about: It would move a very successful block grant program to an entitlement. It would provide free taxpayer-funded health care to illegal immigrants. It would add more adults than what our own IRS

calls high-income families to the government health care rolls. It would remove people from private insurance and put them over on the government rolls. It would, in many cases, replace the doctor-patient relationship with the bureaucrat making the decision.

It doesn't live up to its name. It doesn't live up to what it is supposed to do. How do you pay for it? With budget gimmicks. Look at what happens in 2012. Let's show respect for the issue. Take it back. Sustain the President's veto.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL) 1 minute.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, in a move that defies logic, President Bush made the mistake of vetoing the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, contradicting an explicit pledge he made during the 2004 campaign to "lead an aggressive effort to make sure uninsured children receive health coverage, guaranteeing them a healthy start in life." Instead of living up to that promise, he is denying millions of children access to high quality, affordable health care.

CHIP is a vital program for both the Nation and the State of New York. Since 1997, it has proven to be a popular, successful program, covering 6.6 million children nationwide, and helping to reduce the number of uninsured children in my State of New York by 40 percent. The bill he vetoed would help 268,000 more of New York's kids.

The President has said that children don't need health care; all they need to do when they get sick is go to an emergency room. I am not sure if that comment was uninformed and irresponsible or simply callous, but I think that parents of New York would like to see the veto overridden.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. HULSHOF, a member of the Health Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, be permitted to allocate the remainder of the time on my side.

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

There was no objection.
Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Never in my wildest dreams would I imagine that on a day in August of 1997 that a Democratic President would sign a bill presented by a Republican Congress, and that that would be a high-water mark as far as consensus between a divided government, 10 years ago, the high-water mark of a divided government coming together to create a solution. I was here to help create the bill. In that instance, a Republican Congress worked with, negotiated with, compromised with the President of the other party to create a solution to the problem of children who had no health insurance.

□ 1130

Now, I would say, Madam Speaker, that the 2007 version of the Children's

Health Insurance Program is almost unrecognizable from the original bill, and certainly beyond the original intent of that bill.

For instance, New Jersey currently has a planned amendment that would use income disregards which would allow it to raise its SCHIP eligibility levels to 350 percent of poverty. That's about \$71,000 for a family of four. And don't just take my word for it. Look at section 114, subparagraph A under the bill. And that would continue under this bill.

Many adults without children would be eligible under this bill. Don't take my word for it. Read subparagraph A of section 112 of the bill. You know, the bill allows States to move them to Medicaid, but allows it to pay.

The Federal Government should not be, in my humble opinion, in the business of paying for States who want to cover childless adults that are grandfathered in this bill. And on behalf of my constituents in Missouri, should I ask them to reach in their pockets then and to pay for health care for a family of four in New Jersey making \$70,000 or a family of four in New York making \$80,000?

So it comes down to this. In fact, there are still 79,000 kids in Missouri, Madam Speaker, that are still at or below 200 percent of poverty. Those are the kids we need to reach out to to provide health insurance.

So the question at the end of this vote is this, to my friends on the other side, Do you want the politics or do you want the policy?

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from South Carolina, my friend, Mr. CLYBURN, 3 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, when it comes to the war on terror, the President is always quick to remind members of the international community that they're either with us or against us. There is no neutral or impartial position that can be taken. Well, I'm here to tell my colleagues today that there is no nonaligned position that they can assume on child care. You either support working families with health care for their children, or you don't. It's just that simple.

Now, I've heard the specious claims that SCHIP is a form of socialized medicine. The President did not call it socialized medicine when he promised the American people he would seek to expand the program when he was accepting the party's nomination for a second term. Then again, how can it be socialized medicine when it covers 10 million children and not be socialized medicine for 6 million children?

And the outrageous claim that this Congress is neglecting poor children is inaccurate. We already provide assistance to poor children through Medicaid. SCHIP is designed to provide assistance to those working families whose incomes are too high to qualify for Medicaid and too low to purchase private health care coverage.

If you do not want to provide relief to middle-income families, you should just have the guts to say so. But don't come here to the floor and mislabel this bill as socialized medicine or accuse Democrats of not prioritizing the needs of America's children.

I implore those of you who plan to vote to sustain the veto to reconsider your position. Think of how devastated you would be if your children and grandchildren had to go without basic health care. Imagine the hopelessness and despair you would feel in such a situation.

This is where we are today, because when you cast your votes today, you either stand with our children or you stand against them. There is no in between.

Let's vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say that I support expansion of the children's health care program, but not in its current form, and here's why. Half of the 1.2 million new enrollees in the expansion of SCHIP under this proposal already have insurance, already have insurance, and that's according to the Congressional Budget Office. When it comes to adults, they cost 60 percent more to care for than kids. This program should be about helping expand coverage to children whose families do not have access to health insurance.

I spent 21 years in small business. I'd never sign a contract that I knew I couldn't keep my word on. This bill is unfunded after year five. In year six, according to the Congressional Budget Office, this program is short about 80 percent.

Beyond that, if we took the million and a half adults off of this program and put them on Medicaid, which they're eligible to do, then that would free up funds that could go to help kids. In fact, I think it's about 780,000 adults in 2012 would still be on this program. That would fund 1,150,000 children who could be put on Medicaid.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to recognize the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus, who has a brilliant 3-minute speech, and I yield him 1 minute in which to present it.

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, Dolores Sweeney, from my district, works for an insurance company that doesn't provide health care for her or her children. She earns a paycheck, not a welfare check. She has three children and would like to buy private health care, but can't afford to do so.

Dolores Sweeney's children are on SCHIP, and without the SCHIP program they would go without health care, or she would have to go without a job.

Our bill does right by Dolores Sweeney and the other 10 million children from working families.

I believe that you care about the poor, but I wonder why you voted to cut \$8 billion from Medicaid.

I believe that you think this is excessive cost, but you never said that about the \$680 billion for Iraq, no questions asked.

And I believe that you say that this is a taxpayer-funded government-run health care, just like the health care your kids get in the Federal Government program. This is exactly that.

I believe the sincerity of your positions; but time and again, when it came to standing up for poor kids, you cut Medicaid. When it came to excessive cost, you provided \$680 billion for the war in Iraq. And when it comes to government-funded health care, if it's good enough for your kids, it's good enough for Dolores Sweeney's children.

Mr. HULSHOF. I continue to reserve my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, at this time I reserve my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Congressman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I believe that every child deserves proper health care. I support SCHIP's renewal with increased funding. And I also support its expansion, but I believe it must be done in a responsible manner, a manner that ensures valuable resources target our Nation's most vulnerable children without unnecessarily expanding the program to those who do not need it.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, of the 4 million children who would receive coverage under the current proposal, approximately 40 percent already have private insurance. Our dialogue should focus on our children who are uninsurable, sick children who have exhausted private coverage, and families who cannot afford coverage for their children. Yesterday, I introduced a measure that seeks to achieve this goal.

Congress now has the opportunity to engage in a productive, bipartisan discussion focusing on strengthening the SCHIP program.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the moment of truth has arrived. And now, our Republican friends have a very clear choice that they must make. They can stand with 10 million American kids who need, deserve and currently are eligible for health insurance under the CHIP program.

They can stand with the bipartisan majorities in the House and Senate who supported compromise legislation to reauthorize CHIP, including 18 Republican Senators and 45 House Republicans.

They can stand with the States' Governors, the American Medical Associa-

tion, the Association of Health Insurance Plans, pharmaceutical companies, nurses, children's advocates. And most important, they can stand with the American people, 81 percent of whom support expanding the CHIP program to cover more low-income children, according to a just-released CBS News poll.

This poll, of course, was taken long after the American people knew exactly what the terms of this bill are all about. Eighty-one percent, including a large, over two-thirds majority of independents and including over 60 percent of the Republicans polled, believe that we ought to move forward on this bill.

Or, Madam Speaker, House Republicans can choose today to stand with President Bush, who earlier this month broke his own campaign promise to extend insurance coverage under CHIP to millions of additional low-income American children, low-income American children.

They can choose to stand with President Bush, who continues to make inaccurate and misleading claims about the bipartisan bill that he has vetoed; claims that have been repudiated by Senators HATCH, GRASSLEY, ROBERTS and many other Republicans.

Let me remind my Republican colleagues, who I believe want to help children, as the gentleman who preceded me said, here is what President Bush told the American people 3 years ago when he was seeking their votes for re-election at the Republican National Convention, the President of the United States, 2004, seeking re-election, promising what he would do: "In a new term, we will lead an aggressive effort to enroll millions of children who are eligible but not signed up for government health insurance programs. We will not allow a lack of attention or information to stand between these children and the health care they need."

That is what President Bush said in 2004 when he was seeking the votes of the American people for re-election. Yet, the President's own proposal that he has made this year would force nearly 1 million children from low-income families who are participating in CHIP to be dropped from the present CHIP program. So his proposal not only does not add the millions that he promised to add in 2004, but it drops over 830,000 children.

In sharp contrast, Madam Speaker, through this bipartisan compromise this Congress has done exactly what the President said he would do if re-elected.

The American people have heard both sides of this issue, and they have disagreed with the President. They stand with America's children, and so must this Congress.

I urge my Republican colleagues, and the reason I say I urge my Republican colleagues, because we believe that there are very few, if any, Democrats who will not vote with the children this day.

Look at the facts. Look into your hearts. Look beyond partisanship and politics. Look at the pictures of your loved ones back in your office and ask, what if they were the ones today who needed health insurance?

Luckily, our children are covered. Our children are covered.

□ 1145

But think of the millions of children to whom President Bush referred to in 2004 that he promised to add to this critical program.

This, I suggest to all of us, is a defining moment for the Congress of the United States. Will we, as the Founding Fathers contemplated, exercise the policymaking authority, or will we once again crumble, complicit in the President's failure to respond to the views of the American public and to our children?

My friends on both sides of the aisle, let us come together. Let us come together and do the right thing for our children and for our Nation. Let's override the President's unjustified veto of this compromise, bipartisan legislation. Let us ensure that 10 million low-income children have the health care coverage they need and deserve. This will not be a partisan victory if we override this veto. It will be a victory for our children and for the President's promise.

Vote to override this veto. Vote for our children.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, this is a moment of truth for millions of American children and the hard-working families who love them. With this vote we can say yes to providing health care to 10 million children.

The Children's Health Insurance Program is pro-family and pro-work.

You know, there has been a lot said over the last 7 years about leaving no child behind. Well, today we can do something about it. The choice is clear: A "yes" vote means 10 million children receive better health care. A "no" vote will leave millions of children behind without adequate health care.

Our children don't need slogans. They don't even need good intentions. Today, they need our vote. Today, they deserve our vote.

I would ask each Member one question: If this vote meant the difference between your child or grandchild having health insurance or not, how would you vote? How would you vote?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHAD-EGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, I listened to one of my colleagues just a

moment ago say that this bill should be easy to reauthorize and should be done on a bipartisan basis, and, indeed, it should. But it is not because it has fallen victim to politics. It is victim to overreaching and political exploitation.

This is a program that is supposed to be about uninsured poor children. But the President vetoed it because the majority insisted on expanding it to already insured middle-class children and adults.

We can reform this program and keep it where it is supposed to be, and then we can move on to real health care reform. In his State of the Union address this year, the President proposed an idea to help every uninsured American, a proposal to end the outrageous discrimination by which those who have employer-based insurance get it with pretax dollars but the rest, who don't, have to pay more.

We can do better for all Americans. We can help all the uninsured. And when this veto is sustained today, as it should be, let's reauthorize this program, but then let's reform health care for all the uninsured.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

I proudly rise to vote to override the President's veto and to support 10 million children with health care.

Madam Speaker, as the chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I rise to announce that I will proudly cast my vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 976, the "State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) Authorization Act of 2007."

By vetoing the bipartisan SCHIP Authorization Act, the President vetoed the will of the American people. By vetoing this legislation, the President turned a deaf ear and a blind eye to the loud message sent by the American people last November.

I will vote to override the President's veto because I can think of few goals more important than ensuring that our children have access to health coverage. I will vote to override the President's veto because I put the needs of America's children first.

Madam Speaker, this important legislation commits \$50 billion to reauthorize and improve the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and it also makes critical investments in Medicare to protect the health care available to our Nation's senior citizens. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto.

Madam Speaker, SCHIP was created in 1997, with broad bipartisan support, to address the critical issue of the large numbers of children in our country without access to health care. It serves the children of working families who earn too much money to qualify for Medicaid, but who either are not able to afford health insurance or whose parents hold jobs without health care benefits.

Children without health insurance often forgo crucial preventative treatment. They can-

not go to the doctor for annual checkups or to receive treatment for relatively minor illnesses, allowing easily treatable ailments to become serious medical emergencies. They must instead rely on costly emergency care. This has serious health implications for these children, and it creates additional financial burdens on their families, communities, and the entire Nation.

This year alone, 6 million children are receiving health care as a result of SCHIP. However, funding for this visionary program expires September 30. Congress must act now to ensure that these millions of children can continue to receive quality, affordable health insurance.

As chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I can think of few goals more important than ensuring that our children have access to health coverage. It costs us less than \$3.50 a day to cover a child through SCHIP. For this small sum, we can ensure that a child from a working family can receive crucial preventative care, allowing them to be more successful in school and in life. Without this program, millions of children will lose health coverage, further straining our already tenuous health care safety net.

Additionally, through this legislation, we have an opportunity to make health care even more available to America's children. The majority of uninsured children are currently eligible for coverage, either through SCHIP or through Medicaid. We must demonstrate our commitment to identifying and enrolling these children, through both increased funding and a campaign of concerted outreach. This legislation provides States with the tools and incentives they need to reach these unenrolled children without expanding the program to make more children eligible.

In my home state of Texas, as of June 2006, SCHIP was benefiting 293,000 children. This is a decline of over 33,000 children from the previous year. We must continue to work to ensure that all eligible children can participate in this important program. To this end, Texas Governor Rick Perry signed legislation in June which, among other things, creates a community outreach campaign for SCHIP.

In addition to reauthorizing and improving the SCHIP program, this legislation also protects and improves Medicare. Due to a broken payment formula, access to medical services for senior citizens and people with disabilities is currently in jeopardy. Physicians who provide health care to Medicare beneficiaries face a 10 percent cut in their reimbursement rates next year, with the prospect of further reductions in years to come looming on the horizon. The budget proposed by the Bush administration does not help these doctors, or the patients that they serve.

This is extremely important legislation providing for the health coverage of 11 million low-income children, as well as protecting the health services available to senior citizens and persons with disabilities. President Bush was wrong to veto this legislation. I stand strong with the children of America in voting to override his cruel veto.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill that I do understand has expanded dental care and I do understand puts mental parity more on a par with physical disability.

But I must rise today because that number of nearly 4 million children uninsured is almost too large for me to comprehend that we haven't done something before, based upon when my daughter, struck with a malignant brain tumor and given 3 to 9 months to live at age of 4, and you all provided me, as a 31-year military veteran, with the opportunity for her to live.

But what I was most struck by was her roommate when she began her chemotherapy. A young 2½-year-old boy, where we listened and could not help in that small room hear social workers come and go for 6 hours as they tried to determine whether that young boy, struck with acute leukemia, whose parents did not have health care, would have the same opportunity as you gave my daughter; that this Nation gave them the time for not just quality of life but for life.

I rise in support of this bill to give all children what you gave me as a member of the Armed Forces.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to an individual who is now the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee, who also helped create the Children's Health Insurance Program back in 1997, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I would like to make one point perfectly clear: Republicans support health care for low-income children.

Second, I want to address something that was said on the floor the last time we considered this issue. It was said that failing to cast a "yea" vote would give new meaning to the phrase "suffer the little children." However, it's the failure of this legislation to refocus benefits on low-income children that gives new meaning to the phrase "suffer the little children."

If, as the verse continues, it is to these children "that the Kingdom of God belongs," then why is this children's program failing to serve so many children? How is it that in my home State of Michigan 87,000 eligible children don't have health care while 39,000 adults are in the program?

How is it that in Minnesota 87 percent of the enrollees in this children's program are adults?

How is it that this low-income program is covering families in New Jersey making more than \$70,000 a year? No wonder New York wanted to go over \$80,000.

Ladies and gentlemen, the answer to these questions is clear. The majority does not want a low-income children's plan. They want what Hillary Clinton called for in 1994, the first step towards nationalized, government-run, controlled health care.

We should not be diluting this children's program, and we should not be diverting money away from these low-income kids.

I am proud to have offered yesterday the Kids First Act, a bill that would return this program to its roots, insuring

low-income children, covering an additional 1.3 million American children, does not raise taxes, and is fully funded. This is the kind of legislation we should be debating instead of continuing this senseless stalemate that uses children as political pawns.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this veto override, and more importantly, I urge my colleagues to quickly compromise on this important issue and ensure that low-income American children have health care coverage.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I would just note that my good Republican colleagues have ignored one fact that is important, and that is that every time that there is an inclusion of anybody over the level of 200 percent of poverty, it is on an express waiver granted by the Republican White House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Dr. BURGESS of Denton, Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor of the House today to say that I support the reauthorization of the State Children's Health Insurance Program. It's a good program that deserves to be reauthorized. I wasn't here when it was first passed in 1997, but I believe in the original intent of this program.

Madam Speaker, I believe it is critical to focus on the most important recipients of this program: That's the poor children, poor kids first.

Madam Speaker, this debate is not about money; it is about freedom. And it is also critical to remember to focus on what is necessary to do to cover the poor kids. And every opportunity for expansion, every opportunity for expansion based on income set-asides, expanding covering adults, expanding covering people in the country without the benefit of a Social Security number, every time we expand the benefit, we limit the benefit for the poor and the near poor, the initial population that we were supposed to be covering. We can't cover those other populations at the expense of people that we are required to take care of.

Finding more of the truly eligible children is hard work. It's hard work, but it's the right thing to do. Hard work first. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today we must override the President's veto because it is the right thing to do for our children.

We have a mission, an obligation, and a mandate to provide health insurance for all of the children and override the President's veto.

We can spend millions and billions of dollars on war, but we cannot take care

of health care for our children? It would be a shame and a disgrace not to take care of the little children.

We must take care of the children. "Suffer the little children." They need our help and they need it now. Override this veto.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, as Senator GRASSLEY wrote in a letter to The Washington Post, it's fine to have a philosophical debate over the merits of this program, but opponents should be intellectually honest about what the bill does and does not do.

Despite this, the President and a few supporters are still clinging to a series of distortions and spin to try to mislead the public. The President keeps talking about families earning as much as \$83,000. If this were true, I would have voted against this program. And as for the exception for New Jersey, the \$72,000 was requested by a Republican Governor and approved by President Bush's administration. Some of the President's supporters have claimed we didn't provide a way to pay for this bill, but we did. As Americans, we want our children to be healthy and productive.

The irony did not escape me that while the President was attacking SCHIP, I was sitting in a hearing of the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member. The topic was waste and fraud in Iraq, billions of dollars. Like I said, the irony did not escape me, and it did not escape most Americans.

We must override this veto.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, is it acceptable under the rule that we are operating under, as long as we control time, to recognize a Member more than once as long as you control the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition is within the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I'm not sure I understand. Let me rephrase my question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman seeking to have another Member recognized that has already spoken?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I want to recognize myself now and then recognize myself later in the debate, because my speakers aren't here. Is that acceptable, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In controlling time the gentleman may speak more than once and may yield to another more than once.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that has been talked about in this debate is that the pending bill before us does not allow illegal aliens to receive benefits, and there is a section in the bill, section 605 that says that. But it has no enforcement. And in another part of the bill the requirement for citizenship verification is repealed, and the substitution for that is a requirement that a beneficiary or potential beneficiary simply show a Social Security number.

□ 1200

And as we all know, there are millions of fraudulent Social Security numbers floating around. So when we actually do get down to negotiating the conference after this veto is sustained, I hope that my friends in the majority will work with us in the minority to make sure that illegal aliens do not get benefits and that we have the appropriate enforcement mechanism in the bill that we send to the President.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to recognize a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished lady from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for 1 minute.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, coming from a State with one of the highest percentages of uninsured children, I know how important it is that we succeed in overriding the President's veto today.

I think it's absolutely shameful that in the United States of America, in the 21st century, in a country of such great abundance, we have to override a Presidential veto to provide essential health care to kids from lower-income, hard-working American families.

Passage of this bill is essential to ensure continued coverage for the more than 30,000 kids currently receiving their health care by the SCHIP program in Nevada. And the bill will also enable Nevada to reach out to the nearly 70,000 children currently eligible who remain uninsured and not in the program because of a lack of funding.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto. It's a shame that he vetoed this bill in the first place.

Mr. HULSHOF. Before yielding to my friend from Texas, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to a previous speaker, the gentlelady from New Hampshire, who said that she would have voted against the original bill had she known or had she believed that, in fact, a family of four making \$80,000 would qualify their children. Well, in fact, I would point the gentlelady to section 114, subparagraph A of the bill that allows income disregards.

And I would say to the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, who pointed out that, yes, it was the administration that granted the waiver, there are some on this side

who would suggest the administration has approved unwise waivers in the past. But even this administration has indicated to a particular Governor that before we allow this waiver to occur, in the instance of New Jersey, so many additional enrollees would have to meet the intent of the SCHIP program, to which the Governor said, "I don't have to abide by that." And I find that a bit difficult to swallow as we then discuss whether this should be the law of the land.

I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ten years ago, a Republican Congress created SCHIP to provide health insurance benefits to children who are uninsured, who are Americans, and whose parents represent the working poor. Yet today, once again, this Democrat Congress will try to do something else, and that is, give these same benefits to adults, to illegal immigrants, to those who are already insured, and to some of the wealthiest among us. These are the facts.

Although the program was designed for those up to 200 percent of poverty, we know today there are families of up to \$82,000 of income receiving these benefits. Although the program was designed for children, we know almost 20 States now serve more adults than children. Although the program was designed for Americans, the Democrats strip out proof-of-citizenship measures. And although the program was designed for the uninsured, CBO said this will have the effect of taking 2 million off and putting them on a government insurance program. That is wrong.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am delighted to recognize the gentlelady from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) for 1 minute.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the 179,000 children in the State of Arizona who need Congress to stand up for them.

Ten million American children need SCHIP, known as KidsCare in my home State of Arizona, because it changes their lives. For example, when Collin Bollinger was born, his mother, Sherry, did not have health insurance. Sherry was gainfully employed, but she could not afford her company's high insurance premiums and did not qualify for Medicaid. After Collin's second birthday and a series of ear infections, Sherry scraped and borrowed enough money for private insurance to cover Collin at the high cost of \$150 per month. At times, Sherry chose her son's health care over paying the rent and having a full dinner.

Then she discovered the KidsCare program; her premiums then fell by 90 percent per month. With the money that Sherry saved, she could even afford her own health insurance. Now Collin is a straight A student. He plays football at Cienega High School and leads a happy and healthy life. His mother credits KidsCare.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I just have two speakers left, the distinguished minority leader and myself. I'm prepared to do the miniclose. I assume that Ms. PELOSI is going to close for the majority, so we're kind of in a holding pattern here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize for closing speeches in the reverse order of opening: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. STARK, Mr. BARTON, and then Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I would observe that here we have three speakers before we're prepared to close. And if you would permit, Madam Speaker, the Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, will close for us.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm delighted to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER).

Mr. SHULER. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Madam Speaker, every night when we sit down, we talk to our children, we say our prayers, my wife and I, we thank God for the many blessings He has bestowed upon us, some of those blessings that we don't even recognize so much every single day, like having health care for our children. But there are children and parents every day for whom that is a constant reminder.

And here we have questions about what is important, how many children will it be. My children, age three and six, they talk about and they pray that God will bless all children. We talk about, across the aisle, I am pro-life. My distinguished colleagues across the aisle talk about being pro-life. It is time they start being pro-life today and start by overriding this veto.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the Chair of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Madam Speaker, we have a health care crisis in our country. And the President vetoing the SCHIP bill has made bad policy based on bad information. We've heard it from the floor today from the minority.

The President should know we target low-income children below 200 percent of poverty. The President should know that we focus SCHIP on children and phase out parents and childless adults that were allowed by this administration to be covered. The President should know that the bill covers 4 million children who are eligible for SCHIP but not enrolled. The President should know that we do not cover illegal alien children. It's frustrating, when we have a health care crisis in our country, that we can't cover the children.

When the White House asked Congress just recently for a special \$190 billion for the war in Iraq, over and above the hundreds of billions we've already spent, why can't we find much less than that for covering 10 million

low-income children, parents who are working in this country?

We have a health care crisis, and the Republican minority and the President have turned their back on that crisis, especially to the children.

Mr. Speaker we have a health care crisis in our country. In vetoing our SCHIP bill, the President has invoked a bad policy based on bad information.

The President should know we target low-income children below 200 percent of poverty.

The President should know we focus SCHIP on children, and phase out parents and childless adults that were allowed by his administration.

The President should know the bill covers 4 million children who are eligible for SCHIP but not enrolled.

The President should know this does not cover undocumented children. Under the President's proposal, 6 million of our children eligible for SCHIP would remain without health insurance.

And, an additional 700,000 children currently in the program would join them in the ranks of the uninsured.

If the President is so concerned about adults and middle income families in the SCHIP program, he should sign this bill which effectively addresses those concerns.

America's low-income children shouldn't suffer because the President can't get his facts straight.

More than 8 in 10 Americans support this legislation to expand SCHIP for children.

When the White House asks Congress for a special \$190 billion for the war in Iraq, over and above hundreds of billions already spent why can't they find much less to cover 10 million low-income children.

This is the people's House, and it is our duty to override this veto and listen to the American people.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I hope that we can find, as we close today and we come to this vote, enough people on both sides of the aisle who will vote to override the veto. It doesn't make much sense. There is no cost, there are no illegal aliens, there are no rich people, unless the Republicans choose to make it possible for them. It's a bill that is paid for, unlike the war, which the Republicans don't mention.

What are you going to do for that 200 or 300 billion bucks, folks, that you're spending to kill these kids when they grow up? You can't answer that, can you? You look at your shoes, look up here, you don't know.

So you don't even want to talk about \$200 or \$300 billion to kill innocent Iraqis and young men and women. There is no Member of this House that has an enlisted child over there. There is no risk for you guys.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORARE

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

Mr. STARK. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

The fact that we don't want to talk about killing children that we send to

die in a war and spend \$200 billion, we're going to shuffle on, calling things "socialism," Madam Speaker. And we're going to talk about if we only had a chance to do this a little better to make sure that illegal aliens were treated a little less fairly than they are now, we might vote for it. It's too bad. It's too bad they're voting to harm children for a bunch of really petty grievances that they have in the minority. I hope they will change their minds and vote to override the veto.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

With all respect, Madam Speaker, I don't need to be lectured to by a Member who did not even support the original Children's Health Insurance Program.

The fact is that we reached compromise 10 years ago. And I recognize that the chairman of the Health Subcommittee can ram through a bill when you've got the votes, as the original bill was done, without any input from anybody else, that it's my way or the highway. And I recognize that when you have the votes, that's one way you can try to enact legislation.

So my question still stands, after this veto is sustained, Do you want the politics or do you want the policy? I hope the latter. Because I guarantee you we can have a meeting of the minds.

Mr. CAMP and I, Mr. BOUSTANY, in fact, introduced the Kids First Act that would reauthorize this program. It's similar to the alternative in the Senate that would increase State allotments by \$14 billion over the next 5 years, that would allow 1.3 million new low-income children to be covered, that reimburses States at their Medicaid matching rate, fully offsets the bill without raising taxes, bolsters current provisions to provide premium assistance to kids who have access to private coverage so that we can better coordinate public and private programs to prevent the crowding-out effect.

So once this political effort is done, I hope we can have a meeting of the minds.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, at this time I reserve my time. I have one more speaker and then the Speaker who will be closing for us.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1215

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, what we have today is a classic case of a Washington, DC, nonintersecting conversation. Since the President vetoed this bill several weeks ago, my friends on the majority side have spent 2 weeks encouraging outside groups and perhaps their political arm, I am not sure about that, to spend millions of dollars in television and radio ads bombarding targeted Republicans to get them to change their vote.

Now, that is only the sixth time in history that we know of that a veto has not been brought to the floor immediately on the President's veto. The result is going to be that when we get to the vote in the next hour or so, the President's veto will be sustained. Then, hopefully, we will have the real bipartisan negotiations that should have started 6 or 7 months ago.

It is interesting to me that we are still having a misunderstanding about the basic facts. And the reason is, we have never had a legislative hearing in either the Ways and Means Committee or the Energy and Commerce Committee. We have not had a subcommittee markup in either of the jurisdictional committees. And we really didn't have a markup at full committee, because the original bill for SCHIP was a 500-page mammoth bill that we got at midnight the day before it was supposed to be marked up in the case of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

But once we do sustain the President's veto, we are going to have these negotiations I hope. And first we are going to talk about the kids. Both sides are talking about the kids. Well, here are the facts. Under current law, every child in America who is below 100 percent of poverty is covered by Medicaid. Both parties support that. Under current law, every child in America who lives in a family between 100 and 200 percent of poverty is covered by SCHIP if they will sign up. Now, there are some children and families that won't sign up. In Dallas, Texas, I am told that only 33 percent of the eligible SCHIP children are actually in an SCHIP program. That is a travesty. We ought to do something together to reach out to those children and those families to make sure that they either have SCHIP coverage or private insurance, that they have something. We can work together on that on a bipartisan basis.

Now, once you get above 200 percent of poverty, we have a difference of opinion. The original House bill said go to 400 percent of poverty. That bill is dead. The bill before us goes to 300 percent. It is a legitimate policy argument: If you want to go above and expand the program, how much do you expand it above 200 percent? Do you go to 300 percent? Do you go to 250 percent? The Republican alternative is, let's cover the lowest income kids first. Once we get 90 percent of those kids covered below 200 percent of poverty, let's let States go to 250 percent. That is the Barton-Deal alternative that we have the discharge petition on. But that is a legitimate policy argument.

Now, let's talk about illegal aliens. Under current law, you are not supposed to cover a child of an illegal alien. But they are covered because there is no verification enforcement system. In the pending bill, they have section 605 that says no benefit shall go to children of illegal aliens. But that is

all it says. There is no enforcement mechanism. There is no enforcement mechanism. That is something we can work on in the conference. That is something we can work on together to really put some enforcement to make sure that SCHIP benefits are for citizens and legal residents. We can work on that.

Let's vote to sustain the President's veto, and then let's work together to get a program that really is for the kids, not for adults, that really is for citizens, and that we can afford.

Well, Madam Speaker, there they go again. Once again, we are being forced by the Democratic Leadership of the House to vote on a bill that exists almost exclusively to help Democrats score political points against the President.

We're going to sustain the President's veto today, and we're going to do it because the President did the right thing by vetoing this poorly written expansion of federalized health care that leaves the poorest kids behind. Anybody who cares about needy children can vote against this bad bill proudly.

I'm both proud and concerned that Republicans had no part in writing this legislation. Proud because this bill is an embarrassment. Concerned because we're all supposed to be legislating on behalf of children, and as everybody knows, no Republican Member of this House was even asked for an opinion, much less invited to participate in writing the Democratic SCHIP bill.

I don't even think the Democrats who wrote it understand what they've done. I challenge the supporters of this bill to look people in the eye and say that they understand all of the provisions that are actually in this bill. Because I have some questions for you.

Madam Speaker, it would be a compliment to say that the so-called process which produced this bill is an abuse of our democratic system of Government. It was so much worse than garden-variety abuse. It was pathetic. Yet, I'm sure that some will show up here with a handful of talking points from your Democratic staffers who actually constructed this legislation, and you will explain to us that it is not an abomination at all, but a wondrous triumph of bipartisanship.

Give me the name of one Republican in the entire House of Representatives who directly participated in these discussions. Name just one.

I know that the authors of this bill certainly did not consult with either Mr. DEAL or myself, I know that they have not included any Members of the Republican Leadership in the House; and I'm not aware of a single Republican Member of the Energy and Commerce Committee or the Ways and Means Committee being invited to participate in this process.

And although we were excluded from the negotiations and the Democratic Leadership has repeatedly refused to hold a legislative hearing on this bill, we have learned a few facts from the official projections produced by the Congressional Budget Office, and from what I've read, this bill isn't something that I could ever support.

For example, we know that the vast majority of the people added to the SCHIP program under the Democrats' bill will either already have private health insurance or they live in

families with incomes too high to be eligible for SCHIP coverage today.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office projects that H.R. 976 will lead to over 1.2 million new enrollees will be added to SCHIP as a result of an "expansion of SCHIP and Medicaid eligibility to new populations." This means that these 1.2 million children live in families whose incomes are too high to qualify for the current SCHIP program. On the other hand, CBO projects that only 800,000 currently SCHIP eligible kids will be enrolled as a result of H.R. 976. This means that 50 percent more higher-income kids will be enrolled than currently SCHIP eligible kids.

And who will be paying for this expansion of SCHIP eligibility to higher-income families? Well, according to the Congressional Research Service, the vast majority of the \$70 billion in additional tobacco tax revenues will come from low-income families. In fact, the Congressional Research Service said that tobacco taxes are "the most regressive of the federal taxes."

So, with H.R. 976, the Democrats really are taxing the poor in order to give to the rich.

In their defense, I guess it is difficult for the Democratic Leadership to know exactly what is in their own bill since it has neither been subject to a single legislative hearing nor conferred by the House and the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I wonder if someone can explain to me why the Democratic Leadership decided to wait until just days before SCHIP expires to bring their reauthorization to the House floor. We have known for well over 10 years that the current SCHIP authorization would expire on September 30, 2007, and the Democratic Leadership in the House and the Senate have known since early November of 2006 that they would be in charge of actually producing a bill to reauthorize this vital health care program for low-income, uninsured children. Yet, here they were, a full 10 months later, jamming a bill through the House with fewer than three legislative days before the entire program expires and children's health care stops.

Well, Madam Speaker, I was not sent here by the 6th District of Texas to be quiet and do what the gentle lady from San Francisco instructs me to do. I was sent here to represent my constituents' best interests and I demand the ability to do what I have sworn to do.

We all know that the President promised to veto this version of the bill, so why did we waste precious time on a bill that we all know didn't stand a chance of ever becoming law?

While we are down here on the floor participating in this Theatre of the Absurd, the Democratic Leadership is in the back rooms trying to figure how they will extend the SCHIP program for another 6 months or a year. We all know this to be a fact, but I guess the Democrats want to pick a fight with the president so they can pretend that he is against children, and only then will they permit everybody to do the right thing and extend SCHIP.

Madam Speaker, I'm sorry it's come to this. The pettiness of this transparent political strategy to damage and weaken the president is a new low.

I'd hoped that we would not engage in this game, and it's still not too late to stop it. We could start debating how to best extend the SCHIP program so that we can actually do the job people sent us here to do. We still have a chance to write a responsible, long-term re-

authorization of the SCHIP program. Now, it's true that writing a solid, bipartisan bill will not give the Democrats the "political victory" that they are hoping for, but that's the price that Democrats will have to pay. Given that millions of needy children are depending on us, it doesn't seem like a big price.

I am ready to start today to sit down with the Majority and reach a compromise bill so we can reauthorize this program expeditiously. Short 6-week extensions are irresponsible. We can and should come up with a compromise that can be signed into law and that ensures that low income children continue to have access to the SCHIP program. We should not drag this political process out any longer than today. Let us dispense with politics and commence with legislating.

Here's a way that will get me to call the President and urge him to sign up fast.

Require that States find and enroll 90 percent of the kids under 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level before they go looking for more people with higher incomes.

States should be free to spend their own money, of course, but Federal taxpayers in 49 States shouldn't be made to subsidize the health care premiums for one State making \$80,000 a year.

No adults except pregnant women, please. No more childless couples and, beginning in 2009, and Medicaid-eligible adults should move to Medicaid.

Let's preserve the requirement that States document the citizenship and identity of Medicaid applicants. Just writing down a Social Security number doesn't make you a citizen.

A bipartisan effort could pass this bill in a week, and doing so would make sense to poor kids, their families and nearly everybody outside the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MCCREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I have with me, I am going to submit this for inclusion in the RECORD, a page from a report from the Congressional Budget Office that we received last night. This one page puts the lie to the assertion that this bill is paid for, at least in any terms that a reasonable person would agree that the bill is actually paid for. What this sheet says, in 2012, under the March 2007 baseline, CBO estimated 3.3 million people, not just children, 3.3 million people would be covered. Under the President's proposal, in his budget, CBO estimated 4 million people would be covered in 2012. If the current program with all the exceptions and waivers were continued, CBO says that in 2012, 5.3 million children will be covered. CBO says under the bill on the floor in 2012, 7.8 million people would be covered. But then they say, in 2017, 5 years later, under the President's budget, 2.9 million people would be covered. Under the current program, with all the exceptions and waivers, 5.6, and

under this bill, 1.3 million people. So you go down from 7.8 million to 1.3 million over 5 years, and you are telling

me that that is going to take place? It is not. You know it. And you are going

to have to pay for it to the tune, the CBO says, of \$40 billion.

CBO PROJECTIONS OF SCHIP AVERAGE MONTHLY ENROLLMENT (BY FISCAL YEAR, IN MILLIONS)^{1,2}

	2008	2012	2017
March 2007 Baseline ³	4.1	3.3	2.1
President's FY 2008 Budget ⁴	4.9	4.0	2.9
Maintain current programs ⁵	5.0	5.3	5.6
H.R. 976, CHIPRA ⁶	NA	7.8	1.3

¹The figures in this table include the program's adult enrollees, who account for less than 10 percent of total SCHIP enrollment. These figures represent the average number of individuals who could be covered in a typical month. The total number of individuals enrolled at any time during the year would be about 170 percent of these figures. These figures do not include enrollment in the U.S. territories.

²These enrollment figures are for SCHIP only. Relative to the baseline, the President's proposal and maintaining current programs would reduce Medicaid enrollment by shifting some children to SCHIP. In 2012, CHIPRA would also shift some children from Medicaid to SCHIP; however, in 2017 the reduced SCHIP funding levels under an extrapolation of CHIPRA would cause a shift in children from SCHIP to Medicaid. CHIPRA would increase Medicaid enrollment overall by providing financial incentives to states to enroll additional children.

³Title XXI of the Social Security Act authorizes SCHIP through 2007. Consistent with statutory guidelines, CBO assumes in its baseline spending projections that funding for the program in later years will continue at its 2007 level of \$5.0 billion.

⁴The Administration proposes funding of \$5.0 billion in 2008, \$5.3 billion in 2009, and \$6.5 billion in each of fiscal years 2010 through 2012.

⁵Assumes increases in funding sufficient to account for increases in health spending per enrollee and the projected number of enrollees (due both to population growth and increases in the number of uninsured). Also assumes no change in eligibility rules or benefit packages after 2008.

⁶CHIPRA authorizes SCHIP through 2012. For budget scoring purposes CBO has projected spending under CHIPRA through 2017, based on the funding level at the end of 2012—an allotment of \$3.5 billion per year. The 2017 enrollment figures shown there reflect that extrapolation.

Note: SCHIP = the State Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIPRA = the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007, as cleared by the Congress on September 27, 2007.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize the gentlewoman from Colorado for 1 minute.

And pending that recognition, I would just like to point out that under the Republican plan, by 2017 we probably will have killed 20,000 soldiers in Iraq spending \$200 billion.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

"I would just like to point out that under the Republican plan, by 2017 we probably will have killed 20,000 soldiers in Iraq spending \$200 billion."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The words do not descend to personality within the meaning of rule XVII. Nor do they engage in such inflammatory rhetoric as might otherwise breach decorum.

The words are not out of order.

The gentleman from California may proceed.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I stand with the 81 percent of Americans who support this bipartisan compromise bill that gives health care to 10 million poor children in this country. It builds upon the strong foundation of SCHIP and covers almost 4 million additional children.

You can use whatever words you want to talk about this bill, but here's the truth and here are the real facts: the bill does not cover adults, the bill does not cover people who are here illegally, and it does not cover the wealthy. It is fully paid for.

We in Congress should hang our heads in shame if the wealthiest country in the world refuses to provide basic health care to the children of our land. Let us rekindle the bipartisan spirit of the past and join together to reauthorize the State Children's Health Insurance Program. Let us put the

working families of this country first. Let us override this veto.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I want to yield our last minute to the distinguished minority leader from the State of the current number one college football team in the country, Ohio State, Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I am disappointed that we have reached this point. I think all of us know that Democrats want to renew the SCHIP program and Republicans want to renew the SCHIP program. We haven't been afforded the opportunity to sit down and work together to resolve the differences we might have in order to keep this important program alive and available to children in America who deserve and need good health care coverage. I hope that that opportunity to sit down and work together comes today after this vote.

In 1997, Republicans and Democrats worked together to create the State Children's Health Insurance Program. We worked to ensure that low-income children without health insurance come first. But I think all of us know that is not what has happened.

Today, there are 500,000 eligible low-income children for this program who are not covered. Yet there are some 700,000 adults around America who are covered under the Children's Health Insurance Program. I think the numbers speak for themselves. In Minnesota, 87 percent of the people on the Children's Health Insurance Program are adults. In Wisconsin, 66 percent of the people on the Children's Health Insurance Program are adults.

Madam Speaker, what we have been working towards is trying to find a way to say that we ought to insure poor children first. I know States have all kinds of ideas about how to expand this program, but let's not let this become another Washington program that starts with one principle in mind and then becomes something for everyone. Why can't we refocus the program to ensure that we help those poor children who do not have health insurance before we get into insuring adults and people beyond the low-income folks that we are trying to help?

I think the President vetoed this bill because, frankly, I think the majority sent it to him to ensure that it was vetoed. There were no conversations in this House between Democrats and Republicans on what this bill would ever look like. I don't think there was ever any intention that this bill be sent to the White House to be signed into law.

It is a point that I have made here before, and I am going to make it again: the American people are tired of all the political games. They want us to find some way to work together to resolve our differences and to help move America forward. What we have seen over the last several months on this bill, and especially the last two weeks, is an example of the political games that the American people are tired of.

Madam Speaker, when you begin to look at Congress's approval ratings, it shouldn't come to anyone's surprise in this Chamber that they are very low. And why are they low? Because I think Americans are tired of the rhetoric, they are tired of the political games, and they want us to find some way to work together to address their needs and their concerns.

Two weeks ago, when the President vetoed this bill because we didn't put poor children first, we could have had this vote right then and there. We could have had the override vote. Then we could have sat down and begun to resolve our differences. By now we could have had them resolved and we could actually be here today on a new bill that makes sure that the poor children who don't have health insurance actually get it.

Madam Speaker, what I would say to all of my colleagues is that I would hope that the political games will come to an end.

On behalf of House Republicans, I again extend this invitation to all of you: let's sit down and work together in a bipartisan manner to resolve our differences. Secondly, let's make sure that we put poor children first.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, before I yield to our Speaker to close, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD a letter from Peter Orszag, Director of the Congressional Budget Office. That office notes several things. First of all, one, this bill actually saves money for the Treasury; two, it is fiscally responsible; three, it is fully paid for.

The bill also covers approximately 10 million children in 2012, but it authorizes that only through 2012. In my Republican colleague's comparison with events in the year 2017, those comparisons are both impossible and bogus. I would note that the legislation covers 4

million more children than the administration's proposal.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 18, 2007.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to questions that we have been asked about the enclosed enrollment table that CBO circulated yesterday regarding the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), two points are worth noting. First, as indicated in footnote 2 of the table, the enrollment figures are for SCHIP only. The Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (CHIPRA) would also raise enrollment in

Medicaid by 1.3 million in 2012 relative to the baseline. Second, as indicated in footnote 6 of the enclosed table, CHIPRA authorizes SCHIP only through 2012, and the figures for 2017 are therefore based on an extrapolation of CHIPRA beyond the legislation's authorization window. Under that extrapolation of CHIPRA through 2017, SCHIP and Medicaid enrollment combined would rise relative to the baseline.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact Keith Fontenot at 226-2800.

Sincerely,

PETER R. ORSZAG,
Director.

Enclosure.

CBO PROJECTIONS OF SCHIP AVERAGE MONTHLY ENROLLMENT (BY FISCAL YEAR, IN MILLIONS)^{1 2}

	2008	2012	2017
March 2007 Baseline ³	4.1	3.3	2.1
President's FY 2008 Budget ⁴	4.9	4.0	2.9
Maintain current programs ⁵	5.0	5.3	5.6
H.R. 976, CHIPRA ⁶	not available	7.8	1.3

¹ The figures in this table include the program's adult enrollees, who account for less than 10 percent of total SCHIP enrollment. These figures represent the average number of individuals who could be covered in a typical month. The total number of individuals enrolled at any time during the year would be about 170 percent of these figures. These figures do not include enrollment in the U.S. territories.

² These enrollment figures are for SCHIP only. Relative to the baseline, the President's proposal and maintaining current programs would reduce Medicaid enrollment by shifting some children to SCHIP. In 2012, CHIPRA would also shift some children from Medicaid to SCHIP; however, in 2017 the reduced SCHIP funding levels under an extrapolation of CHIPRA would cause a shift in children from SCHIP to Medicaid. CHIPRA would increase Medicaid enrollment overall by providing financial incentives to states to enroll additional children.

³ Title XXI of the Social Security Act authorizes SCHIP through 2007. Consistent with statutory guidelines, CBO assumes in its baseline spending projections that funding for the program in later years will continue at its 2007 level of \$5.0 billion.

⁴ The Administration proposes funding of \$5.0 billion in 2008, \$5.3 billion in 2009, and \$6.5 billion in each of fiscal years 2010 through 2012.

⁵ Assumes increases in funding sufficient to account for increases in health spending per enrollee and the projected number of enrollees (due both to population growth and increases in the number of uninsured). Also assumes no change in eligibility rules or benefit packages after 2008.

⁶ CHIPRA authorizes SCHIP through 2012. For budget scoring purposes CBO has projected spending under CHIPRA through 2017, based on the funding level at the end of 2012—an allotment of \$3.5 billion per year. The 2017 enrollment figures shown there reflect that extrapolation.

Note: SCHIP = the State Children's Health Insurance Program; CHIPRA = the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007, as cleared by the Congress on September 27, 2007.

At this time it is with great pleasure and privilege that I yield the balance of my time to our distinguished Speaker for purposes of closing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend him for his exceptional leadership on this issue.

The issue of health care for Americans has been a signature issue for the Dingell family. Mr. Dingell, the distinguished chairman's father, was the author of legislation for access to health care for all Americans. He continues that tradition. He was in the chair the day and gavelled the vote on Medicare. So thank you for your years of experience and leadership, and, again, your leadership on this important issue of insuring our children.

This isn't about an issue; this is about a value. Thank you, Mr. STARK, thank you, Mr. PALLONE, for your leadership, and thanks to the distinguished Chair of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, for his important and relentless leadership on this issue.

My colleagues, as I listen to the debate today, I hear a lot of subterfuge and distractions; but the fact is that this is a discussion about America's children and it is a discussion about America. There is no industrialized country in the world that anyone respects that does not provide health insurance for its children. We are the exception. This is not a designation to be proud of.

But the American people in their wisdom have this not as an issue, but as a value, as an ethic. That is why I am so proud of what has transpired since we took our first vote on this bill. That

day I said we could establish ourselves as "the Children's Congress," and we did. Work remains to be done to bring that to fruition.

In the meantime, across our country, Democrats and Republicans, Governors and mayors, people who work with children or have the responsibility of delivering a system of health care have been advocating for this reauthorization of SCHIP that we have before us today. Every organization you can name, from AARP to YWCA, and everything in between, the American Medical Association, Catholic Hospital Association, Families USA, every organization you can name is supporting this legislation.

I am so proud, because earlier this week Easter Seals representatives covered the Hill with hundreds of advocates visiting Members' offices. We were pleased to hear from the president of Easter Seals, President James Williams, who said, "Without health care coverage, our early intervention in other programs for children cannot be successful." That is why the Easter Seals organization was here.

□ 1245

He was very eloquent in his advocacy, but no more eloquent than the young children who were here to tell us their stories.

Today, representatives of the March of Dimes, over 400 of them, are visiting offices on Capitol Hill. And Jennifer Howse, president of the March of Dimes, has stated that SCHIP "is the health insurance lifeline for millions of low-income children who have no other way to obtain coverage."

Our country has put poor children first; that's called Medicaid. The poorest of the poor children in our country

are able to receive health care through Medicaid.

I wish you could have heard the stories of some of the parents who told us, Bethany's parents who were in the other day. The press asked them if they were afraid their family would come under attack because they were lobbying for SCHIP. They said we are already under attack, but we are proud to come forward to support this initiative. We are not proud of the fact that we are low income, they said. We are trying very hard to lift ourselves up into the middle class. We work very hard not to be on Medicaid, but to be among the working poor, it is not something that we brag about, but SCHIP is something that we need.

So when the President wants to have 4 or 5 million children instead of 10 million children in his initiative, is he the one, the decider, who wants to go to that family and say, Your child is out? Bethany had heart problems from birth. She was 2 years old in July. They have been told by some people as they lobbied, The baby is better now; you don't need SCHIP anymore. Well, she does.

They said, We are not just lobbying for Bethany; we are lobbying for all of the children.

As far as the March of Dimes is concerned, and I am proudly wearing their pin, they deal with children with birth defects, and it might interest you to know that one of eight children in America each year is born prematurely, around half a million babies born prematurely. Many of those children, I am not saying all, but many of those children have ongoing conditions and preconditions that bar them from

getting any health insurance. Those children need SCHIP. They are in the category that makes them eligible.

And that category does not include people earning \$83,000 a year. So while some of you may use that as an excuse not to vote for the program, I hope you know intellectually it is not a reason to vote against this initiative. There are currently no children enrolled in SCHIP with family income of 400 percent of the Federal poverty level, \$83,000 for a family of four. In fact, 91.3 percent of the children enrolled in SCHIP are in families of four that make less than 200 percent of poverty. And 99.95 percent, just a hair under 100 percent of them, are in families under 300 percent of poverty.

So this is a sad thing. We are asking people who are working hard and playing by the rules, they are taking care of their families. They could have stayed out of work and stayed on Medicaid, but that is not what we are encouraging people to do in our country. We are encouraging them to move on and upward. And these families have to come forward and say why they have not attained the American Dream of enough wealth to afford \$1,200 a month in health insurance premiums, and that's a big order.

I am so pleased, though, that with the work they have done, Easter Seals, Red Cross and all of the organizations I mentioned earlier, and the Governors and mayors, et cetera, that now 82 percent of the American people support this initiative. If I said it before, I want to say it again.

And let me also say that there are some myths about SCHIP. Well, I don't think that they are myths; I think they are excuses not to vote for the bill. I mentioned one of them. Another one is about illegal aliens.

Clearly, the bill states "no Federal funding for illegal aliens." It says it, but it is also the law of the land. Illegal aliens do not get benefits, so don't use that as an excuse to deprive 10 million children in our country who are eligible for enrollment in SCHIP that they shouldn't get it.

This has been a bipartisan effort, and some of what has been said about SCHIP is simply not true. But don't take it from me. Senator ORRIN HATCH, former Chair of the Health Committee in the Senate, now the ranking member, said: "I believe that some have given the President bad advice on this matter because I believe supporting this bipartisan compromise to provide health coverage to low-income children is the morally right thing to do. If we were truly compassionate, it seems to me, we would endorse this program." Senator ORRIN HATCH, Republican of Utah.

Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY, former chairman of the Finance Committee, another committee of jurisdiction and now the ranking member said: "The President's claims about SCHIP are flatly incorrect. The SCHIP bill is not a government takeover of health care.

Screaming 'socialized medicine' during a health care debate is like screaming 'fire' in a crowded theater. It is intended to cause hysteria that diverts people from looking at the facts." Senator GRASSLEY, Republican Senator from Iowa.

So, my colleagues, we have a decision today to override the President's veto, which would be, in my view, the right thing to do for our children and for our country. It is not about compassion. It is about fairness. It is about fairness. And this is a bill again that has been bipartisan in its development and required enormous sacrifice from the Democrats in the House of Representatives. We had a much higher goal. This is what is achievable for the children. It should have been signed by the President. There is no reason that he has given that is consistent with the facts.

And so I urge my colleagues to think about the children, to think about Bethany and think about a little boy, Zeke, who was in my office this morning. He is the ambassador of the March of Dimes for 2007. He is 8 years old, born prematurely at a pound and a half, and now going out and speaking on behalf of the needs of other children.

The President is isolated in this. Don't join him in his isolation. Come forward on behalf of the children and let's truly send a signal that we are about the future. I tried to do that when I was sworn in by being surrounded by children. It was a spontaneous moment, but it was one that was clear in its message: We are gaveling this House to order on behalf of the children.

There is nothing more important that we have to do in our work than make sure that our children are healthy and safe. Today we have an opportunity to do that. Let's not miss that opportunity. Let's give a vote for the children and against the President's veto.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my strong support for overriding the President's veto of the State Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization. This bipartisan legislation would provide health coverage for 10 million of our most vulnerable children. It is supported by over 80 percent of the American public, as well as bipartisan majorities in the House and Senate and 43 of our Nation's Governors.

The fact that the President and the House Republican leadership continue to oppose this critical, life-saving legislation is difficult to comprehend. All of the excuses that they have trotted out for blocking this bill—that it would cover the rich, or illegal aliens, or that it would institute "socialized" medicine—have been exposed as false. This bipartisan program puts poor kids first, as reflected in the fact that 90 percent of families covered by SCHIP live under 200 percent of the poverty level. It bars coverage of illegal immigrants, as is spelled out clearly in the bill's text. In fact, the bill does not even cover legal immigrants. Finally, the SCHIP reauthorization does not institute "socialized" medicine. Seventy-seven percent

of children in the SCHIP program are covered by private insurance companies, and the American Association of Health Insurance Plans, as well as the American Medical Association and PhRMA, all support this bill. The Republicans' other excuse for opposing this bill—that we can't afford it—is disingenuous. This legislation is fully paid for with a tobacco tax. I also find it interesting that those who raise the cry of "fiscal responsibility" when it comes to a few billion dollars for poor children do not seem to have any objections to providing hundreds of billions for the President's disastrous war.

Having revealed that the Republicans' stated reasons for opposing this legislation are patently false, one is forced to wonder what is actually motivating them. I believe that the President and his supporters are blocking this legislation because they are afraid. They are afraid of SCHIP because it demonstrates that health care guaranteed by the government is workable, it is affordable, and it is popular. They worry that if SCHIP is expanded, even more Americans will begin to demand that the government guarantee health care to all our citizens, not just to poor children. After all, every other industrialized nation does so, while spending less than we do and while achieving better health outcomes for its citizens. The Republicans will apparently use every means at their disposal to ensure that health care in this country remains a privilege for those who can afford it, rather than a right guaranteed to all.

Madam Speaker, today's vote raises a moral question. Simply put: will we, as a nation, take responsibility for ensuring that all our children have necessary health coverage? All other issues raised in this debate are obfuscations meant to hide the fact that the party claiming the mantle of "family values" is in fact unwilling to back that slogan with substance. There is only one vote today that truly supports America's families. It is a vote to override this shameful veto.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today for one main reason: the 10 million low-income children in this Nation whose health, health care and wellness are very much at stake. This is especially true today as the House votes on whether to override the President's inhumane, unethical and irresponsible veto of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

We honored the promises we made to this Nation when we not only passed the Children's Health and Medicare Protection Act, the CHAMP Act, but when we exercised the art of compromise and passed a bipartisan CHIP bill that, though more modest than the CHAMP Act, still represented a respectable step in the right direction. In fact, the CHIP bill that so many of us stood behind would have provided health insurance coverage to nearly 4 million currently uninsured, low-income children. Unfortunately, despite our tireless efforts, the President opted to veto the bill that would have reduced the number of uninsured children in this Nation by nearly half.

Madam Speaker, we can and should do better, not only because we promised to, but because this Nation's children deserve it. We cannot and should not shortchange the most vulnerable among us, and we cannot and should not relent in our efforts to ensure that our Nation's low-income children have reliable

access to the health care services and treatments that they will need to be healthy and to pursue their life's destinies.

Madam Speaker, today we have yet another opportunity to reach across the political aisle and stand together to do the right thing for America's children. As I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle well know, the children who are currently enrolled and would be newly enrolled in CHIP are not undocumented residents; they are legal American citizens. Efforts to try to derail our intention to override the veto by inundating CHIP in an immigration debate are both unconscionable and inaccurate.

And, the children who are and would be covered by CHIP also are not children from wealthy or even middle-income families who could otherwise afford health insurance. The mythical \$83,000 CHIP family is just that: a myth. They are no more real than the weapons of mass destruction we invaded Iraq to find.

The reality, however, is that more than 9 in 10 children enrolled in CHIP are from families with incomes that are below 200 percent of the Federal poverty level. That means, Madam Speaker, that CHIP kids are coming from families earning less than \$41,300 a year for a family of four. These are not financially comfortable families. And, these are not families living lavishly off the backs of taxpayers. These are hardworking American families whose children's health care needs often exceed their financial means. They deserve better and their children deserve better, and we ought to override this veto to ensure that the CHIP program captures these kids and keeps them from joining the ranks of the uninsured.

It has never been lost on me or my colleagues in the minority caucuses that CHIP is a key minority health issue. In fact, 8 in 10 currently uninsured African-American kids and 7 in 10 Hispanic children are eligible but not enrolled in the program. Without health insurance, children suffer worse health outcomes and are less able to enjoy their childhoods because of illnesses that are often preventable. Overriding the President's veto, therefore, not only will help reduce uninsurance among our Nation's most vulnerable children and improve their health, but also will help us reduce the racial and ethnic health disparities that plague our health care system.

I urge all of my colleagues to override the President's veto. We not only can and should do better, but we should demand that the President do more for our children. Let's do it now for all of America's children.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise as a supporter of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, which focuses on covering children in families at or below 200 percent of the poverty level, \$41,000 per year. I have voted to extend this program and to provide additional resources to ensure that those living in families below 200 percent of the poverty level, \$41,000, have access to affordable health insurance through the SCHIP program.

Before sharing my concerns over the bill that was vetoed by the President and that we are voting on today, I would like to share with my colleagues an overview of the SCHIP reauthorization bill that I am joining in introducing today. Our bill will provide families with health care choices, health care transferability and health care security.

The bill I have cosponsored would ensure that all children between 100 percent and 200 percent of poverty are eligible to enroll in SCHIP. In addition to being able to enroll in SCHIP, these families could also decide to use their SCHIP credit to pay for the additional costs of enrolling their children in the parent's employer provided health plan. For those making between 200 percent and 300 percent of the poverty level, our bill would provide a \$1,400 per child health care tax credit. This credit would be refundable for those who have tax liability less than the amount of the credit. Parents could use this credit to pay the additional costs of enrolling their children in an employer provided health care plan or in another state licensed health care plan. This plan borrows from the proposal put forward by a broad range of organizations that run the political spectrum—from the liberal Families USA, to the Chamber of Commerce, and the American Medical Association, AMA.

The biggest question remaining after this vote is taken today is whether or not our House Democrat colleagues will do something that they have by and large failed to do so far with regard to SCHIP: invite House Republicans to participate in developing the legislation. To date, House Democrat leaders have abused the rules of debate to totally shut Republicans out of the legislative process.

Two weeks ago, rather than having an up or down vote on the President's veto, the Democrat majority chose to put off the final vote for two weeks in order to engage in political posturing and partisan attacks. Today we are holding that vote and the outcome today is no different than what it would have been two weeks ago. So, why the delay? Solely for partisan posturing. Madam Speaker, our children deserve better and it is time to stop using them as political pawns. Unfortunately, recent press reports are filled with quotes from Democrat leaders stating that they want to keep this alive as a political issue, calling for "repeated votes" and temporary extensions of SCHIP over the next year, rather than approving a long-term bipartisan bill that secures SCHIP coverage for those it was intended for—children in low-income households with family incomes of less than 200 percent of the poverty level.

I would now like to address once again, why I cannot support the bill before us. This bill: 1. Fails to place a priority on first enrolling uninsured children in households earning less than \$41,000 per year, 200 percent of the federal poverty level; 2. Expands government SCHIP subsidies to those making far more than the Federal poverty level; 3. Spends half of the additional SCHIP dollars to enroll children in the government SCHIP program who are already enrolled in private insurance; and 4. Uses budget gimmicks—like booting millions of children off of the program in 2012—in order to fool the public into believing they can fund the program for the next 5 years.

It is fiscally irresponsible to expand this program by enticing millions of children in families earning far above the poverty level to drop private coverage and enroll in the SCHIP program that cannot be sustained. In August, House Democrat leaders forced an earlier version of SCHIP through the House that cut over \$150 billion from Medicare and moved that money into SCHIP so that they would have a way to pay for millions of new SCHIP enrollees over the next 10 years, including mil-

lions of currently insured children from middle and upper middle class families.

Their plan to cut Medicare was rejected not only by Republicans but by the U.S. Senate, and most importantly by the public at large. The bill that the President vetoed is a bait and switch. This nearly triples the size of SCHIP over the next 5 years—including enrolling millions of children currently insured by private plans—only this time they have chosen to hide from the public how they plan to pay for the program for the next 10 years. They ramp up the annual SCHIP budget to nearly \$14 billion a year, and then they simply leave it to a future Congress to find a way to continue paying for the massively expanded SCHIP program. And they hand the bill to future generations of Americans. It turns out that their nearly tripling of the Federal cigarette taxes still leaves them tens of billions of dollars short. Americans should be on notice that in 2012 the Democrats will ask for another \$180 billion to continue SCHIP for another 10 years.

Particularly troubling is that by significantly expanding SCHIP enrollment eligibility to those far above the poverty level, the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, estimates that millions of new SCHIP enrollees will be children that move from private coverage to the SCHIP program. By moving children from private insurance onto the government program, this bill essentially enrolls 5 uninsured children for the price of 10. Enticing millions of children to drop private coverage and sign up for SCHIP is shortsighted and irresponsible, particularly given the multibillion dollar SCHIP budget shortfall that hits in 2012.

What we should be doing is focusing this program on enrolling uninsured children in households earning less than \$41,000 per year. Madam Speaker, our children and the American taxpayers deserve better than what the Democrat leadership has put before us today.

In February of this year, States that had overspent their SCHIP funding grants came to Congress begging for more money to "insure uninsured poor children." The root problem in many of these States was the fact that they had used their Federal grant to enroll children in the SCHIP program who were neither poor nor uninsured. New Jersey, for example had used their grant to enroll children in families with incomes of more than \$72,000, even though there were and still are over 150,000 children in New Jersey in households earning less than \$41,000 who are uninsured.

I offered an amendment in February that would have refocused SCHIP to make sure that children in families under 200 percent of the poverty level were covered first. My amendment was rejected by the liberal majority on the Committee, who stated that they had no intent to refocus SCHIP on lower income children. Rather, they planned to continue expanding the program to those well above the poverty level—to include adults and illegal immigrants—as a step toward universal government-run health care. A recent op-ed in the Washington Post, by liberal columnist E.J. Dionne Jr., removes any doubt of this goal by writing: "This battle [over SCHIP] is central to the long-term goal of universal coverage."

While the press releases about today's bill focus on uninsured low-income children, the language in the bill is about much more than uninsured low-income children. If the bill before us was focused on low-income uninsured

children, I would be voting for it. The bill before us does the opposite. It repeals recent rules requiring States to ensure that at least 95 percent of those under 200 percent of the poverty level are insured under their State SCHIP programs. Democrat leaders in Congress have responded to the rule by arguing that there is no way to ensure a 95 percent enrollment rate of uninsured children in households earning less than \$41,000 per year. They argue that since they cannot achieve the goal we should simply expand the program to those in households earning more than \$60,000 a year or more.

They use budget gimmicks to say that their bill is balanced and paid for through higher cigarette taxes. The Heritage Foundation has estimated that the amount of money Democrats estimate they will raise from higher cigarette taxes comes up billions of dollars short and that over the next 10 years they will have to find 22 million new smokers to bring in the amount of cigarette tax revenue they hope to raise. It is also noteworthy that lower-income Americans pay a higher percentage of cigarette taxes, but it is middle-income Americans that will receive most of the expanded SCHIP benefits under this bill.

I am also concerned over provisions included in the bill that repeal the requirement that individuals must prove citizenship in order to enroll in Medicaid and SCHIP. This opens the program to fraud and the enrollment of illegal immigrants. In 2006, the Inspector General, IG, of the Department of Health and Human Services found that 46 States allowed anyone seeking Medicaid or SCHIP to simply State they were citizens. The IG found that 27 States never sought to verify that enrollees were indeed citizens. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that repealing this requirement will cost \$1.9 billion.

And finally from a Florida perspective, Florida taxpayers come up short. Florida taxpayers will send \$700 million more to Washington than we will receive back in SCHIP allocations. Where will Florida taxpayer dollars end up going? Residents of California, New York, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and New Jersey will be the biggest recipients of Florida tax dollars. Yet, Florida has a higher rate of uninsured children than several of these.

Florida voters will also be asked to foot part of the bill for a \$1.2 billion earmark inserted into the 300-page bill at the last minute by the powerful chairman of the committee for his home State of Michigan.

Madam Speaker, let's open up the legislative process and develop a strong bipartisan bill. It is time to end the politics around this issue and ensure that low-income children have access to this program.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 976, which extends and expands the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP.

We have a moral obligation to cover all our children so every child in America can grow up healthy. It's the right thing to do; it's also the cost-effective thing to do.

The great Minnesotan Hubert H. Humphrey once said that a key moral test of government is how we treat those who are in the dawn of life, the children. We must not flunk this moral test.

My home State of Minnesota started covering children through its medical assistance

program even before SCHIP was created, but we still have far too many children without coverage—73,000 kids.

That's why I strongly support extending and expanding SCHIP. I also hope we can work together to provide greater access to private insurance coverage for America's children and other uninsured Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support overriding the veto. We cannot afford to wait any longer. It's time to break down the barriers to health care for our kids. It's time to reauthorize SCHIP. It's time that all kids have a chance to grow up healthy.

This legislation passed both the House and Senate with strong bipartisan support, and it deserves to become law.

Let's put children's health first and do the right thing. Let's override the veto of the SCHIP reauthorization and reduce the number of uninsured children by at least 70 percent.

There is no better investment than to invest in the health and well-being of America's children.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, since its inception in 1997, I have been a steadfast proponent of SCHIP, known in Georgia as PeachCare for Kids, and I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in sustaining this successful program by voting to override the President's veto.

Let me first say that, while my support of children's health care has been unwavering, this is not a perfect bill. Like many of my colleagues, some provisions in the bill concern me. But let us not let "perfect" be the enemy of the "good."

On health care, our country faces a tremendous challenge, and while disagreement still impedes finding creative solutions to encourage responsibility for health care to solve problems of access for adults, it is our moral imperative to rise up and meet these challenges for our Nation's children. Furthermore, as Members of this body, it is our solemn duty to protect the youngest and most vulnerable among us. This legislation presents us with such an opportunity.

It is disappointing to see the administration throwing up so many roadblocks. Indeed, this administration has proven its willingness to "rise up and meet" other challenges. Beyond that, it has proven its willingness to sign blank checks for a military operation with an ever-changing, increasingly expensive mission. For the past 4½ and years we have been engaged in an overseas conflict that has taken a large toll on this country—in terms of both human life and taxpayer money. While it is of utmost importance to ensure our troops continue to have every dollar, dime, nickel, and penny they need to fight this war, we must not neglect our domestic priorities.

The SCHIP reauthorization asks the administration to rise up and meet the challenge of one of those domestic priorities. Plainly, the bill asks for just 41 days worth of Iraq war funding to embark on a clearly-defined, targeted, and morally justifiable mission—providing American children from low-income families with comprehensive health care.

That's right—just 41 days worth of Iraq war funding would pay for the entire SCHIP bill. Just one week of the Iraq war would pay for 1.7 million children. That's enough to cover all the children eligible for SCHIP in Georgia, as well as several other States. One week of war funding would do all that.

To my colleagues opposing this legislation, let me reiterate something many know very well: the President, recently, asked for compromise legislation.

This bill, in fact, represents a compromise, as evidenced by its broad bi-partisan support. Forty-three of our Nation's Governors, including Governor Sonny Perdue of Georgia, support this legislation, as do 270 organizations representing millions of Americans, 68 Senators and a majority of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join the bi-partisan majority and vote in favor of overriding the President's veto.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I will vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 976. As the only former State schools chief serving in Congress, my life's work has been to provide for a better future for the next generation, and health care is critically important to that effort. There is no doubt that the State Children's Health Insurance Program, or SCHIP, has served this Nation well and must be reauthorized and expanded. The Congressional Research Service reported this week that, at current funding levels, 21 states would run out of SCHIP money before the end of the current budget year, and funding for North Carolina would only provide coverage for needy children through May 2008.

In North Carolina, over 250,000 children who would otherwise have gone without insurance have been served by North Carolina's Health Choice. The services they get through Health Choice—regular checkups and preventative care, doctor and hospital visits when they are sick, and ongoing dental and vision benefits—make sure that North Carolina's children are as healthy and productive as possible and grow up to fulfill their best potential. Untreated illnesses can have long-term consequences, and ensuring access to health care, as SCHIP does in North Carolina and across the country, allows children to remain healthy and strong and head off expensive treatments down the road. As a nation, we must follow through on the promise of SCHIP to protect our most vulnerable citizens.

SCHIP is not government-run medical care as some have falsely claimed. SCHIP is an effective initiative to extend health insurance to working families who otherwise cannot afford to send their children to the doctor when they are sick. In North Carolina, this has meant providing a physician-directed managed care system modeled on health insurance for children of state employees and teachers. North Carolina has about the best child health programs of any state, providing seamless cost-effective care for thousands of at-risk children, each year reducing costs and becoming more effective at providing health care.

The funding increase in H.R. 976 is necessary to address shortfalls in the current SCHIP funding plan, and to allow states to reach more eligible but uninsured children. The bill expands health care coverage to 10 million children in America over the next five years. In North Carolina the \$35 billion in this legislation translates into 210,000 covered children, an increase of 90,000 children. Only kids aged 6–17 with families below 200 percent of the poverty level are covered by SCHIP in North Carolina. Even if some of these children have had private insurance for some of the time, their parents only were able to afford it by cutting back on other necessities. We owe it to these children to ensure

that they are continuously covered and can get the health care they need when they need it. I wholeheartedly support the increased funding and the guidelines for states in this legislation.

I have withheld my support for this bill in the past due to my concerns about the bill's funding mechanism, and I continue to be concerned about the impact of a tobacco tax increase on North Carolina's rural communities. I am working with the leadership of the House of Representatives to craft an effective disaster relief package that will assist North Carolina's farmers and help to counter any negative impact. As the Chairman of a key Agriculture Subcommittee, I will continue to work to address the needs of farm country, including finishing the Farm Bill with a real safety net for farm families and pursuing disaster relief for drought-stricken regions like North Carolina. Should the veto override fail, I will continue to urge the Congressional leadership to write a new bill that funds SCHIP without placing the burden of funding on the backs of North Carolinians.

After careful consideration, I will vote to override the President's veto, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the children of America's working families.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, for the last two weeks the Democrats have continued their political games. They have failed to correct the inherent flaws in this legislation and at a closer section by section look it is clear this legislation contains numerous errors.

Section 101: provides an appropriation of \$9 billion in 2008, 25 percent more than governors of both parties have told CMS would be necessary to fully fund SCHIP next year.

Section 211: provides a new citizenship documentation option, but what this new provision does is completely erase the stricter citizenship requirements enacted in the Deficit Reduction Act. The Social Security Administration states that this provision will not guarantee that applicants who use false Social Security Numbers will be identified thus clearly opening the door for millions of illegal aliens becoming enrolled.

I hope the other side stops using these children as political pawns and crafts sound legislation that does not throw away tax dollars for votes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of overriding the President's veto of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007.

I was deeply disappointed that the President exercised his veto pen on a bicameral and bipartisan bill. Not so long ago, the President pledged to expand coverage of CHIP to include eligible children who are not yet enrolled in the program. In his September 2004 speech to the Republican National Convention, the President stated—and I am quoting here, "We will lead an aggressive effort to enroll millions of poor children who are eligible but not signed up for the government's health insurance programs. We will not allow a lack of attention, of information, to stand between these children and the health care they need." With this veto, the President has reversed course and turned his back on America's children.

The CHIP Reauthorization Act would reauthorize and improve the very successful Children's Health Insurance Program for 5 years. This bipartisan bill would preserve coverage for the six million children currently enrolled

who otherwise would have access to health insurance while extending coverage to 3.8 million children who are already eligible, but not enrolled in the program. The bill also includes guaranteed dental coverage and mental health parity in the CHIP program. By reauthorizing this very important program, we will strengthen CHIP by improving the quality of health care children receive and at the same time increase health insurance coverage to one of the most vulnerable segments of our society.

This legislation is paid for. It increases the tobacco tax by 61 cents to a total of one dollar. Increasing the tobacco tax will save billions in health costs and is one of the most effective ways to reduce tobacco use, especially among young children. In short, raising the tobacco tax will prevent thousands of children from starting to smoke and the proceeds of the tax will be used to provide health coverage for children. That is a win-win result.

Madam Speaker, we should do the right and moral thing and override this veto. I strongly urge my House colleagues to override the President's veto on this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. EVERETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to this attempt to override the President's veto of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (H.R. 976). This bill expands a good program far beyond its original intent, and opens the door to government controlled healthcare. The SCHIP program was created 10 years ago under a Republican led Congress to fill a gap of uninsured, low-income children whose families fell into a salary bracket too high to receive funds under Medicaid. This bill, however, takes this money and gives it to adults, illegal immigrants, and children whose parents are currently making up to \$82,000 a year. This bill would encourage more and more children to move from private health care to health care coverage from the Federal government. According to the Congressional Budget Office, as many as two million children would make this shift.

The Liberal spin machine has tried to frame the veto as "anti-children", while denying the American people the facts. This bill would cost the American people \$60 billion over 5 years. This is a \$35 billion increase over the current program, and is \$30 billion more than the President said he would support. Even the funding sources of this bill have been hidden from the general public. This bill would add a 61 cent tax to every pack of cigarettes, which the Democrats claim will curb smoking among children. This line of thought, however, is intrinsically flawed by the fact that 22 million new smokers will be required to pay for the cost of this bill. How can anyone be anti smoking when they need the very revenue it creates to pay for the healthcare of children? In addition, in 2012, the funding for this program will all but disappear. After a 5-year campaign of signing up as many middle-class children, adults and illegal immigrants as possible, program funds will be cut by 80 percent. This will cause millions of children to be dropped from their healthcare programs, or require an even more extensive funding expansion and burden on the taxpayers.

While supporters of H.R. 976 claim the bill does not allow Federal payments for illegal residents, it severely weakens Federal law to leave those individuals a gaping loophole. Existing law requires documentation proving one's citizenship in order to be covered under

Medicaid and SCHIP, however, this bill would merely require a name and social security number. According to Social Security Administration Commissioner Michael Astrue, a Social Security number would not keep someone from fraudulently receiving coverage under Medicaid of SCHIP if they claimed they were someone that they were not.

Two weeks after the President vetoed the bill the Democrat Leadership has decided to play politics and gamble on the health of these children before having this override vote. This stalling tactic has done nothing but shorten the time we have until this program expires. I am proud to sustain the President's veto and I sincerely hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle care about these children enough to create a bill that everyone can stand behind, as it was when the program first began. I urge a "no" vote on the motion to override the President's veto.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the President's veto. It is important for the American people to understand that this debate is not about whether or not to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, but how we reauthorize it. This bill completely misses the mark. It is a massive expansion of a government-run program that takes resources away from the very children it was meant to help.

In this country there are millions of low-income uninsured children who are currently eligible for government help, but are not enrolled. I firmly believe it is our responsibility to cover the neediest of America's kids first.

The bill the President vetoed did just the opposite.

The Democrats' bill diverts money away from those who need it the most in order to cover kids who already have private health insurance. One in every three kids covered under this bill already has private health insurance coverage. Because the Democrats care more about how much they can expand taxpayer funded entitlement programs rather than helping those who actually need help, I will vote to sustain the President's veto.

Out of respect to the American taxpayer and the uninsured kids who need our help—Congress can and should pass a more fiscally sound bill that puts the poorest kids first.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of reauthorizing a program that has proven to be crucial to the lives of children across the Nation. The State Children's Health Insurance Program—or SCHIP, as it is known—provides access to health care for 6.6 million children. Through bipartisan efforts, Congress is trying to expand eligibility to nearly 4 million additional underserved and uninsured kids, but the President a few weeks ago decided to ignore the will of the people and veto the bill to renew this popular, worthy and socially responsible program.

I can't overstate how extraordinarily troubling this veto is. Rather than spending the \$3.50 a day it would cost to provide health insurance for these children, the President instead has cynically claimed the mantle of fiscal responsibility. Had he not already presided over the largest increase in government spending since the New Deal, this claim might not ring as hollow as it sounds. Let's be clear: the President has chosen insurers and tobacco companies over the well-being of more than 10 million children and their families.

This is the wrong issue and the wrong time to pander to business interests.

Madam Speaker, it is unconscionable that American families must choose between buying a warm coat for the winter and having their children immunized. No American families should have to choose between putting food on the table and getting a life-saving operation for their son or daughter.

We go back to our respective districts and meet the people who are forced to make these sorts of decisions on a daily basis. We feel and see the utter insanity of vetoing \$3.50 a day for health coverage for our neediest children. As members of the House of Representatives, we speak directly for the American people and we come to the floor to vote with their hopes and wishes foremost in our minds.

Each day that we fail to provide basic health care to kids, is a day we have failed as leaders.

Congress is The People's House, and we have a duty to represent the needs of the American people, not of multi-billion dollar international insurance companies. This administration has sided with big business too many times and at too heavy a cost to the little guy.

Republican President Calvin Coolidge once said, "The business of America is business," and it seems that the current President agrees with him. I say that this Congress' business is the people's business. I urge my colleagues to override the President's veto and allow an entire generation of America's children to grow up healthy.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, the day is finally here. Today, the American people will see what this body is really made of and where members stand on the issue of children's healthcare. Is this body willing to stand up to the President and override his veto? Or are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle going to fold like a house of cards and follow this President right off a cliff?

The choice is easy—you are either for healthcare for 10 million children or you are not. You can equivocate all you want and come up with an excuse that is politically expedient, but when it comes down to it, there is no way to hide from your vote.

When that voting board lights up this afternoon, we will know and remember those who let 10 million children and their families down. The President and most of the Republicans in Congress will tell you that we can't afford this bill, but don't let them fool you. This bill is fully paid for, unlike the half a trillion dollars that we have already spent in Iraq.

And keep in mind, the members that vote against this bill today are going to turn right around and vote for \$190 billion more dollars for the war in Iraq. Unfortunately, it's the children that end up with the short end of the stick. The children the President is refusing to insure today are the same ones that will be forced to foot the bill for the war in Iraq tomorrow.

But you have a chance to make things right today, to set the record straight. You can show your constituents and this country that you care about the millions of uninsured American children more than continuing this disastrous war.

Please, don't let these children down. They need your vote. Vote to override this misguided veto.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the vote to override

the President's veto of H.R. 976, the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. While the bill vetoed by President Bush was a watered down version of the bill passed by the House, it was at least a step in the right direction.

The SCHIP bill that Congress sent to the President was a bipartisan effort that renews and improves the Children's Health Insurance program, providing health care coverage for 10 million children. This bill preserves coverage for the 6 million children currently covered by SCHIP and expands coverage to nearly 4 million more uninsured children.

Madam Speaker, two-thirds of Americas' uninsured children are currently eligible for SCHIP or Medicaid but are not enrolled for various reasons. This bill gives states the resources and incentives to enroll, those children.

The President's budget proposal would have increased SCHIP by \$5 billion over the next 5 years. This increase fails to cover the costs of simply maintaining the current SCHIP enrollment of 6 million children. In fact, according to the Congressional Budget Office, over the next 5 years, the President's budget would result in over 1 million children losing their SCHIP coverage.

Madam Speaker, the SCHIP reauthorization is supposed to be a bill to expand coverage, not reduce it. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the vote to override the President's veto of SCHIP. I do so because the President's objections to government health insurance for low income children are outrageous.

That said, I still believe, the bill's failure to provide coverage for legal immigrants is reprehensible. All children deserve health care coverage. Health care is a right, not a privilege. The denial of a lifesaving service based on an arbitrary length of citizenship is simply wrong.

It is the responsibility of Congress to address the main difficulties that prevent legal immigrant children from gaining access to health care. This bill does exactly the opposite. Thus I felt compelled to vote against the bill after the Senate negotiators refused to provide health benefits to legal immigrant children. Negotiating away health care for 400,000–600,000 children as a political compromise is not acceptable.

The President has vetoed the bill because he calls it a step toward socialized medicine. This perennial straw-man is trotted out when meritorious arguments are lacking. In fact, SCHIP uses private doctors and private health care plans. More importantly, however, the President is fond of ignoring the volumes of literature showing that government-run health insurance programs that use private hospitals and doctors like Medicare and Medicaid, deliver higher quality care at lower costs with higher rates of satisfaction than private insurance plans. According to a 2007 article in the journal, *Health Affairs*, administrative costs of private plans were about twice as much as those for Medicaid. Medicare's overhead costs are approximately 3 percent while those of the private sector are closer to 31 percent.

That is one of the main reasons that H.R. 676, the Expanded and Improved Medicare for All Act, is the best cure for our health care ills. It captures the enormous savings to be had if Americans had health care provided through

Medicare and uses them to cover everyone for all medically necessary services with no co-payments, no deductibles and now premiums. That is how wasteful private insurance is. Providing cheaper coverage through the private sector simply leaves Americans with dangerously weak coverage. About 50 percent of all bankruptcies in the U.S. are related to medical bills. Of those with medically related bankruptcies, about 75 percent had insurance before they got sick. Their so-called "coverage" did not cover them. They were, in fact, underinsured. The President chose to ignore this crisis by vetoing a bill that would have not only covered uninsured children but provided better coverage for many who are one illness away from losing their money and their home.

The provisions in the bill would make substantial and crucial progress in providing health care for all American children. It would provide coverage for 3.8 million more children than are covered now and preserve coverage for 6.6 million more. It would help ensure Ohio can expand its program to include an additional 20,000 children. It targets the lowest-income uninsured children for outreach and enrollment, ensures dental coverage and mental health parity.

The President was fundamentally wrong to veto the SCHIP bill. He needs to understand the economic and moral realities behind SCHIP. I cast my vote to express that.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I will vote to override the President's veto of this urgently needed legislation.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said "of all the forms of inequality, injustice in health care is the most shocking and inhumane." H.R. 976 does not end health care inequality, but it would have provided continued coverage for children not covered by Medicare but whose parents cannot afford to buy insurance and whose employers do not provide it.

These children—currently 6 million of them—are now eligible for coverage under the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP)—but that program is set to expire and the President should have accepted this compromise legislation. Because the President does not accept this bi-partisan compromise bill, these 6 million will no longer have access to quality, affordable health insurance.

This legislation would assure continued coverage for those now enrolled and would provide coverage for an additional 4 million children who currently qualify, but who are not yet enrolled under CHIP.

I believe that health care should be a right, not a privilege, and this act is a step in the right direction toward that goal. So, I support this bill although I wish it went further.

Despite claims by some, this bill does not change the basic nature of the CHIP program. Instead, it maintains current eligibility requirements for CHIP. The majority of uninsured children are currently eligible for coverage—but better outreach and adequate funding are needed to identify and enroll them. This bill gives states the tools and incentives necessary to reach millions of uninsured children who are eligible for, but not enrolled in, the program.

Earlier this year, I voted for the "CHAMP" bill to extend CHIP. The House of Representatives passed that bill, and I had hoped the Senate would follow suit. It would have increased funding for the CHIP program to \$50 million, instead of the lesser amount provided

by this bill. The CHAMP bill would have also addressed major health care issues, first by protecting traditional Medicare and second by addressing the catastrophic 10 percent payment cuts to physicians who serve Medicare patients.

However, the bill vetoed by the President represents a compromise between the House and the Senate and deserves support today. It will pay for continued CHIP coverage by raising the federal tax by \$0.61 per pack of cigarettes and similar amounts on other tobacco products. According to the American Cancer Society, this means that youth smoking will be reduced by 7 percent while overall smoking will be reduced by 4 percent, with the potential that 900,000 lives will be saved.

H.R. 976 has the support of the American Medical Association, American Association of Retired Persons, Catholic Health Association, Healthcare Leadership Council, National Associations of Children's Hospitals, American Nurses Association, US Conference of Mayors, NAACP, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, and United Way of America.

It is imperative that we vote to override this veto in order to protect those that are most vulnerable in our society by increasing health insurance coverage for low-income children. I hope that we have the opportunity to take up the other important Medicare issues addressed in the CHAMP bill soon.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this effort to override the President's veto of H.R. 976, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Reauthorization bill.

Virtually everyone with a stake in public health and health care is calling for this bill to be passed. There are 270 groups supporting this bill: 43 Republican and Democratic governors, including Governor Schwarzenegger, the American Medical Association, AARP, America's Health Insurance Plans (AHIP), the Healthcare Leadership Council, and Catholic Charities, among others.

There are at least 10 million reasons to insure the children of our Nation because 10 million children don't have healthcare coverage today.

The bill provides dental care, mental health benefits, and other medically necessary benefits that are part of the program.

The bill provides coverage to expectant mothers.

The bill allows States to provide assistance for CHIP-eligible kids to secure private insurance through a parent's employer-sponsored coverage.

The bill is fully funded by a 61-cent per pack increase in the tax on cigarettes.

The opponents of this bill are hiding behind the thinnest arguments.

They say there are only 500,000 uninsured kids who are eligible for CHIP that we need to enroll. This is incorrect. According to the Urban Institute, there are more than 6.6 million low-income children who qualify for CHIP but are yet to be enrolled. This bill provides States with the resources and incentives to ensure these kids get the coverage they're eligible for.

The President says the program will cover children in families with incomes of up to \$83,000 a year. Senator GRASSLEY, the Ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, disputes this charge, saying "the president has been served wrong information about what our bill will do." In fact, the bill provides

incentives for States to enroll children below 200% of poverty and any State that chooses to provide more generous coverage must get approval from the Administration.

Opponents assert that the bill increases taxes on "working people." The truth is it increases taxes on smokers. Not only does this help pay for the program, but according to the Institute of Medicine, by increasing the tobacco tax, there will be a decrease in tobacco use, particularly among young people.

Opponents assert the bill will cover adults not children. Although the program has been used to cover adults in the past, this practice will be phased out over the next two years.

Opponents assert that the bill gives coverage to undocumented aliens. There is nothing in the bill that would provide such coverage. In fact, the bill says, "nothing in this act allows federal payment for individuals who are not legal residents."

The moment has arrived for the House of Representatives to override the President's veto of the Children's Health Insurance Program, and when we do, we will stand next to the children and on the side of a brighter future for them and our entire country.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, this is the choice we have to make today. We stand up for our children and their future or we stand down with the President and tobacco companies. Good health or no health for millions of poor and disadvantaged children across America—that is what's at stake today.

The President will spend \$50 billion in 5 months on a war in Iraq, but he won't spend \$35 billion over 5 years on poor and vulnerable kids. We pay for SCRIP but we will keep paying for the war for decades to come. We take care of our children while the President passes his war costs on to our children, and grandchildren.

We can vote to provide access to quality, affordable health care for our Nation's children by voting to override this veto, or we can vote to sit back and watch the economic security of our working families erode day by day, as this Administration has done.

The President said he is using his veto pen on SCRIP to show he is relevant, but with the stroke of a pen he has merely shown he is irresponsible with the health and welfare of America's future.

Let's set a good example for our children and support a bipartisan, fiscally responsible, health care bill that will get us one step closer to universal coverage for all Americans.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, in Massachusetts, we have begun to address the crisis of the uninsured. We believe health care is a right, not a privilege for the wealthy.

The president's veto of the bipartisan SCHIP compromise abandons 11 million children, including 90,500 Massachusetts children. That is unacceptable.

I wish President Bush would take the time to meet hardworking families like the O'Neils of Fall River. They were just blessed with their first child, Sean. Dad works several jobs while his wife recovers her health.

But the cost of all those doctors' visits and immunizations add up. Thanks to SCHIP, Sean is a happy, healthy baby.

But thanks to the President's veto, my proactive State exhausted its SCHIP allotment on October 1. Even with the extension, all of its funds will be gone by January 11.

To justify his position, the President has decided to distort what this good bill actually

does. It doesn't cover well-off families. It doesn't cover illegal immigrants. What it does do is give a hand to millions of families who are struggling to provide health care for their kids.

I simply don't understand the President's priorities. He's more than happy to sign bills giving billions of tax breaks to oil companies and multi-millionaires, but he won't sign a modest, fully-paid-for bill that helps millions of low-income children? He's willing to spend hundreds of billions of dollars—none of it paid for—in Iraq but is unwilling to sign a bill that is paid for and will keep children from losing their health care?

That makes no sense to me.

This bill has the support of the medical community, children's advocates, and even the insurance industry. There is simply no reason for the President to reject it, other than partisan politics.

I will continue to fight for this important program, and I urge all of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to do the same.

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, this is a defining moment for the state of health care in this Nation . . . a defining moment for this Congress . . . and a moment when the country will watch this government take sides.

The State Children's Health Insurance bill is one of the best pieces of bipartisan legislation the House has considered in a decade. It lays bare the most significant difference between what this Congress supports and what the President—and those who stand with him in support of his veto—supports.

Supporters of SCHIP stand with working families and children . . . opponents here in Congress—and the President—stand with insurance companies. The President's veto cut off health care for over 120,000 kids in Texas.

There's just no lipstick to pretty up this pig. The President's veto was downright mean. He leaves a legacy of a war he won't pay for and children he won't give health care to. Being for war and against kids is an awful record and a horrible legacy.

Those who stand with the President today in sustaining his veto of this bipartisan bill will bear the ridicule of that record the next time they face the voters.

Those who do an unpopular thing—knowing it is the right thing to do—are rewarded by history. History will accurately note that those supporting the President in this veto are doing the bidding of the health insurance companies, at the expense of our children. Those supporting the President's veto are doing the wrong thing for the wrong reasons.

Congress created SCHIP in 1997 with broad bipartisan support. This year, 6 million children have health care because of SCHIP. The program has worked well in Texas. This has been an excellent investment for our nation, given that health care costs without insurance would be much more expensive.

The President highlighted his support for SCHIP while running for re-election in 2004. Today he—and those who stand with him in sustaining this veto—show their true colors: say one thing in political campaigns, do another when the moment comes to record your vote . . . when the rubber hits the road.

I urge my colleagues to override this veto. We are the last hope of children and families all over this country. They are watching us—all of us.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, today the House of Representatives has an historic

opportunity to provide health insurance for 10 million children from low-income families. In fact, when the House takes up a motion to override the President's veto on the State Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Reauthorization Act, it will be the second time in as many months that Congress votes to provide low-income, working families with health insurance for their children.

This legislation, passed by Congress in September, is an essential step in providing better access to healthcare for the 47 million uninsured individuals in this country, 5 million of whom are children. One could argue that the state of Texas, which has the highest percentage of uninsured individuals of any state in the Nation, needs this bill the most. Texas is home to a staggering 1.4 million children who lack even the most basic health insurance.

The CHIP Reauthorization that President Bush vetoed provides health insurance for 10 million underprivileged American children. The bill adds \$35 billion for the CHIP program over the next 5 years. It maintains coverage for the 6 million children who are already enrolled, and allows for an additional 3.8 million who are already eligible for the program to start receiving benefits.

Instead of supporting this modest expansion, President Bush wants to increase funding for CHIP by a mere \$5 billion over the next 5 years. Such a proposal would not allow for any new eligible, uninsured children to enroll in the program. In fact, according to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, President Bush's proposal would result in 840,000 children losing their CHIP coverage.

We cannot in good conscience enact a program that will push children from the CHIP rolls. I will stand behind the Congressionally-passed CHIP authorization and hope that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me and override the President's veto today.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, it's disappointing that the Administration and many Republicans can't get their priorities in order and support an expansion of SCHIP. The Administration's veto of H.R. 976, the Children's Health and Medicare Protection Act, shows just how far its priorities are from the rest of this country.

The Administration said it's too expensive. Yet the Administration has had no trouble spending half-a-trillion dollars on the occupation of Iraq. The Administration's priorities are clear: Unlimited money for occupation, no money for kids. Currently, we're spending about \$14 million dollars per hour on the occupation. That means we could provide medical, dental, and mental health care to more than 10,000 low-income children for the cost of just one single hour in Iraq.

This bill was an opportunity for us to stand up and say that 10 million of our Nation's children deserve health coverage and access to dental and mental health services. In California, that would have provided 607,000 additional children with health insurance. By vetoing this bill, the Administration has turned its back on these children.

Additionally, the Administration has abandoned its promise to our Nation's military service members and their families. This legislation amends the Family and Medical Leave Act, the landmark workplace protection legislation passed 14 years ago, to provide the

spouse, child, parent, and next of kin of an injured service member with six months of unpaid, job protected leave to care for their wounded loved one. This language is identical to the bipartisan bill, H.R. 3481, the Support for Injured Servicemembers Act, which Chairman GEORGE MILLER and I have championed in the House and Senators CHRISTOPHER DODD and HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON have fought for in the Senate. We have a moral obligation to honor our military families, who should never have to choose between keeping their jobs and support and meeting the needs of their loved ones. As the Chairwoman of the Workforce Protections Subcommittee, I believe we can no longer afford to deny these dedicated men and women the urgently needed protections included in this bill.

Children are 25 percent of our population but 100 percent of our future. I look forward to working with my fellow Members to continue to protect the health and well-being of our Nation's most valuable resource: its children.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, despite all the rhetoric about the State Children's Health Insurance Program which was created by Republicans, the fact remains that we all want low-income children to have access to health care. The only difference is that Republicans have stood by the principle of covering poor children first and not covering adults, illegal aliens, and those already covered by private insurance.

The President's SCHIP proposal provides an increase of \$5 billion to cover those who are currently enrolled and the 500,000 children eligible but not yet covered. The billions more in spending that the Democrats are requesting will use taxpayer dollars to provide health care for individuals SCHIP was never meant to cover. Additionally, the Democrat proposal pulls the rug out from underneath these children when funding to the program is drastically cut in 2012.

When you take the Democrat legislation at face value and look past the political rhetoric and the demagoguery, the Republican proposal to promote SCHIP is best for families and children.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 273, nays 156, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 982]

YEAS—273

Abercrombie	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Ackerman	Berman	Braley (IA)
Allen	Berry	Brown, Corrine
Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Buchanan
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Capito
Baca	Bono	Capps
Baird	Boren	Capuano
Baldwin	Boswell	Cardoza
Barrow	Boucher	Carnahan
Bean	Boyd (FL)	Carney
Becerra	Boyda (KS)	Castle

Castor	Jones (OH)	Ramstad
Chandler	Kagen	Rangel
Clarke	Kanjorski	Regula
Clay	Kaptur	Rehberg
Cleaver	Kennedy	Reichert
Clyburn	Kildee	Renzi
Cohen	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Conyers	Kind	Richardson
Cooper	Kirk	Rodriguez
Costa	Klein (FL)	Ross
Costello	Kucinich	Rothman
Courtney	LaHood	Royal-Allard
Cramer	Lampson	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Langevin	Rush
Cuellar	Lantos	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Salazar
Davis (AL)	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Latham	T.
Davis (IL)	LaTourette	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Lincoln	Lee	Sarbanes
Davis, Tom	Levin	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
DeGette	Lipinski	Schwartz
Delahunt	LoBiondo	Scott (GA)
DeLauro	Loeback	Scott (VA)
Dent	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Dicks	Lowe	Sestak
Dingell	Lynch	Shays
Doggett	Mahoney (FL)	Shea-Porter
Donnelly	Maloney (NY)	Sherman
Doyle	Markey	Shuler
Edwards	Matheson	Simpson
Ehlers	Matsui	Sires
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton
Ellsworth	McCollum (MN)	Slaughter
Emanuel	McDermott	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Engel	McHugh	Snyder
English (PA)	McIntyre	Solis
Eshoo	McMorris	Space
Etheridge	Rodgers	Spratt
Farr	McNerney	Stark
Fattah	McNulty	Stupak
Ferguson	Meek (FL)	Sutton
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Tanner
Fossella	Melancon	Tauscher
Frank (MA)	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Thompson (MS)
Giffords	Miller (NC)	Tiberi
Gilchrest	Miller, George	Tierney
Gillibrand	Mitchell	Towns
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Tsongas
Gordon	Moore (KS)	Turner
Green, Al	Moore (WI)	Udall (CO)
Green, Gene	Moran (KS)	Udall (NM)
Grijalva	Moran (VA)	Upton
Gutierrez	Murphy (CT)	Van Hollen
Hall (NY)	Murphy, Patrick	Velázquez
Hare	Murphy, Tim	Visclosky
Harman	Murtha	Walsh (NY)
Hastings (FL)	Nadler	Walz (MN)
Herseth Sandlin	Napolitano	Wasserman
Higgins	Neal (MA)	Schultz
Hill	Oberstar	Waters
Hinche	Obey	Watson
Hinojosa	Olver	Watt
Hirono	Ortiz	Waxman
Hobson	Pallone	Weiner
Hodes	Pascarell	Welch (VT)
Holden	Pastor	Wexler
Holt	Payne	Wilson (NM)
Honda	Pelosi	Wilson (OH)
Hooley	Perlmutter	Wolf
Hoyer	Peterson (MN)	Woolsey
Inslee	Petri	Wu
Israel	Platts	Wynn
Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy	Yarmuth
Jackson-Lee	Porter	Young (AK)
(TX)	Price (NC)	Young (FL)
Jefferson	Pryce (OH)	
Johnson (GA)	Rahall	

NAYS—156

Aderholt	Bonner	Carter
Akin	Boozman	Chabot
Alexander	Boustany	Coble
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Cole (OK)
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Conaway
Baker	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Barrett (SC)	Brown-Waite,	Cubin
Bartlett (MD)	Ginny	Culberson
Barton (TX)	Burgess	Davis (KY)
Biggart	Burton (IN)	Davis, David
Bilbray	Buyer	Deal (GA)
Bilirakis	Calvert	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bishop (UT)	Camp (MI)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blackburn	Campbell (CA)	Doolittle
Blunt	Cannon	Drake
Boehner	Cantor	Dreier

Duncan	Kline (MN)	Reynolds
Everett	Knollenberg	Rogers (AL)
Fallin	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Feeney	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Flake	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Fortenberry	Linder	Roskam
Fox	Lucas	Royce
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Frelinghuysen	E.	Sali
Gallegly	Mack	Saxton
Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Schmidt
Gingrey	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	Marshall	Sessions
Goode	McCarthy (CA)	Shadegg
Goodlatte	McCaull (TX)	Shimkus
Granger	McCotter	Shuster
Graves	McCrery	Smith (NE)
Hall (TX)	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Hastert	McKeon	Souder
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Stearns
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Sullivan
Heller	Miller, Gary	Tancredo
Hensarling	Musgrave	Taylor
Herger	Myrick	Terry
Hoekstra	Neugebauer	Thornberry
Hulshof	Nunes	Tiaht
Hunter	Paul	Walberg
Inglis (SC)	Pearce	Walden (OR)
Issa	Pence	Wamp
Johnson (IL)	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Weller
Jones (NC)	Pitts	Westmoreland
Jordan	Poe	Whitfield
Keller	Price (GA)	Whitford
King (IA)	Putnam	Wicker
Kingston	Radanovich	Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—

Carson	Johnson, E. B.
Jindal	King (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1317

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, due to the sudden circumstances regarding my mother's health, I will not be present during today's rollcall vote on the override of the Presidential veto of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (H.R. 976). If I were present, I would vote "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The veto message and the bill will be referred to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-

hour business and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes rolled until 6:30 p.m. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A list of those bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour business and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. We expect to consider H.R. 1483, the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Act; H.R. 1011, Virginia Ridge and Valley Act; H.R. 505, Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act; H.R. 3685, Employment Nondiscrimination Act; and H.R. 3867, Small Business Contracting Act. On Friday, there will be no votes in the House.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information. There are really a couple of bills I wanted to ask about that I wonder when and if they are going to be coming back. As the gentleman knows, we only have a few more weeks of legislation outside of what we might have to do on the appropriations bills.

Yesterday, I spoke on the floor, and others did, in opposition to the FISA bill, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act bill, that was on the floor yesterday. We quit in the middle of that debate. I am wondering if the gentleman has any information on when that bill may come back to the floor or if you have any information that it wouldn't be coming back.

I would yield.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We do expect the bill to come back to the floor, and it is under discussion as to when that will be.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that. I would say that we would be interested in trying to continue to work to get a bill on the floor on this important issue that a broad base of Members of the House on both sides could support. And as we were able to talk about earlier today, I would hope that we would have a chance maybe to look at that bill one more time.

The other bill that got a lot of attention this week was the bill that was reported out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Armenian genocide, and I wonder if my friend has any sense of the status of that bill.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman. We are still looking at that bill, and we expect next week to have some announcements about it.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information. We are very interested in that bill.

On the bill that we just voted on, a vote that would have been pretty easy to predict, I believe, 2 weeks ago, I noticed just this week that the Governor of New York said that he would be willing to accept new language in that bill that would eliminate his State's ability to cover families at over 400 percent of the poverty level. I would suggest

that that is one of the compromises that would really be helpful, if we could eliminate that level that appears to only initially apply to the State of New York. Last week, when Mr. HOYER and I discussed this, he suggested that if the veto was sustained, that his view was that we should have an opportunity to work together on a bill that could come to the House floor. And I am wondering if the gentleman has any information on how the majority intends to move forward now on that bill.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman. I can tell the gentleman that we are serious about extending coverage to 10 million children. I think that the issue you just raised is an issue that has been talked about quite a bit, especially in the media, for the last 2 or 3 days, and I suspect that that is one of the things that we would be taking a look at in order to try to bring some resolution to. I think, so long as we can maintain the intentions to cover 10 million children, everything else will be under discussion.

Mr. BLUNT. I would particularly think that that would be the topic I just raised, where families of four could make up to \$83,000 a year and still have their children insured by taxpayers, would be one of the areas that, if we could deal with that issue, that would be a significant step on the bill, maybe not the only step necessary. But if we could now get in a situation where we could do what the vast majority of the House said they wanted to do just a few weeks ago when we definitely went on record saying we don't want this State Child Insurance Program to go out of existence but we want to do what we can to be sure that it is meeting the real goals of the program.

□ 1330

That would be helpful. And any efforts that we can collectively make to where we work together on this would be, I think, helpful in reaching a conclusion. And I think this too: unfortunately, I don't think many minds were changed in the last 2 weeks, and we lost 2 weeks that we could have been talking. But that's behind us now, and I'm hoping we move forward.

The other major topic that I wanted to ask a question about today to my friend was on appropriations. I've been asking every week since we started the new fiscal year, or approached the new fiscal year, when we were going to have some bills on the floor or to go to conference, rather, on bills. On the Military Quality of Life bill, the Senate Democrats have been named to the conference. The Senate Republicans have been named to the conference. The House Republicans have been named to the conference. And I'm wondering if the gentleman has any sense of when we might actually see something now begin to happen on these appropriations bills.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish I could give you some good sense of where we are with all of that. As you know, these discussions are taking place. The rules are a little bit different with the Senate than they are with us. We've done our work here on the House side. I would hope that those conference committees will get ready real soon. I'm sure that we'll take them up as soon as they are ready, and I hope that will be very soon. I have no sense as to when that will be. I'm very hopeful, like you are, I'm sure, that it will all be between now and November 16.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's view on that. I am hopeful. I think we've got a handful of bills that have been approved now by both the House and the Senate, bills reported over to the House from the Senate; and my view is that we're beyond the time when we should have been reaching some conclusions on these bills, and urge the majority to work with the minority and find a way to get these bills done.

I think in the Mil Qual Veterans area there was a substantial increase. There's been an increase every year for the last dozen years. But a substantial increase to the tune of like \$18.5 million a day in benefits to veterans and military families; and every day we let that go by just complicates the delivery of those services. And I hope we can move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
OCTOBER 22, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF
MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AP-
PROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Greg Lankler, Staff Assistant, Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, October 18, 2007.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I am submitting this letter pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. On October 11, 2007, I received a grand jury subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the Central District for California. After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, and based on the information currently available to me, I have determined that the ad testificandum aspect of that subpoena is not consistent with the rights and privileges of the House, and the duces tecum aspect of the subpoena seeks records that are not material and relevant.

Sincerely,

GREG LANKLER,
Staff Assistant.

INTERNET GAMBLING REGULA-
TION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT
OF 2007

(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, I rise today to enter a letter cowritten by my Maryland Attorney General which raises concerns about the impact that the Internet Gambling Regulation and Enforcement Act of 2007 would have on the power of the States to make and enforce their own gambling laws. In my view, the letter raises questions that merit the consideration of my colleagues.

SEPTEMBER 28, 2007.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK AND RANKING MEMBER BACHUS: We, the Attorneys General of our respective States, have grave concerns about H.R. 2046, the "Internet Gambling Regulation and Enforcement Act of 2007." We believe that the bill would undermine States' traditional powers to make and enforce their own gambling laws.

On March 21, 2006, 49 NAAG members wrote to the leadership of Congress:

"We encourage the United States Congress to help combat the skirting of state gambling regulations by enacting legislation which would address Internet gambling, while at the same time ensuring that the authority to set overall gambling regulations and policy remains where it has traditionally been most effective: at the state level."

Congress responded by enacting the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006 (UIGEA), which has effectively driven many illicit gambling operators from the American marketplace.

But now, less than a year later, H.R. 2046 proposes to do the opposite, by replacing state regulations with a federal licensing program that would permit Internet gambling companies to do business with U.S. customers. The Department of the Treasury would alone decide who would receive federal licenses and whether the licensees were complying with their terms. This would represent the first time in history that the federal government would be responsible for issuing gambling licenses.

A federal license would supersede any state enforcement action, because §5387 in H.R. 2046 would grant an affirmative defense against and prosecution or enforcement action under and Federal or State law to any person who possesses a valid license and

complies with the requirements of H.R. 2046. This divestment of state gambling enforcement power is sweeping and unprecedented.

The bill would legalize Internet gambling in each State, unless the Governor clearly specifies existing state restrictions barring Internet gambling in whole or in part. On that basis, a State may "opt out" of legalization for all Internet gambling or certain types of gambling. However, the opt-out for types of gambling does not clearly preserve the right of States to place conditions on legal types of gambling. Thus, for example, if the State permits poker in licensed card rooms, but only between 10 a.m. and midnight, and the amount wagered cannot exceed \$100 per day and the participants must be 21 or older, the federal law might nevertheless allow 18-year-olds in that State to wager much larger amounts on poker around the clock.

Furthermore, the opt-outs may prove illusory. They will likely be challenged before the World Trade Organization. The World Trade Organization has already shown itself to be hostile to U.S. restrictions on Internet gambling. If it strikes down state opt-outs as unduly restrictive of trade, the way will be open to the greatest expansion of legalized gambling in American history and near total preemption of State laws restricting Internet gambling.

H.R. 2046 effectively nationalizes America's gambling laws on the Internet, "harmonizing" the law for the benefit of foreign gambling operations that were defying our laws for years, at least until UIGEA was enacted. We therefore oppose this proposal, and any other proposal that hinders the right of States to prohibit or regulate gambling by their residents.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS GANSLER,
Attorney General of Maryland.
BILL MCCOLLUM,
Attorney General of Florida.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H. Res. 106

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor on House Resolution 106.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RON
PRESCOTT

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Los Angeles Unified School District in California lost one of its most prestigious leaders. Ron Prescott died a week ago, and for over 30 years he represented the district in Sacramento, California, the capital.

Ron Prescott, over the years, was voted one of the top lobbyists for children. He was charismatic, he was diplomatic, but most of all, he was dedicated to the children of our State, and particularly the second largest school district.

Ron Prescott had a way of influencing you to do the right thing. When there were several attempts to break up the unified school district, it was Ron that saved our district.

When you needed to know the facts on funding for certain programs, it was Ron who was there with the facts.

He was never the kind to be obnoxious, but the kind that you could understand. He was always clear. He was always factual. He was always committed.

We have lost a great educator. We mourn his loss.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ERNEST WITHERS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, Memphis, Tennessee and the Nation lost a great photographer and a great public personage in Ernest Withers. Ernest Withers died at the age of 85. He was a gentleman who was at the right time at the right place with the camera that took the picture that showed the civil rights movement, showed the history of Memphis, Tennessee and its progress from segregation to integration to a city that's one of America's great cities today.

Mr. Withers was one of the first African Americans hired as a police officer in the city of Memphis in 1949. He left that profession and went into photography. And whenever there was an event, Mr. Withers was there. He took a picture of B.B. King and Elvis together on Beale Street. The King and the King together on Beale, back in about 1956, when B.B. was thin enough that you wouldn't recognize him, and Elvis was thin too.

He had pictures of Dr. King and the civil rights movement. He covered Oxford, Mississippi; he covered Medgar Evers. He covered all of the major civil rights events that came throughout the mid-South.

He was published in *People Magazine* and the *New York Times*, and *Ebony* and *Jet*, and was honored by the Memphis College of Art with an honorary degree in 1992, and by the Missouri School of Journalism for his great work in photography.

He'll be missed in Memphis, and his collection needs to be maintained and made available to all citizens for remembrance of what went on during the civil rights era. He'll be missed by all of us. He'll be remembered in history books and museums.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. Res. 106

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from House Resolution 106 as a cosponsor.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was commu-

nicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-65)

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:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia is to continue in effect beyond October 21, 2007.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain economic pressure on significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia by blocking their property and interests in property that are in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons and by depriving them of access to the U.S. market and financial system.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 18, 2007.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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.)

□ 1345

PREVENTABLE INFECTIONS OCCURRING IN HEALTH CARE SETTINGS

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the news headlines yesterday and today, we learned that more people die from an infection called MRSA than die from AIDS. The news, however, is much worse than this. And that is, if you look at the amount of preventable infections that occur in health care settings, it actually is more like 90,000 people die, will die this year from preventable infections in health care settings, and over 2 million cases will occur.

The cost to our health care system in America is over \$50 billion. As we look at the cost of health care and how families cannot afford it, it is important that this Chamber take into account what we can do to reduce costs and fix the system and not just finance the system. And this is one of those areas.

Now, recently, the Center for Medicare Services, CMS, also said that they would move towards not funding treatment of preventable infections in hospitals. Now, although that is an important move, and one that will save a great deal of money and one that we believe will help motivate health care centers to take more action, it still does not help with a couple of issues. One is that there's not a universal system across America where citizens can find out what are the infection rates within certain health care settings. And those are important because when one is selecting a hospital for care or going to a clinic, it would be good to know what those infection rates are.

You know, for example, it's mandated by law that airlines have to report their on-time rates for when they depart or arrive at the gates at an airport. However, you cannot find that information about the safety levels of the hospital which you may be going for treatment or surgery, and we need to make that available.

Nineteen different States require some level of this, but, quite frankly, it is a hodgepodge of different requirements. Some report to the Department of Health. Some report some diseases and not others. And we need to make this uniform across the Nation so that patients can tell and that it is an important aspect of helping people to understand before they go into a hospital.

Now, the thing about this is these infection rates are preventable. You have issues such as MRSA, methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus; pneumonias; urinary tract infections; and others that could be preventable by a couple of important procedures: washing hands; wearing gloves for procedures; sterilizing equipment; cleaning up before and after procedures, including patients' rooms and other areas;

making sure that visitors to the hospital follow these same procedures; wearing a hospital gown or other clothes so that patients do not get exposed from one doctor visiting one room to the next. Some countries even require visitors to wear masks and a gown and to scrub. I understand in the United Kingdom they require the doctor to make sure they scrub and not wear jewelry room to room and to put on a different gown as they go to each room so that diseases are not spread. These are important steps that can take place. However, we don't have any kind of universal reporting system in this country.

My bill I introduced called H.R. 1174, the Healthy Hospitals Act, would help to make this uniform. And that is it would require the Secretary of Health to come up with a system of reporting and hospitals would give their information and there would be an annual report to Congress of best practices to reduce these deadly diseases.

It is tragic that more people die from infection they pick up at a health care center each year than all of our soldiers who died in Vietnam. And if we saw this as the emergency that it is, if, for example, we had heard that a plane crashed somewhere and a couple hundred people died, we would know that all sorts of Federal agencies would be all over that investigating that. If the next day another plane crashed and a couple hundred more died, an uproar would be across America as to what is happening to airplane safety. If it happened a third day in a row, probably we would shut down the airports. But here, when someone dies every 5 minutes, new infections occur all the time, we do not take this kind of action. And we need to see this as an emergency, particularly because there has been a number of hospitals which have tackled this problem and have solved this problem and have virtually eliminated some of their infection rates. We need to do this as a nation.

In addition, my bill, H.R. 1174, would also provide, from the savings that come from reducing these infections, a grant program to hospitals that have been able to massively reduce or eliminate their infection rates.

We need to gather together as a Congress and no longer ignore this problem, which is leading to so many deaths. We need to acknowledge those hospitals and health care settings that are leading to major changes and cleaning this up and also help those hospitals that are not. We can no longer hide from this problem when we see in the news the number of deaths that are occurring there, and even now so many have this, the things that are occurring in schools as well.

We have to take vigorous action as a nation to save these lives. And I would hope that my colleagues would sign on as supporters of this bill.

PRESIDENT'S VETO OF CHIP REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened that we have failed to override the President's veto of legislation to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program. This action represents a misstep of historic proportions.

It also saddens me that several Members on the other side applauded when this body failed to override the President's veto. By voting against this bipartisan, bicameral legislation, some Members of Congress have turned their backs on more than 10 million poor children who need health insurance now.

Let me be clear. The legislation that was vetoed today was an excellent piece of legislation, and our children will be worse off without it. The continuing resolution that we passed will temporarily cover children who are currently enrolled in CHIP, but the uncertainty surrounding the program's future leave our children's futures uncertain. Some States are already indicating that they will make cuts to the program if they cannot rely upon a steady Federal funding stream.

Further, the continuing resolution fails to address many of the critically important measures that we included in the reauthorization. Notably, dental, mental, and vision coverage are all absent.

We need no greater reminder of the need for these provisions than the recent death of Deamonte Driver, a 12-year-old boy from my home State of Maryland who died when an untreated tooth infection spread to his brain. Yes, he died.

Those who voted against this bill have ignored the calls of more than 81 percent of the American people and members of the Democratic and Republican Parties who support the initiative. Because of their lapse in judgment, 4 million uninsured children, 65,500 of them from my home State of Maryland, will be denied the coverage that Congress intended to grant them. Further, my colleagues who voted against this bill have shut the doctor's office door on approximately 6 million children who currently rely on CHIP for health insurance.

It chills the conscience to think of all those children who will be forced out of care.

It is particularly upsetting to consider how this will affect children with chronic disease who rely upon the CHIP benefit to get the care they need to simply survive. Lives are in the balance.

Bipartisan coalitions, including the National Governors Association and the United States Conference of Mayors, recognize the unique moral obligation we have with this legislation. Ear-

lier this week, Mayor Sheila Dixon of my hometown of Baltimore held a press conference to call on Congress to override the President's veto. She also joined 20 mayors from across the country in signing a letter making the same appeal. Unfortunately, some of our colleagues in this Chamber stubbornly failed to acknowledge the reality that so many of us have clearly seen.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk about the benefits of reauthorizing CHIP as I have in the past statements before this Chamber, but today I will take a different approach by letting my Republican colleagues speak for me. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I will associate myself with the following comments:

Republican Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY of Iowa said, "This is not a government takeover of health care. This is not socialized or nationalized medicine or anything like that."

Republican Senator ORRIN HATCH of Utah called the bill "an honest compromise which improves a program that works for America's low-income children."

Republican Congressman DON YOUNG of Alaska said, "Issues such as the health and well-being of our Nation's children are nothing to play politics with and nothing to scrimp on."

Republican Congressman VITO FOSSELLA of New York said the bill "will put millions of young people on the road to a longer and healthier life."

And, finally, Republican Congressman WAYNE GILCHREST from my home State of Maryland expressed his support for the bill, noting, "It focuses on the lowest income kids and fixes a lot of problems with the current program."

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the President and some of our colleagues lack the foresight to recognize the critical importance of passing the CHIP reauthorization. We simply must regroup and pass this vital piece of legislation.

Access to quality care is not a privilege; it is a right. We cannot afford to play politics with our children's lives.

FISA MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I found the comments of my friend from Maryland very interesting. I would just remind the Speaker and all who have looked on the vote today about the veto of SCHIP that when we passed the continuing resolution, we passed a continuation of SCHIP. So no children should be affected adversely during these weeks as we work to reach the compromise that the President has said he is working for.

Mr. Speaker, I thought this should be called the "FISA Week," Foreign Surveillance Intelligence Act Week. But now because of the actions of the majority, we were not able to vote on that

particular bill as it was presented to us earlier this week. We already knew we would be prohibited from offering any amendments, as the Rules Committee granted a closed rule.

So let us call this the "FISA Month," since we now know there is consideration for bringing the FISA bill back next week and the importance of FISA, foreign intelligence surveillance, cannot be overestimated.

Yesterday, the Speaker of the House took the floor in the debate on the rule and, in a diplomatic or parliamentary tour de force, managed to contradict the United States Constitution, every decision made by the United States Supreme Court on this issue, and the decisions made by the appellate court of FISA, the FISA Courts. And that was when she suggested that the Constitution does not grant any inherent authority to the President to involve himself or direct, that is, foreign intelligence. As a matter of fact, every Supreme Court decision since the beginning of the Republic has recognized that. With respect to exclusivity of the law, every Supreme Court decision has recognized that such a law cannot be exclusive, as does the FISA Court, the appellate court under the FISA structure itself.

Interestingly, however, when we do look at FISA, the bill that was brought forward to us as a result of a manager's amendment's being incorporated into the bill presented to us, it contains this language: This deals with the situation in which we have, everyone agrees, a constitutionally permitted wiretap or otherwise means of collecting communications between Osama bin Laden, a terrorist target in a foreign country, a foreigner in a foreign country. We have every right to gather that information under the law. There's no disagreement. But here is what happens under the bill presented to us:

If the electronic surveillance referred to in that paragraph dealing with what we presume to be foreign-to-foreign communications inadvertently collects a communication in which at least one party to the communication is located inside the United States or is a United States person, the contents of such communication shall be handled in accordance with minimization procedures adopted by the Attorney General, and, now, this is the important language, "that require that no contents of any communication to which a United States person is a party shall be disclosed, disseminated, or used for any purpose or retained for longer than 7 days unless a court order" is given, "or," further it says, "unless the Attorney General," and this requires him specifically, "determines that the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person."

Now, why is this unfortunate? It is unfortunate because it changes the way we handle minimization in the criminal justice context. If we have a legal wiretap on a mafioso member and

he happens to call his sainted mother or a priest or someone else, and that, therefore, is someone who was not under the wiretap, you don't have to go back to a court to get another court order in order to use whatever he said, that is, the mafioso member, against his interest. And here we would say that if in this conversation Osama bin Laden said something that didn't implicate the American but did give us information as to where Osama bin Laden was located or where Osama bin Laden was going to move, we would be prohibited from using that information, disclosing that information, disseminating that information, or keeping it for more than 7 days unless we went to a court for a new court order.

That is nonsense. That gives Osama bin Laden more protection than an American citizen in the United States who is being investigated for a criminal offense. That is nuts. Not only is it nuts, it is dangerous to the American people because it creates a situation in which we would be blinded about information which would give us an ability, first of all, to find out what the dots are and then to connect the dots as to what the threat is against the United States. There is no rationalization for it, but it is part and parcel of what we have heard from the other side that we need to give now habeas corpus rights to those people we found on the battlefield around the world who are unlawful enemy combatants. It is part and parcel of a program that puts us at risk.

I would ask us to consider it seriously next week.

□ 1400

CONGRATULATING CHESHIRE HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SWIM TEAM

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, you know, we live in a world that's hard to reconcile sometimes. Now, our focus often is on the evil that exists in this world, but all too often we let that focus overwhelm the counterbalancing good things that happen in our communities every day. And I rise today to recognize that strange, delicate symmetry in my hometown of Cheshire, Connecticut.

This week, the Cheshire High School girls swim team broke the record for the longest dual-meet winning streak in American history with their 235th straight victory. As you can imagine, this is a pretty remarkable record to break. In fact, the girls on this record-breaking swim team that broke the record on Monday night weren't even alive when that streak began some 21 years ago.

I wasn't there Monday night, unfortunately, but hundreds of parents and friends and siblings and supporters were in attendance, and I heard that

the record-breaking night was pretty magical. But strangely, something else happened that night, something that the girls probably didn't even notice or seek out. Monday night, the girls swim team at Cheshire High School transcended statistics and records and wins and losses. And the most important marker that they set down that night was not as the best swim team in the country, but as a bright, beaming emblem of a resurgent community with so much to celebrate.

You see, my town has been grieving over the past several months. And it's hard to figure out what else to do when you wake up one morning and find out that three of your neighbors, a mother and her two young, vibrant daughters, lost their lives in an unspeakable act of barbarism. It becomes difficult, impossible even, to square the wonderful, serene existence of life in a quiet small town with the random and brutal acts of violence that left Dr. William Petit mourning the unexplainable loss of his family.

How do you reconcile the two? How do you wake up, even for those of us who didn't know the family personally or live in that neighborhood, and pretend that the veil of safety and goodness that always seemed to envelop Cheshire, Connecticut, was still there after that? I thought about little else in the days and weeks following that incident, and I know that I wasn't alone.

But then the unexpected happens. And I know it sounds silly to even talk about a murder and a swim team in the same sentence and, frankly, of course, the two are incomparable, but therein lies the problem. There is no and there will be no one clear moment when we collectively decide that the moral order has been restored in our community. And so we're left to seek out those moments that simply remind us of why we love Cheshire in the first place and why we have confidence that our community will heal, that we will persevere, and that we will recover. This week is one of those moments.

I didn't grow up in Cheshire, so I certainly can't claim to know the town like those who call it their birthplace, but I did know a good thing when I found it. And Tuesday morning, when I heard that the record had broken, I couldn't help but wonder whether it wasn't just a coincidence that a national record 21 years in the making matured at the very moment that a burst of good news was most needed in our community. And I couldn't help but think about how this streak, which started two decades ago and has been the careful construction of hundreds of girls and thousands more family members, friends, supporters and coaches stands as a testament to the strength, persistence and spirit of our little town, not just on one night, but over the span of decades.

And so, yes, one unspeakable act can and probably should shake the confidence and faith of a community. And

nothing will ever repair that damage, certainly not for the Petit family, and probably not entirely for the community that they call home.

And so we're left to look for those moments of triumph, those instances of community reaffirmation that remind us why Cheshire is such a special place to live. Well, we found one this week.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Cheshire High School girls swim team and to thank them for everything that they have done. Cheshire is a pretty special place to live, and Monday night reminded us of why that is.

CALLING FOR A SECURITY SUMMIT AT O'HARE AIRPORT

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today's USA Today reports on a major security failure at two of our Nation's largest airports, Chicago's O'Hare and LAX. In a simulation conducted by the Transportation Security Agency, screeners at LAX missed 75 percent of hidden explosives and bomb parts carried through the security by undercover TSA agents.

Screeners at Chicago's O'Hare missed these items 60 percent of the time. According to the report, bomb materials were packed away in toiletry kits, briefcases and CD players. Now, more than 6 years after September 11, we have to fix the security failures at major hubs like O'Hare and LAX.

Security officials should call a security summit, bringing together local leaders and the Departments of Homeland Security and Transportation to schedule intensive retraining for TSA screeners, new testing standards, and accountability for lapses in security.

Much of our safety and a great deal of our economy depends on the security of O'Hare Airport. We can do this. And a security summit to fix this glaring security problem would help.

POST OFFICE BOX 1142 RESOLUTION

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, from 1942 through the end of the Second World War, a top secret military intelligence service operated clandestinely on the shores of our own Potomac River. At Fort Hunt Park, along the GW Parkway, a secret installation operated silently in the shadows of our Nation's Capital.

Known only by its mailing address, P.O. Box 1142, the men and women at this post provided the military intelligence that helped bring an end to World War II and gave the United States an early advantage in the Cold War.

P.O. Box 1142 was an interrogation center. Throughout the war and its aftermath, the post processed and interrogated nearly 4,000 of the most important German prisoners of war.

The men who performed the interrogations were drawn from across the country. The shared attribute is that they all spoke fluent German to be able to interact with their captives. Many were Jewish, to ensure their loyalty to America's mission. And most had friends and family battling on the front lines against Nazi Germany. To them, the war was personal and would impact their lives forever.

Despite these circumstances, their interrogations never resorted to torture, used violence, or implemented cruel tactics to obtain the vital information required to support our Nation at war. Instead, their most effective interrogation technique was to start a dialogue to develop trust with their captives. They all talked with their captives, played card games, took walks, discussed their lives, and ultimately obtained the necessary information from their captives. Despite the apparent simplicity of these methods, these interrogations resulted in the discovery of most of Germany's secret weapons programs.

P.O. Box 1142 learned about research to develop the atomic bomb, the jet engine and the V-2 rocket, all technologies that became essential informational components in waging the Cold War. The detainment and interrogation of high-ranking German officials, such as Reinhard Gehlen, who ran the German intelligence operations, advanced our military intelligence operations well beyond the Soviet Union's capabilities.

In advancing the Nation's interests and uncovering vital secrets, the interrogators at P.O. Box 1142 never resorted to tactics such as sleep deprivation, electrical shock, or waterboarding. Their captives were never sexually abused, humiliated, or tortured. They never resorted to the methods that have recently branded our Nation so negatively. As a result of the war on terror, I'm afraid that America is now haunted by lasting images of Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay. The current intelligence community can learn from the men of P.O. Box 1142. For all our sake, I hope it's not too late.

Despite the vital work that the interrogators at P.O. Box 1142 performed, their activities remained closely held secrets by those who worked at the post. Many of these men never told family or loved ones. It wasn't until park rangers from the GW Memorial Parkway uncovered declassified documents and met former officers of P.O. Box 1142 that the operations that occurred at Fort Hunt Park during World War II became known.

Under the encouragement of the National Park Service, these park rangers identified veterans of P.O. Box 1142. They conducted professional oral his-

tory interviews. The deeper the park rangers dug, the more obvious it became they had discovered a remarkable story that had remained unrecognized by the officers because of their oath of secrecy.

After 2 years of work, the National Park Service decided it was time for the men of P.O. Box 1142 to finally be acknowledged. On October 5 and 6, the National Park Service held the first-ever reunion of the veterans of P.O. Box 1142 at Fort Hunt Park. The veterans raised the American flag in the post's original flag pole setting and memorialized the grounds.

Today, I'm proud to play a small part in giving justified credit for the tremendous work performed at P.O. Box 1142. Along with my northern Virginia colleagues, Congressmen TOM DAVIS and FRANK WOLF, I'm introducing a long, overdue resolution to honor the men of P.O. Box 1142.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my appreciation to these veterans. The Nation owes a great debt to them for their sacrifice to our Nation during a time of war for their pursuit of critical intelligence, while maintaining the highest level of integrity and America's moral values, and for their intrepid actions that have, until very recently, gone unacknowledged.

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

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona 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 Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WYNN 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 Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1396

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of H.R. 1396, and because we inadvertently transposed some numbers, I ask unanimous consent that Representatives NITA LOWEY, RICHARD NEAL, and ARTUR DAVIS be removed as cosponsors of H.R. 1396.

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

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, all too often we've seen this administration turn a blind eye toward the priorities of our very country. While the administration has consistently failed to demonstrate restraint when it comes to escalating the occupation of Iraq, it has cold-heartedly insisted on denying the children of struggling working families with health insurance in the name of fiscal discipline. Once again, the values of the administration are glaringly out of step with the values of the American people.

The administration will not stand for accountability, transparency, or dissent when it comes to ending the occupation of Iraq. They will, however, support another blank check, resulting in more lives lost and more of our priorities left unfunded.

Earlier today, the House voted on overriding the President's veto of the children's health insurance reauthorization, or SCHIP. When the President vetoed SCHIP, he argued that the appearance of fiscal responsibility was more important than the health of 10 million of our children in this Nation. But when we learned that insuring 10 million children in America for 1 year costs the same as 40 days in Iraq, it is clear that the administration does not have its priorities straight.

Mr. Speaker, supporting our service men and women is certainly our absolute responsibility. Our Nation has an obligation to those who sacrifice and defend us during times of war. However, our servicemembers in Iraq were sent into combat without adequate training, without state-of-the-art body armor and equipment, and without assurances that their tours of duty will not be overextended. The glaring failures in Iraq show that not only is the Bush administration defunding our Nation's priorities to continue the occupation, but that it is allowing much of that money to be wasted.

The Inspector General has reported that \$8.8 billion appropriated for Iraq's reconstruction cannot be accounted for. Media sources have recently reported that the administration is constructing a \$600 million American Embassy located in the Green Zone in Iraq. This embassy, which is the largest in the world, in fact, it is larger than the Vatican, this embassy will include grocery stores, a movie theater, tennis courts and a social club.

It will require \$1 billion a year to keep it up and to be maintained. Instead of our children's health care, the priorities of the Bush administration seem to be waste, fraud and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, when the administration vetoes a bipartisan investment in health insurance for our Nation's children, it rejects the priorities of the American people. When the administration spends billions on constructing

and maintaining an embassy in Iraq while Iraq's infrastructure collapses around them, it compromises the safety of our troops abroad. And when the administration refuses to end the occupation in Iraq, it assures that countless generations will suffer for their mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, the priorities of the American people are clear. They want to provide health care for children. They want to promote peace and protect our troops. They want us to fully fund the efforts to bring our troops home. They want us to do it now.

□ 1415

THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor weary but well after a week in which I have had the privilege of being involved in not one but two debates over the very freedoms enshrined in the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States. I am humbled as someone who not only has been charged with public duties in representing the good people of eastern Indiana here on the floor of the Congress, but I am humbled as someone who, from my youth, has been fascinated with the freedoms enshrined in the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

This week, I had the privilege of seeing legislation that I authored 3 years ago come to the floor of this Congress and be adopted in overwhelming and bipartisan measure. It was legislation known as the Free Flow of Information Act that I first introduced in the last Congress in partnership with Congressman RICK BOUCHER of Virginia, and our journey over these last 36 months brought us to that moment, this Tuesday, where we were able, through regular order, through a thorough process of committee hearings and markups and amendments on the floor, to see the first Federal legislation concerning the freedom of the press to be adopted by this Congress, a sense that freedom was enshrined in the first amendment and added by Congress to the Constitution itself.

What was especially gratifying to me was that we did it in a bipartisan way. Because I want to say as a recurrent theme this afternoon that on this floor there are many differences of opinion, but freedom is not a partisan issue in the House of Representatives. And the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech proved this week not to be a partisan issue, when 398 of our colleagues came together across the partisan divide to say "yes" to a free and independent press.

I come before this Chamber today, Mr. Speaker, to say "thanks" and to

say how moving it was for me to play some small role in putting what I believe was a stitch in a tear in the fabric of the first amendment, freedom of the press. In that legislation known as the Free Flow of Information Act, we created for the first time a privilege, a qualified privilege for reporters to keep information and sources confidential.

Now, this was not a radical step. Some 33 States already have statutes that protect a reporter's privilege. But it was the first time that it has succeeded in passing the House of Representatives on the Federal level. And we await action by the Senate on similar legislation and hope for a conference committee and resolution of the matter that it might be sent to the President. We also hope, despite concerns expressed by the administration, that we can continue to shape this legislation, continue to work with the good men and women in the Department of Justice Criminal Division to dial it in in such a way that would make it possible for this President to sign this legislation.

I come before you today not just because I was privileged to co-author legislation that protected a reporter's right to the freedom of the press and a free and independent press enshrined in the Constitution, but also because I have authored one other piece of legislation about which we have taken action this week which is also about freedom of the press. It is called the Broadcaster Freedom Act. It is principally my purpose for coming before the Chamber today. But in each case, I want to begin by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I see the two as inextricably linked, that the work that Congressman RICK BOUCHER and I with, now, 390-plus of our colleagues to strengthen a free and independent press for those who engage in the business of reporting the news, we were attempting to do just as vigorously and just as effectively for those who commentate on the news. Because it has been the subject of commentators, especially commentators on talk radio in America, about which there has been much discussion and much consternation since this summer. And as I will expand further, there has been what I would characterize as, both on Capitol Hill and off Capitol Hill, troubling discussion about returning censorship on the airwaves of America by reimposing what used to be known as the Fairness Doctrine on radio and television broadcast outlets in this country.

I want to begin by stitching these two projects together because I think they are linked. Back in southern Indiana, we like to say "what is good for the goose is good for the gander." The press freedom that our Founders enshrined in the first amendment for those that engage in reporting is also the same freedom I would argue that protects those that are engaged in commentating. We tend to forget that opinions that we hear, left, right and center, on radio and television are

every bit as much protected by the first amendment freedom of the press than those who are typing copy and bylines that appear on the front page of the Indianapolis Star, the Muncie Star Press, the New York Times or the Washington Post. And the business of reporting and the business of commenting are two time-honored traditions in the practice of American press that I have been able to be a part of strengthening and defending this week.

As I said, now on the first, the creation of a reporter's privilege, we were able to come to the floor and pass that legislation out of the House in strong bipartisan measure. On the second, we took action this week to file a, Mr. Speaker, what is known as a discharge petition at the Calendar here in the House of Representatives to enable the Broadcaster Freedom Act to come to the floor for an up-or-down vote.

I want to explain to my colleagues and to anyone else looking on the import of that discharge petition and why I believe it is every bit as important that we have a vote on the Broadcaster Freedom Act as I believed it was important that we have a vote on the Free Flow of Information Act.

Let me take a half step back and say once again what a joy it was for me on both of these measures to be doing freedom's work here on the floor of the Congress. Because we debate many things in our various committees and responsibilities here, some foreign, some domestic, and some having to do with spending, some things as mundane as roads and bridges and potholes, but as we saw today with our newly elected colleague, Congresswoman TSONGAS from Massachusetts, every one of us takes a very simple oath. We raise our right hand, as she did in this Chamber today, in a moment I was privileged to attend as a new colleague. We raise our right hand and we take an oath to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States and to protect her against all enemies, foreign and domestic. It is at the very center of what we are here to do. In the first amendment of that Constitution, this Congress is specifically enjoined. We are, in effect, commanded by our Founding Fathers to make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. It was an application of that principle, a principle that I believe is a principle of limited government, because I happen to believe in my heart of hearts, as I said during the debate over the Federal media shield bill this week, that as a conservative who believes in limited government, I think the only check on government power in real-time is a free and independent press. There is actually nothing more consistent with my belief in limited government than my vigorous defense and advance of the interests of a free and independent press.

Now, that being said, while we have the success on the one, we need an up-or-down vote on the other for reasons that I want to describe. But I want to be clear on the point that I believe this

is all tied up in our duty that each one of the 435 Members of this Congress embraced in taking that oath of office. Because I can't help but feel that whether it was the erosion of an independent press and a rising tide of reporters being threatened with subpoenas, subpoenaed, and even being put into jail that was encroaching on that injunction in the first amendment, I also believe that much of the talk about restoring regulation and outright censorship to the airwaves of America, particularly the radio airwaves of America, is also violative of that specific language in the first amendment.

Now, about the Fairness Doctrine. The American people love a fair fight, and so do I, especially where the issues of the day are debated. But I would submit that in a free market, fairness should be based on equal opportunity, not equal results. And the fairness doctrine, as it was applied to 4 decades in American radio, was a doctrine that, while it was perhaps borne of the best intentions, it was not about the equal opportunity in a wide range of ideas, but it was about dictating results on the airwaves of America. Here is where it came from.

The Radio Act of 1929 was passed into law by this Congress, perhaps well-debated in this very room. When it became law there were, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, very few radio stations in America. I don't know the exact number off the top of my head, but radio at the time of the Depression was in its infancy. By the time that the Federal Communications Commission got around to passing the regulations that came to be known as the Fairness Doctrine in 1939, there was virtually no television in America, and radio was still in its infancy. Many communities in America, having no indigenous radio station at all, but the regulations folks then came along and said, look, there is a limited number of radio stations in America, in 1929 to 1939, and so the thought was because they are, the airwaves belong to the public, that, in effect, the Federal Communications Commission ought to make sure that both sides of controversial issues is debated fairly and evenly. It sounded reasonable enough at the time, I suspect, and while it rubs against my more libertarian instincts, I will say, there may have been a legitimate basis for the Fairness Doctrine in 1929, less so, but maybe in 1939, because of the scarce number of radio signals that were there. But from 1939 to 1987, for 4 decades, the Fairness Doctrine reined on the airwaves of America.

□ 1430

As we learned in those 40-some-odd years, there is nothing fair about the Fairness Doctrine. The elements of this regulation that were designed to ensure that both sides of the argument were heard ended up having the effect of ensuring that in most cases, on most radio stations, no sides of the argument were heard.

The reality is that from 1939 to 1987, when the Federal Communications Commission struck down the Fairness Doctrine on its own, there was virtually nothing like what has come to be known left, right and center as American talk radio today. In fact, it is almost inarguable that the dynamic forum that has emerged as talk radio today virtually began with the repeal of the Fairness Doctrine in 1987.

So the first part of this debate, Mr. Speaker, is we don't need to wonder what American broadcast radio would look like if the Fairness Doctrine were re-imposed. We have four decades of experience. We know precisely what the public airwaves would look like if we returned to this arcane rule of content regulation.

Truthfully, I think the most likely outcome is not that radio stations that carry Rush Limbaugh would also carry Alan Colmes. The reality is, faced with recordkeeping, red tape, potential legal fees that would attach to a Fairness Doctrine challenge filed with the FCC, and potential loss of their license, most of the 2,000 radio stations today that carry talk radio simply wouldn't carry it any more.

Now why do I know this? Let me be a little bit autobiographical for a second, Mr. Speaker. Before I was elected to Congress in the year 2000, I made a living in radio. I had a call-in talk radio show heard exclusively in Indiana. It was carried on 20 different radio stations, from 9 a.m. to noon. I tell people sometimes I was Rush Limbaugh on decaf. I was conservative, but wasn't in a bad mood about it. We had all different sides on. But I would bring my cheerful conservative perspective to bear across the airways of heartland Indiana every day.

Mr. Speaker, I started in radio in little old, no pun intended, Rushville, Indiana, in 1989, a little tiny show that aired from 6 to 6:30 p.m. That gave rise to a weekend show, and that gave rise to a daily show, and then I was in syndicated radio for the better part of 7 years. It was a blast. I enjoyed it. When the opportunity came for me to go into public service, I was torn because I so enjoyed the opportunity to get in front of that microphone and talk to Hoosiers every day about the things that were important to them and share my philosophy of government.

My wife and I ultimately felt a calling in our life to public service. We stepped forward. I never looked back. But I lived in the business for a long time. I spent a lot of time driving around to little radio stations across Indiana and dropping off tapes to station managers and asking them if they would carry what we conveniently entitled "The Mike Pence Show."

So I know these radio station owners, and I know that a lot of them run these stations on a shoestring. The reality is, and the reason why, when the Fairness Doctrine was in effect, there were 200 talk radio stations in America, and after the Fairness Doctrine was repealed, there are now 2,000 talk radio

stations in America, is because, quite frankly, when the Fairness Doctrine was in effect, most radio stations just said we can't deal with the controversy, the recordkeeping, the making sure that we live up to Federal regulations. For heaven's sake, we can't live with the risk that somebody would file a complaint with the Federal Communications Commission and we would possibly lose our license.

I saw in the years immediately following the repeal of the Fairness Doctrine radio station owners beginning to awaken to the fact that they could put commentators on the airwaves and enjoy freedom and let nothing other than the marketplace itself choose who was going to succeed on their radio station. As my friend, the former majority leader, Dick Arme, loves to say often, and I give him credit for the phrase, freedom works.

The truth is, after the Reagan administration struck down the Fairness Doctrine, we saw an explosion of talk radio. Frankly, most of the talk shows that have succeeded on a national level reflect a center right philosophical perspective. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that in many of the largest markets around the country, some of the most popular talk show hosts are self-described liberals, or progressives and I say more power to them.

The truth is that the reality of American talk radio today is as diverse as the American people. And yet, and now I shift on the reason for the Broadcaster Freedom Act and the reason for us taking the extraordinary measure of filing a discharge petition on the floor of the Congress, I say with a heavy heart that some on Capitol Hill are calling for a return of the Fairness Doctrine to the airwaves of America.

Mr. Speaker, I will offer some quotes, with great respect to colleagues in this Chamber and the next. Senator RICHARD DURBIN said, as quoted in *The Hill* on June 27: "It's time to reinstitute the Fairness Doctrine." The Senate majority whip, DICK DURBIN of Illinois, went on to say: "I have this old-fashioned attitude that when Americans hear both sides of the story, they are in a better position to make a decision."

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN told the same publication that she is, in fact, "looking at" reviving the Fairness Doctrine. She told Fox News on Sunday, June 24, that she was reviewing the Fairness Doctrine "because talk radio is overwhelmingly one way," in her words. Senator JOHN KERRY, the former Democratic nominee for President of the United States, and easily one of the most respected and powerful Members of the United States Senate, told the Brian Lehrer radio show on June 26: "I think the Fairness Doctrine ought to be there. I also think the Equal Time Doctrine ought to come back." He went on to say: "I mean, these are the people who wiped out one of the most profound changes in the balance of the media, is when conservatives got rid of the equal time require-

ments. And the result is that, you know, they have been able to squeeze down, squeeze out opinions of opposing views, and I think it's been an imposing transition in the imbalance of our public."

Mr. Speaker, three of the most powerful Members of the United States Senate this summer, in the wake of the collapse of the amnesty bill that the Senate was attempting to move, expressed with frustration the need to return Federal regulation of the airwaves of America. American Spectator recently reported that according to two Members of the House Democratic Caucus, Speaker NANCY PELOSI and STENY HOYER, they will "aggressively pursue reinstatement of the so-called Fairness Doctrine over the next six months." That was reported on May 14.

When I brought an amendment to the floor this summer that would just buy a 1-year moratorium to the re-imposition of the Fairness Doctrine, while 107 of my Democratic colleagues voted with us, none of the Democratic leadership or any of the leadership of the powerful committees of jurisdiction voted with us to prevent the Fairness Doctrine from returning.

Mr. Speaker, there are other examples of distinguished colleagues who have every right to hold the views they hold. I do not question their integrity or their sincerity; I just disagree with them vigorously. I do not accept the conclusion of the Center for American Progress, run by the former chief of staff of the Clinton administration, John Podesta, one of the most highly regarded thinkers in the modern Democratic Party today, runs a think tank. That group published an extensive cross-tabulated report this summer from their Center for American Progress entitled: "The Structural Imbalance of American Talk Radio." While their proposal did not specifically call for the Fairness Doctrine, frankly, it called for much worse. It called for a whole new range of regulations involving ownership and consent on the airwaves of America.

So before anyone dismisses our efforts in trying to bring the Broadcaster Freedom Act to the floor of the House of Representatives as just more politics, let me say that I believe that it is imperative that the American people know that the next President of the United States, whoever he or she might be, could reinstate the Fairness Doctrine without an act of Congress unless we pass the Broadcaster Freedom Act.

Now, let me get to the legislation and make a few other comments about our extraordinary measure in the discharge petition that we filed this week. The legislation itself is very simple. The Broadcaster Freedom Act, which I introduced with Congressman GREG WALDEN that is cosponsored by every single Republican Member of the House of Representatives, and one Democrat, I am very happy and proud to say, a formal journalist himself, Congressman JOHN YARMUTH of Kentucky, the

Broadcaster Freedom Act simply says this, Mr. Speaker: it says that the Congress takes away from the FCC the power to re-impose the Fairness Doctrine without an act of Congress.

Now why is that necessary? Well, I hasten to remind my colleagues and anyone looking in that the FCC did away with the Fairness Doctrine in 1987. They were doing away with a regulation that they created. Therefore, if the FCC were to change its mind, it could bring back the Fairness Doctrine without ever consulting the Congress. The truth is, the next President of the United States is, whoever he or she might be, were they sympathetic to the opinions expressed by Senator RICHARD DURBIN, Senator JOHN KERRY, and others that we need to re-impose the Fairness Doctrine, re-impose provisions of regulations like equal time and other things, that President, whoever he or she might be, could make virtually one appointment to the FCC and restore the Fairness Doctrine like that. I think the American people have a right to know that. The Broadcaster Freedom Act essentially says we are taking that power away from the FCC to re-impose the Fairness Doctrine. It's just that simple and no more complex than that.

Mr. Speaker, why do we need to do this? Then I will talk a little bit about what we are doing tactically and strategically to get an up-or-down vote. The reason we are doing it, I think, frankly, is because who's against fairness? I have to tell you that I was not terribly surprised when a recent national poll done by the Rasmussen polling firm found that 41 percent of those surveyed said they would be willing to require radio and TV stations to offer equal amounts of conservative and liberal commentary, and only 41 percent said they opposed.

So literally the American people, as we stand today, having not had this national debate, are fairly evenly divided on what I believe amounts to censorship of the airwaves of America. But, again, it's because of that pernicious word "fairness." We have seen an entire cable television network built on the catch phrase "fair and balanced." Yet, as I said at the outset of my remarks on the House floor today, there is nothing fair about the Fairness Doctrine. The reality is that were we to bring back this archaic rule to the airwaves of America, we would see talk radio as we know it either greatly diminished or essentially vanish from the American political debate.

So the Broadcaster Freedom Act I think is an effort to run to the sound of the guns on behalf of freedom. I hope that my colleagues who know me well know that I bring the same sincerity of purpose to this mission as I brought to the legislation that I coauthored that we passed this week to create a qualified privilege for reporters in the Free Flow of Information Act. To me, it's all about that constitutional principle of a free and independent press.

Mr. Speaker, while I will say that despite the fact that the Broadcaster

Freedom Act is cosponsored by 203 Members of Congress, despite the fact that the principles of broadcast freedom that were enshrined in the Pence amendment this summer that essentially created a 1-year ban on re-imposing the Fairness Doctrine passed by 309 votes, we are yet to see any action either at the committee level or on the floor calendar for consideration of the Broadcaster Freedom Act.

□ 1445

And I want to tell you, and I will talk a little technical here, Mr. Speaker, I am a regular order kind of a guy. I like legislation to go through subcommittees and committees and have hearings. I think the American people work their will when Congress is moving in the ordinary processes designed to vet and draft and redraft legislation.

And so it is an extraordinary thing for me to say that we ought to have a petition that brings the Broadcaster Freedom Act straight to the floor. In fact, in keeping with that principle, the rule that we wrote is an open rule. I would be more than willing to have several days of debate about broadcast freedom on the floor of this Congress. I would be more than willing to entertain as many amendments to the Broadcaster Freedom Act as Members wanted to propose. This is not an effort to silence the debate; it is an effort to have a debate about the freedom of American commentators on the public airwaves of America to engage in speech in a manner consistent with the first amendment.

And so this week, as I have been alluding, I along with now, I believe, the count this afternoon is about 140 Members of Congress, including all of the Republican leadership, we filed what is called a discharge petition that, if it is signed by 218 Members of Congress, will bring the Broadcaster Freedom Act to the floor of the Congress for an up-or-down vote.

While I would hope that my colleagues in the Democrat majority, while I would hope that the distinguished Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, might even be looking in on my remarks today and may ultimately decide MIKE is right, we ought to have a debate and a vote on the Broadcaster Freedom Act and the discharge petition would not be necessary, I am getting the impression that is not likely to happen.

And so we have taken an extraordinary measure, and as I said, I, along with the Republican leader, JOHN BOEHNER, the Republican whip, ROY BLUNT, conference chairman, ADAM SMITH, and others are now calling on our colleagues in a spirit of good will to say: Give us an up-or-down vote on the Broadcaster Freedom Act on the floor of the House of Representatives, because I want to make a very bold statement about this legislation. And having just seen legislation that I co-authored get 398 votes on the House floor Tuesday, I hope people don't

think that I am talking through my hat.

I want to say with confidence that if the Broadcaster Freedom Act was brought to the floor of the House of Representatives, I believe it would pass overwhelmingly, because every time freedom gets an up-or-down vote on the floor of Congress, freedom wins.

I go back to this summer, as I said, I introduced an amendment, the Pence amendment to the appropriations bill that funded the FCC. I didn't know how it would do. I introduced the amendment to deny any funding to the FCC in the next year to bring back the Fairness Doctrine. It was a way of starting this conversation. My gosh, it passed; 309 Members of Congress voted for the Pence amendment. It was overwhelming, including 107 backbench Members of the Democratic majority. I am sincerely grateful for that, but that was a 1-year moratorium.

The truth is we have a Presidential election just around the corner. We will have a new administration in Washington, DC, and many of the leaders of the Democratic Party on Capitol Hill are calling for a return of the Fairness Doctrine, so now is the time for us to permanently do what 309 Members of Congress voted to do for a year, and that is to ensure the ongoing freedom of the airwaves of America by passing the Broadcaster Freedom Act.

Again, I want to say I am absolutely positive it would win, and I am positive it would have an overwhelming bipartisan vote because, as we learned this week with the Free Flow of Information Act, every time freedom gets a vote on the floor of the people's House, freedom wins.

Let me close, and I notice from the clock it is coming up on the time for me to give a tour to 100 eighth graders from Dearborn County, Indiana, and I can't be late for that. But let me say, bringing back the Fairness Doctrine would amount to government control over political views expressed on the public airwaves. Plain and simple.

I say with great respect to those who think we ought to return to those 4 decades where the Federal Government thought it was its role to regulate the debate that took place on the airwaves of radio and television, I say with great respect to them, I think there is a great danger when we unleash the power of the Federal Government to corral, to organize, to minimize or categorize or prioritize the American political debate. It is the essence of my belief that as messy as freedom is, it is the freedom of the American people that has created the most powerful and the most prosperous Nation in the history of the world.

I really believe with all my heart that at the end of the day, that as messy and as painful as it sometimes is for those of us in positions of public power, that the very well-being of the Nation is tied up in those of us in this body standing for the freedoms enshrined in the first amendment.

I was asked by a reporter yesterday at a press conference, Mr. Speaker: What if all of talk radio, monolithically talk radio reflected a liberal world view, would you still be doing this?

And I stepped to the microphone confidently and I said: Well, let me tell you, a lot of people think a lot of the national news media is fairly liberal. And I agree. An awful lot of the people that report on the network national news and some of the leading newspapers in America are quite liberal in their viewpoints.

Mr. Speaker, that didn't stop me from coauthoring the Free Flow of Information Act to protect the right of reporters in the electronic news media and the print media to keep sources confidential. And I appeal to my colleagues, men and women of good will all, who voted with us this summer for broadcast freedom, to join us again and sign this discharge petition.

I said on the House floor yesterday, if you support broadcast freedom, sign the petition. If you oppose the Fairness Doctrine and the archaic notion of the Federal Communications Commission regulating the airwaves of America as it did for 4 decades, sign the petition. I said if you cherish the dynamic national asset, left, right, and center that has become American talk radio since 1987, sign the petition. And ultimately, if you don't agree with any one of those positions but you just think that broadcast freedom ought to get an up-or-down vote on the House floor, I say to my colleagues, sign the petition because it is imperative to me, and the American people understand, that if 218 Members of this body sign that piece of paper, we will get an up-or-down vote on the Broadcaster Freedom Act, and I am positive we will send the Fairness Doctrine to the ash heap of broadcast history where it belongs.

I have every confidence that Republicans and Democrats in overwhelming numbers will reject the Fairness Doctrine, will adopt the Broadcaster Freedom Act, and we will be able, like we did on Tuesday of this week, to know that we set aside politics and we stood together as a Nation behind that blood-bought freedom of speech and freedom of the press that is enshrined in the first amendment.

Lastly, let me quote President John F. Kennedy, who was a boyhood hero of mine. When I first became involved in politics, it may surprise some of my colleagues to know that I was the Youth Democrat Party Coordinator in Bartholemew County, Indiana. I am probably the only Republican in Congress who has a bust of John F. Kennedy in my campaign headquarters. But as a fellow second generation Irish American, I still find him a deeply inspirational figure.

It seems to me John F. Kennedy expressed some words that speak to our time about this debate. He said: "We are not afraid to entrust the American people with unpleasant facts, foreign

ideas, alien philosophies, and competitive values. For a nation that is afraid to let its people judge the truth and falsehood in an open market is a nation that is afraid of its people."

Let me say that one more time because it literally could be a part of this debate over the Fairness Doctrine today. President John F. Kennedy said: "We are not afraid to entrust the American people with unpleasant facts, foreign ideas, alien philosophies, and competitive values." Let me stop there.

You listen to talk radio today, it is almost as if John F. Kennedy had listened to it. There are an awful lot of unpleasant facts for people in power that get mentioned on talk radio. A lot of foreign ideas. Occasionally some downright alien philosophies. If you listen to late-night talk radio, there are sometimes literally alien philosophies, and there certainly are competitive values.

But John F. Kennedy went on to say: "A nation that is afraid to let its people judge the truth and falsehood in an open market is a nation that is afraid of its people."

You know, America is a Nation of freedom and strong opinion, and our government must not be afraid to entrust our good people with all the facts and all the opinions necessary to make choices as an informed electorate. That is what democracy is all about. Now, is it comfortable for men and women in power who work in this rarified air of this marble building, no. But is it freedom? Is it what our Founders intended when they enshrined a free and independent press in the first amendment of the Constitution? You bet it is. I mean to tell you, our Founders did not enshrine the freedom of the press in the first amendment because they got good press. Our Founders enshrined the freedom of the press in the first amendment of the Constitution because they understood that a free and independent press is the only check on government power in real-time. And our Founders whose faces, some of which are chiseled into the wall or painted on canvases in this Chamber, believed in limited government and they believed in holding people like me and the other 434 Members of Congress who work in this Chamber accountable to a free and vigorous debate among the American people.

So I just come to the floor today to say thank you to my colleagues, thank you for standing for a free and independent press this week in the Free Flow of Information Act. I am deeply humbled and grateful for the work of my coauthor and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) as we passed the first Federal legislation protecting a reporter's right to keep a source confidential in American history. It passed the House this week. It passed by 398 votes.

I also want to thank my colleagues who stood with me this summer against broadcast censorship, voting

for my amendment to ban the Fairness Doctrine for 1 year, 309 Members, 107 Democrats in the Congress joined us, and I thank them for that.

I want to thank the 203 colleagues, all of the Republicans and one Democrat, who have cosponsored the Broadcaster Freedom Act that would send the Fairness Doctrine to the ash heap of broadcast history forever.

Now I want to close on this last legislative day of the week with a challenge.

□ 1500

I want to challenge my colleagues to sign the petition that's at the counter to bring the Broadcaster Freedom Act to the floor of the Congress for an up-or-down vote; and I say again, Mr. Speaker, to you and to my colleagues and to anyone who might be looking in, if 218 Members of Congress sign the discharge petition for the Broadcaster Freedom Act, we will bring this legislation to the floor of the Congress and it will pass.

I say that having been through literally thousands of votes on this House floor, many of which I didn't know the outcome before I showed up, some of which I had to wait a long time for the outcome, longer than I should have. But this one I say with confidence and with humility and with gratitude, if the Broadcaster Freedom Act that would do away forever with the Fairness Doctrine comes to the floor of the House of Representatives, it will pass with bipartisan support because freedom is not a partisan issue on the floor of the Congress.

I believe we proved this Tuesday with the Free Flow of Information Act what we will prove the day the Broadcaster Freedom Act comes to this floor, that every time freedom gets an up-or-down vote in the House of Representatives, freedom wins.

So I urge my colleagues, but especially those who supported broadcast freedom earlier this year, sign the discharge petition for H.R. 2905 and bring the Broadcaster Freedom Act to the floor of the Congress; 218 Member signatures will make it possible for the American people to have their say and send the Fairness Doctrine forever to the ash heap of broadcast history where it belongs.

Let's bring the Broadcaster Freedom Act to the floor. Let's let freedom reign, and let's do it together as we did this Tuesday, Republicans and Democrats, standing for the freedoms enshrined in the first amendment, the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech, the Broadcaster Freedom Act.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be before the House once again.

As you know, the 30-something Working Group, we come to the floor maybe once, twice, three times, if we can, a week to not only share with the Members the good things that we are doing but also some things that we are going to have to work together on, bills that we're going to have to work together on on behalf of America.

We've been able to do quite a bit this session, Mr. Speaker, and accomplish a lot in this first session. We have had record-breaking roll call votes never taken before. I think it's somewhere around 980 votes, I mean, not even counting the votes today, that have been taken here in the House that have never been taken in the history of the Republic, since the mid-70s. I believe it was 1975 or 1974 that held the record for roll call votes, and this year is not over yet, and we still have a lot of business to conduct.

I can't help but, Mr. Speaker, come to the floor and talk a little bit about what happened with the children's health care bill. I know just an hour ago we voted to override the President of the United States, and that's something that the Congress has the opportunity to do. The President decided to veto the children's health care bill. The Congress said that we would override. The Senate had the votes but the House, we weren't able to do it today. It wasn't because of Democratic Members of Congress, why we weren't able to override, and it wasn't because of 44 Republicans who voted with Democrats to override the President. It was 154 Republicans who decided to stand with the President and not voting for the override.

Now, we fell 13 votes short. What does that mean? I'm not here today to start calling names and pointing fingers, but I'm here today to make sure that the Members know that the good thing about America is that you have the second chance to do the right thing, and the Members had a second chance to do the right thing and failed to do so. The 13 Members or so failed to do so because they voted against the original bill that came before us that the President vetoed, but on the override they had the opportunity to say the right thing, and they didn't do it.

And within that 154 or within that 13, I just want to identify some of the States that will not receive health care or children's health care from the CHIP bill.

In California, 1.8 million kids have been denied health care. State of Florida, my very State, my State that I represent, those Members that voted, the 13 we fell short, voted against 616,000 kids. In Georgia, 467,000 for those Members that voted against the SCHIP bill override. Illinois, 435,000; Indiana, 199,000. And I'm just using round numbers here, Mr. Speaker. Iowa, 72,962; Kentucky, 112,000 will be denied health care because Members of the other side, 13 Republicans, said we needed to be able to close the gap, did not vote with us today to override the

President. In Maryland, 185,000; and Ohio, 338,000. In Pennsylvania, 312,000 will not be able to receive health care because we fell short of 13 votes. We did not get it from the Republican side of the aisle.

South Carolina, 122,000 children will be denied health care. In Texas, 966,000 will be denied health care. In Utah, 74,000 will be denied health care. And in Wisconsin, 94,000 will be denied health care, and in Wyoming, 12,000 will be denied health care because we did not have the said votes we needed to have, 13 votes on the Republican side that we needed to override.

Now, there were a lot of things said about the SCHIP bill, and a good part of the day and some 2 hours and change was devoted to both sides having an opportunity, Democrats and Republicans, to discuss their support or lack of support for overriding the President on this veto.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to kind of point out here, this picture is going to end up being one of my National Archives pictures when I, you know, relinquish them and I let them go. I kind of keep things as I come to the floor. There are certain charts, and as you know, Mr. Speaker, I do love charts and I'm glad because they illustrate not only for the Members but they illustrate a period of time in American history which now we're living in right now.

This picture was taken when a majority of the Republican Caucus went down and went to the White House and stood with the President on the first bill that we passed to put the heat on the Iraqi Government as it relates to the politicians there in Iraq living up to its responsibilities so that our U.S. troops don't have to continue to do patrols in the streets of Iraq, to be able to do exactly what the President called for as it relates to benchmarks or timelines, that certain things are supposed to happen or else. We put that in legislation, and the Republican Conference ran down there and had a press conference with the President saying we're standing with the President.

Well, today some of the folks in this photo here stood with the President, and they're within the 154 that voted against the SCHIP bill override. It's so unfortunate that the kids that I just called out and thousands and millions of other kids are going to be denied health care. Poor kids, they're going to be denied health care.

We also have, Mr. Speaker, something that I think is very, very important. Our obligation here is to make sure the children have health care and that the good people of the United States of America have access to health care, and I'm getting more and more concerned about folks being more loyal to the President, more loyal to special interests on the minority side than, in my opinion, being loyal to some of the constituents that need our assistance; and I think that's very, very important.

I think it's important also to note that this goes beyond politics, because I believe those that voted and within the 13 because I'm glad I'm not in that number of the 154 Republicans that voted against this override. They're going to have to, within that, the 13 that was needed to override the President decided not to, and I think that there's been some career decisions that have been made.

Obviously, I mean, everyone knows that I'm a Democrat, but if I was an independent or I was a Republican or I was someone that was thinking about voting one day and taking part in this democracy of ours as it relates to the ballot, if a Congressman came up to me and said, guess what, one day I'm going to have the opportunity to vote for health care for poor children that go to school with your kids that live in your neighborhood, folks that work either in your business or people that work with you at work, I'm going to deny them health care, not once but twice, vote for me on Tuesday. There's no way in the world I know a Member did not give that speech and will not give that speech, but today walked in here, slipped the voting card in here, voted "no" and left and went home for the weekend.

This was the close of business. It was the last vote that we took. It was a major vote. We took a Journal vote earlier today. There were only two votes, approving the Journal and voting to override the President of the United States on denying poor children health care. So no one could have gotten confused about, oh, maybe I pushed the wrong button or what have you.

I just want to make sure that the Members understand that this is about serious business here, and I'm going to tell you the American people voted for a new direction. Matter of fact, this reminds me of the old days when we had the rubber-stamp Congress, and I want to make sure my staff bring the rubber stamp down from my office because we haven't had it down here probably only once in the 110th Congress, but I'm going to make sure it gets down here to the floor before I leave the floor because I can tell you, you can't go wrong with friends like that illustrated here in this picture, you can't go wrong.

The President should feel comfortable, as far as I'm concerned should write a handwritten note saying thank you for sticking with me but not sticking with the poor children of the United States of America. Ten million children we're talking about insuring.

The President says, well, you know, maybe 1 million or 2 million or 3 million or 5 million, that's my proposal or what have you, going back and forth. The bottom line is without even a real discussion, without even a real discussion the President is willing to move forward on saying that we should be in Iraq forever, and I think that's a real issue for the people of the country. I think that's a real issue because when

you look at article I, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, I mean, the Congress has a lot to do.

But what happens as it relates to not only the funding of the war in Iraq but also as it relates to policy, as we look at this issue of Iraq but we're having all this discussion about Iraq and then we try to do something domestic, major something domestic and reauthorizing a program that provides children's health care, and when you look at it, when you look at it here, Mr. Speaker, one day of funding in the war in Iraq costs \$330 million and could insure 270,000 kids. One week in Iraq, one week, we're not talking about, you know, one year, we're talking one week, \$2.3 billion insures 1.8 million kids.

□ 1515

One month in Iraq, \$10 billion, that is \$10 billion, that is with a capital B, 1.8 million kids can receive health care. And 37 days in Iraq, \$12.2 billion spent, 10 million kids can receive coverage.

Now, it is all right and the President is saying, why are you even asking the question? Why are you even questioning my wisdom for even saying that we should continue to fund the war in Iraq? But meanwhile, we are sitting back here and kids are getting the veto again.

I think it is important for the Members to understand what is going on here. And I think that the reason why a lot of average Americans have a great level of frustration with Washington, DC is the fact that we can do something 10,000-plus miles away from continental United States for children that we will not even do for children here in the United States of America. Now, that is a problem.

Now, I don't have a problem. I have been to Iraq three times. I have been to Afghanistan. I have been a little bit of everywhere as it relates to the Middle East, because that is a big concern as relates to our issues that we have not only diplomatically but also as it relates to safety and that we have to engage in dialogue. But I have a problem, Mr. Speaker, of what I know and what is actually happening here on this floor.

Now, again, I am glad this chart is here now. When we start talking about having your back, I mean, the Republican conference which is a number, I am not going to generalize because 44 of the members of that conference voted with the children of America today, with Democrats, and overriding the President of the United States; but the majority, the 154 that voted against were part of the same group. Again, I am going back to the President. The President is not running again for election, but I can tell you this much; that, I can tell you that it is very, very important that we pay attention to the pattern that is taking place. Yes, we have a Democratic majority in the House, we have a Democratic majority in the Senate, but I

think it is important for us to take note of the consistent voting loyal to the President. This is not a loyalty contest. People weren't elected to be loyal to any given party. They are elected to make sure that their constituents and the people of America get what they need out of their government. And when we look at this, foreign debt doubles under President Bush on the \$1.9 trillion in 6 years between 2001 and 2006. Forty-two Presidents that I have here, Mr. Speaker, 42 Presidents, 224 years, \$1.01 trillion, from 1776 to the year 2000, was only able to borrow from foreign nations \$1.01 trillion. So the President has already trumped, with the former rubber-stamp Republican Congress in the last Congress. But it is in another form now, Mr. Speaker. It is in the form to where you see, saying, well, we no longer have the majority. The American people have taken that from us. The American people have taken that from us. Now we are in the business of stopping the new direction Congress that Republicans, Independents, Democrats voted for a new direction because they were concerned about the Republican rubber-stamp Congress following the President of the United States, the rubber-stamp Congress that was here, following the President of the United States to the new Congress, now saying, well, we have enough votes to stop the two-thirds that is needed to override the President, so that is going to be our new stance, Mr. President. We are with you all the way.

Well, I can tell you this much, Mr. Speaker and Members. I think it is important for many of those Members in the 109th Congress that followed the President, the Pied Piper, saying, let's go this way, let's vote this way, stick with me, I am going to lead you. And, guess what? Many of them are at home right now reading the paper about what is happening here in the Capitol dome because they are no longer, they are no longer in Congress. Now, some of them were friends, some of them I knew personally. That is fine. But on the policy end, they were following the President and found themselves unelected.

Now, if this was a political discussion, Mr. Speaker, I would, I would go somewhere and I would go somewhere reading the newspaper or taking a break or something, or maybe reading a good book right now or on the plane going back down to Florida. But this is about politics. Because I would just allow the 154 that voted against the override to continue to vote like they had been voting if it was about politics, because the American people will make sure that they rise up come some given Tuesday in another year from now and vote those individuals out of Congress because they are voting against children's health care.

Saying all of that, I think it is important to say where we are right now in not only history but in the present. If it was just politics, I would just go

sit down, but it is not about politics. It is about children's health care. I must shed light on this and we must continue to put the pressure on. I commend the Speaker for holding her ground on this issue. I want the Speaker to continue to hold her ground on this issue because we cannot backslide on making sure that poor children have health care; not something that looks like health care, but actually has health care, so that they can be healthy and do the things that they have to do.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, as I was in my office preparing to come to the floor, I was just reading some of the clips. I am glad the rubber stamp has made it down to the floor, and I will address the rubber stamp, I will come back to it.

It says on the headline of the New York Times, and this is hot off the press here, it says: The House Fails to Override Child Health Care Bill Veto. And the bottom line is that the vote to override was 273-156, or 13 votes short of the necessary two-thirds majority of those voting. The bill was originally approved about a couple weeks ago, September 25, 265 voting for it and 159 voting against it.

Now, you know, one thing that this administration is not used to, Mr. Speaker, and some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle are not used to is a bill coming to the floor already paid for. They are used to rubber stamping and saying, put it on the credit card for the next generation to pay for. I have a 10-year-old son and I have a 12-year-old daughter, and guess what? I care about their financial future. I don't want them in debt. I don't want to have them to turn around and, Mr. Speaker, having to pay to Japan, to China, to the U.K., to the Caribbean, to Taiwan, to OPEC nations, to Korea, to Hong Kong, to Germany of money that the President and the rubber-stamp Republican Congress before this Congress did because all they did was say, oh, that is fine, you want tax cuts, special interest billionaire, kazillionaire. We want to go into a new stratosphere of how many subsidies we are going to give you. We are going to do it. And guess what? We are not even concerned how we are going to pay for it. We are going to borrow from foreign nations. We are going to put it on the backs of those Americans that are not even eligible to vote right now, those Americans that were born since I have been on the floor here that are going to have to pay the bill. And in a new direction Congress, Democratic Congress, we said we weren't going to do it, and we haven't done it. And here we are again. This is a new form of the Republican rubber-stamp minority that is standing with the President all the way.

I am glad this rubber stamp is down here, because I spent a lot of time, Mr. Speaker, here on the floor with many of my colleagues. I think this stamp here one day will be properly placed

somewhere in a glass case because this is what used to be. The President said, let's give tax breaks to super-wealthy corporations, record-breaking oil subsidies. Boom. No problem. Rubber stamp. It is going to happen. So shall it be written, so shall it be done. Those days are over.

But now it is in a new form. We are going to stand with you when it comes down to overriding some of the major issues that Americans care about. A, this war in Iraq as it relates to the policy that we should be passing that so many Americans are very frustrated with, the fact that the Congress and the President has not been able to come through with policy that will eventually bring our men and women home, will eventually bring our combat troops home, because we will be providing technical assistance in the region for some time. But we are losing a number of our young people and our middle-aged folks that are reservists that have been deployed longer than any other fighting force in the past and we are still here going back and forth. And the reason why we are going back and forth is the fact that we don't have the necessary votes on the Republican side to be able to override the President. And the Senate, the procedural 60 votes that you need to bring certain issues are not there, because there is only a 51 majority Democrats there. So I think it is important, not only do we report the news, but we also talk about how we can do better.

Now, I come to the floor with a clear mind and a clear heart and ask my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle: We fell 13 votes short of providing poor children health care today. I ask, as we started to look at this issue again, and another vote will be coming up in weeks, that one goes within their soul and within their heart and think about voting in the affirmative so that we can pass the bipartisan health care opportunities for young people that we have done.

Now, this was a bipartisan bill. You know, you listen to the President, you think, oh, the Democrats sent me a bill. Well, I guess the 45 Republicans that voted with us on the original bill and the 44 that voted with us today, I guess they are Democrats, too. Or maybe they are just Members of Congress who say that it is their responsibility to make sure that poor children in their district and within the country have health care. Boy, that is something. And so I think it is very, very important that we move down and move in that direction.

I will put that rubber stamp off to the side because I never want to see those days again, but I wanted to bring it down to the floor because I thought it was fitting today that we do that.

I think it is important that we highlight the fact that there are a number of polls that have been out on this issue and who has said that Americans are in full, almost full support of expanding the children's health care bill.

Eighty-one percent in the CBS poll have said, I am for health care and expanding it for poor children; 81 percent, 15 opposed. And I think that is something to look at, and I think that is something that Members should pay very, very close attention to.

I also, Mr. Speaker, I think what is important, as we started looking at what is to be done in the very near future, we have to look at the fact that we have families, we have children, we have policymakers in the States that are counting on a children's health care program. We have doctors that are concerned about the lack of health care that children already are experiencing here in the United States, and so when we started talking about reauthorization, we started talking about expanding to more kids, they are happy but now they are concerned. We have over 170 organizations that deal with children and good government and support, still in support, of overriding the President on the health care bill on the SCHIP bill that he vetoed. That is history now. But I think it is important that, I want to encourage those Members that voted for the override, I want to encourage those Members on the Republican side, the 44 that voted with Democrats to override the President, to stay encouraged. To stay encouraged, because so many times we know about the glory, Mr. Speaker, but we don't necessarily know about the story. And right now we are writing the story on providing health care to poor children in the United States of America. And I say to children of the United States of America, because you have some Members here that are willing to vote for kids in Iraq and other places that have health care but not willing to vote for our own children here in the United States to get health care. And I think it is important that as we start to build this story, there is some good chapters and some bad chapters. And I think the good chapters that can be added to this story of getting to the glory part where we are able to have expanded benefits for children and also expanded coverage for children to provide health care for the next 5 years, or as long as we can get it at that number, for some Members who voted to not allow those children to have health care to come to the side of allowing them to have health care.

□ 1530

Voting in the affirmative for children's health care, now maybe the vote would have been a little different if this was 2008 and their constituents were paying very close attention to every vote that their Congressman or Congresswoman would take here on this floor.

But, you know, the good thing about it, some may say that, but I believe that the American people are paying attention to what's going on here. I also believe that the American spirit will rise up. I said that last Congress; and a lot of folks said, yeah, you know,

that's fine. The attention span, you know, of the average person is probably about, you know, a week or two or what have you. When it falls off the screen of the Today Show and other shows, it'll just kind of drift off.

But I can tell you this much: last Congress there were votes that were taken that the American people remembered. And I think it's important that folks understand that that will happen this time around.

And I'm not in the business of making sure that folks no longer serve in Congress. That's not my piece. I'm here to represent the people of the 17th Congressional District and the people of the United States of America to the best of my ability.

But I think that it's important because this is not politics, it's policy making, that those that voted against it be a part of a good chapter and allowing people to be able to have health care.

I want to commend the March of Dimes, all of the affiliates throughout the country that wrote their Congressmen and -women to vote in the affirmative to override the President.

I would like to thank those 501(c)(3) organizations. The lifeblood of their effort is through volunteers throughout America, and when they come in to volunteer for the March of Dimes, when they come in to volunteer for the Children's Defense Fund, I mean, all the different groups that are out there to do what they do on a daily basis that help this country be what it is today, I thank those individuals, because I don't want them to lose faith in the fact that we're not going to have their back. We're going to have their back. When I say "we," those of us that voted to override the President today.

I don't wake up every morning saying, hey, you know, I'm getting ready to go to the Capitol. We're going to override the President on a bill, on the children's health care bill or on making sure that we have sound policy in Iraq. I don't wake up on those days saying that I look forward to that opportunity. I don't look forward to that opportunity. I'd much rather us work in a bipartisan way to where we can move in that direction.

Well, let's look at the bill. The SCHIP bill received, I believe, 45 votes and the first time it came through here, that's bipartisan. Received, I believe, 14-plus votes in the Senate. Someone correct me if I'm wrong. That's bipartisan, Republican Members coming over and voting with Democrats to be able to move that bill through the process. That's bipartisan.

It gets to the President, all of a sudden it's partisan. Democratic Congress sent, no, it was a bipartisan Congress that sent him a children's health care bill. In the Senate, ORRIN HATCH, I mean, major Republicans are over there saying that the President's wrong and they had the votes, and they still do, to override the President of the United States. They have the votes over there.

In the House, we had a majority of votes, beyond a simple majority. We went well into, fell short 13 votes because Republican, on the Republican side of the aisle, 154 Republicans decided to stick with the President and not with the poor children in the United States of America.

I say all of that to say this: we would not have accomplished as much as we've accomplished, when I say "we," the 110th Congress, if it wasn't for a bipartisan spirit and allowing, not only Democrats, but also Republicans to have bills that they should feel good about when they vote for those bills.

Now, we talked about minimum wage passed on this floor. It was offered when we were in the minority in the last Congress, but never made it to the floor, never made it to a committee hearing.

The 9/11 recommendations, 9/11 Commission, great Americans put together a great document. It was a book, one of the best-selling books. And the President said he wasn't going to sign that. In a bipartisan way we passed that. Sent it to the President. He had to sign it.

And all of these signing opportunities, I don't call them ceremonies. You know, they usually kind of happen like on a Friday, you know, folks leaving town, about to go to Camp David, not going to make a big deal on his way out, just sign it into law instead of celebrating the bipartisan spirit we have here in the Congress and sending that legislation on.

Cutting student loan interest rates in half. That meant \$4,400 in the pockets of the individuals that have taken out the loans. And who are they? Children or young people that are trying to educate themselves to help us to be a stronger America and a more professional America so we can compete against other countries. It's not all about lock and load and shooting at someone. It's about making sure that we continue to stay the economic superpower of the world and to be able to provide the leadership in the world as it relates to a shining example of how one can educate him or herself and become all they want to be in the industry that they want to be, or provide a job to allow other Americans to work.

The President said he wasn't going to sign that. Thank you to the American people, thank you to the Members going back, talking to their constituents, thank you for all of those mothers and grandparents that wrote and emailed and said this is wrong, and that we want, if you want, you know, there's so many times we feel that we know what to do best here in Washington, D.C. because we understand what you need.

Well, guess what? \$4,400 in the pockets that they don't have to pay on interest rates, because the student loan companies were pocketing those dollars. We allowed those dollars to stay in the pockets of those individuals paying on the interest rate on those student loans; and they know what's best.

And guess what? I'm talking to independent voters too. I'm talking to Republican voters too. No one said, well, you know, based on my card, do I get it or not? No, not even based on your income. You get a student loan, you can be an individual punching in and punching out every day making the minimum wage, or you can be a family, a single parent, or you can be a two-parent household with a gross income of \$200,000, a household income of \$200,000 and you still get that \$4,400. And I think it's important, the President said he wasn't going to do it; he did it.

Now I'm asking the Members of Congress to stand in there on behalf of these children, not by their doing, but due to the fact that parents are trying to provide a way of life for them, and their only penalty is the fact that they can't afford health care. That's the only penalty that they have.

We have children that we're sending up to the military academies who cannot pass the tests, not the academic tests, not the fact that they didn't have the GPA to go to the Air Force Academy or to be able to go the Citadel or what have you. It's because they couldn't pass their physical because they didn't know they had a situation that could have been corrected to where they can be one of our best and brightest within our military and they're not able to do it because they don't have what they need to have.

The school lunch program started in World War II because kids were not healthy enough to be able to go into the military because they didn't have the very nutrients that they need to be able to function and grow up here in America. And that's the reason why we have that program today.

So when we started looking at things in a broader picture, I think it's very, very, important, Members, that we pay attention to the present. The 109th, 108th Congress I was a Member of. Before that, my mother was here 10 years prior to my arrival here in Congress. I paid very close attention to her movements, member of the Appropriations Committee, spent a lot of time trying to help a lot of people here in the United States of America. I am glad that it was a broad perspective versus a small perspective of saying, well, I need to stand with a person, with the President of the United States because he said he should not have his veto overridden. And I want to thank, he has a very good legislative staff that comes down here and talks to the Members and says, you know, you need to stick with the President, stick with the President.

Meanwhile, we had all these volunteers on the side of overriding the President, on the side of children's health care, that spent their own money, Mr. Speaker, to come here to Washington, D.C., walk the Halls. Thank God the Speaker had enough wisdom and the majority leader had enough wisdom to say we're going to

postpone the vote to allow those most affected, those that can afford to come to Washington or go to the district office of Members of Congress and the Senate and say please vote on behalf of children's health care because the President's wrong.

It's nothing wrong with being wrong sometimes, but not all the time. And I think it's important that when we look at this whole children's health care bill, I'm reading some articles about, well, you know, the Congress and the President, they need to sit down and come together on the line of compromise. And you know something? In Iraq, the President stands right at one point here on an issue and says this is it; this is what I'm going to do; this is how I'm going to do it and have enough Republicans to be able to stand with him so we can't be able to, well, if we pass a bill it will not be successful because he will veto the bill and it will come back here and then we'll fall 13 votes short. He stands firm, and then we have to end up having to work out some sort of compromise.

I'm going to tell you, I hope that this story, like I said, you have the story and the glory of everything. I hope as we continue to write this story and providing children the kind of health care, poor children the kind of health care that they deserve, that we stand. And when I say "we," the Democrats, the Democratic Caucus that voted to override the President, and the 44 Republicans that voted with us to give us the numbers that we needed.

And it's not just what I'm saying. It's what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is saying. And it's what roll call vote No. 982 says. It says that 44 Republicans and 229 Democrats voted in the affirmative, a total of 273 versus 156 who voted against. So I think it's very, very important that we look at this and that Members pay attention to what's happening.

What side of history do you want to be on? What side of opportunity do you want to be on? And I think that's something that the Members are going to have to take into strong consideration.

I'm happy that the President signed bills that he said he wasn't going to sign. But it wasn't only because of our doing. It was because the American people mobilized and said, well, I know I am going to have my opportunity on a given Tuesday every other year to vote for my representation in Washington; but they mobilized to say that I have faith in this democracy and I'm going to continue to talk to Members of Congress of the importance of the children's health care bill.

And I'm asking for those Americans that took that time out to come to Washington, D.C., called, e-mailed, wrote letters, I want to commend them for doing the work that they did. It was the same group, the same volunteerism that came up out of the ground, literally, when the President wanted to privatize Social Security, and a good

majority of Republicans on that time was in the majority, rose up and said, well, we want to go with the President on the private accounts and privatizing. It was that same volunteer American spirit that stopped that movement.

So we can make something good happen here on behalf of children that are needing health care.

As I move into the close here, Mr. Speaker, and as I was here on the floor and I was listening to the Speaker close, I think that it's important the value of Members playing a very strong role in facts, not fiction. And I was proud to see, you know, there's a lot being said and people were saying different things. And there were some folks that said that, you know, on the Republican side, well, there's going to be funding for illegal aliens in the SCHIP bill. Well, that's not the case. That just wasn't the case.

And I'm glad that the Speaker brought this chart down here, and I asked for this chart when I came to the floor because I thought it was very, very important. Section 605, page 255, right here, right here, and I think it's important, maybe we put it on www.speaker.gov for not only the Members to see this and highlight it like this. So you go down to line 16, section 605, no Federal funding for illegal aliens. Period. So as I look through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, with my highlighter I could go through almost, when I hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because they had very little to hold on to, I mean, how do you wake up in the morning and you say, well, I'm waking up this morning to deny 10 million children health care. Poor, at that. That's what I'm waking up to do this morning.

□ 1545

Or do you say "I'm waking up this morning to stand with the President on denying 10 million poor children health care"? Or do you say, "Well, maybe I can come up with this one: Somebody said it and I'm going to continue to say it, illegal aliens are going to receive health care from this bill, so that's the reason why I can't vote for it" when the law says that it doesn't?

I mean, I hope that the volunteers continue to talk to the 154 Republicans that voted against this. "Well, families that make \$83,000," that is not the case and the facts are right here. "These very wealthy families are going to get a government benefit," that is not the case. And I think it's important that we continue to shed light on this.

I think there should be some sort of meter here on the floor, to be honest with you, fact versus fiction, so that as Members come to the floor and they start talking and the meter starts moving over to the fiction side of it, then other Members will know how to judge what's accurate and what's not accurate. I think that would be very important because I think there will be

better policymaking and there will be fewer excuses why people didn't vote for certain bills.

I am not going to say that I'm mad. I'm just saying that I am disappointed. But the good thing about it, 14 years in public service, some of those years in the State legislature in Florida, 5 of those years, going on 6, here in Congress, there are votes that I remember. And this will be one of the votes that I will remember for the rest of my public career as long as the people from the 17th District will have me here from Florida, the day that we fell 13 votes short, not because of the lack of effort, not because we did not have the bipartisan spirit blowing through the air conditioning ducts here in the Chamber, not because there wasn't bipartisan input in the writing of the legislation need it be House or Senate, but because 13 Members out of 154 decided not to vote in affirmation.

I think it is also important to note, Mr. Speaker, that as we leave and we come back here, I believe, on Monday and we will be voting at 6:30, I hope that the Members engage their constituents on their vote, need it be against or for providing health care to poor children. I think that there should be a line of questioning as one walks through the airport when they get back home. Some of those volunteers out there should ask, "Congressman, how did you vote on overriding the President when he vetoed health care for 10 million poor children here in the United States?" I just want to make sure that one can answer that question with great accuracy. They may miss their flight or their connecting flight or they may even miss the ride home because it's going to be a long discussion. How can you be on the other side of 270 organizations that are not partisan organizations, that are non-partisan organizations, that are 501(c)3s, that are doctors, that are nurses, that are children's organizations, the different organizations and associations that have been created to be here for this very time to educate all of us on those disparities as it relates to health care, to expand the opportunity for 10 million children to have health care and deny it?

There was a bunch of name calling here in Washington, D.C. The President called it socialized medicine. What is socialized medicine? To sit up here and say "socialized medicine" after running up a \$1.19 trillion debt from foreign nations on a war and other things, tax cuts for the superwealthy, that more than 42 Presidents before him and \$1.01 trillion from 1776 to 2007 couldn't do.

You take out your veto pen only one time, one time in the first term when we had a Republican Congress, one time, and that was on stem cell research. And now, all of a sudden, you have a veto pen connected to your index finger in your right hand, walking around, waiting on bipartisan bills passing through this Congress, Demo-

crats and Republicans voting on these bills and sending them to you. And as soon as they get there, you want to veto them and then say something like the Congress is not doing what it's supposed to do.

When I was in the 109th Congress, I would already be home. We would probably vote 1 or 2 days out of the week and then we would go home. Now we're putting in the work, broke the record, 982 roll call votes and the year is not even over yet and we have a lot of work to do. Meanwhile, we have to take these votes to try to override the President. We could have been focused on another issue here today. We could have been focused on some of the appropriation bills that we were waiting to get through the process that we can't get through the process at this point.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that I had the opportunity to come down to the floor on this Thursday evening. I look forward to continuing to work with the bipartisan coalition, with the volunteer coalition in moving this issue forward. I look forward to listening to what Members are going to say in the press as to the reason why they voted for health care for children, which I am pretty sure can be a one-liner, versus those of the 13 votes that we fell short here on this floor in overriding the President and the 154 that voted against today, the dissertation that they have to write on the reason why they voted against children's having health care today.

I want to thank the work of not only the members of the committee but the staff here in working so hard here in Congress in trying to provide the health care that is needed.

I close with this, what I shared maybe about 20 minutes ago, Mr. Speaker: In the legislative process there's a great story. At the end, there is glory once we are able to provide 10 million children with health care. So as we write this story, the good thing about America is its okay to say maybe I took the wrong vote and I have made some mistakes. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have made some mistakes the years I have been in public service thus far, going on 14 years. I have taken some votes and later I said next time I have the opportunity, I'm going to vote the right way. I know more because I studied a little bit more. I have heard some input from both sides. And that's just the human spirit. I mean, that's fine. That happens. But when you have so much information and it is so clear and the evidence is there to show that we have States that are going to be running close to their program ending and children are not going to have health care and we are sitting here trying to override the President and we fall short 13 votes not because of the lack of will, not because of the lack of desire, it's because of whatever reason that those Members of Congress decided not to override the veto. The Senate has the

votes to override. In the House we did not have it, and 154 of my Republican colleagues voted against our doing that. And I think that is very important to note. Again, it's not politics; it's just the facts. And the facts are what they are. And when that roll call vote took place today, which I am pretty sure you will see printed today, roll call vote 982, it may very well be the vote that may give us some new Members of Congress here that may very well provide the kind of leadership that we need. But we cannot wait on that to happen because children will be denied health care, poor children will be denied health care.

Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to address the House, and I want to thank the majority leader for allowing me to have the hour.

I know that the story will continue. We look forward to the glory. And I want to ask those that are pushing to continue to push, and I believe we will make it to where poor children will be able to receive the health care that they deserve and this country should provide.

SCHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

There have been a number of times that I have come down here to convey a message to you and the American people. And after having listened to the gentleman from Florida and his 30-Something colleagues, my material has just gotten so massive, I'm not sure I can rebut all that in the time that I have, let alone convey the message that I came here to convey, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, there seems to be great confusion on the Democrat side of the aisle about the difference between health insurance and health care. They seem to believe, or at least would like to have the American people believe, that kids in America are being denied health care.

This debate about SCHIP has never been about health care. I would draw this comparison: You will hear often in the debates in this country about people are pro-immigrant or anti-immigrant. And when I say that, Mr. Speaker, people draw up an image about being pro-immigrant and anti-immigrant. Some people think illegal immigrants; some people think, appropriately, legal immigrants. When we say "immigrant," we should imply legal immigrant, and when we talk about illegal immigrants, we should say so.

The same goes with health care and health insurance. To interchange the terms and, I think, willfully inform the

American people that this debate is about health care and to stand on the floor of the United States Congress and convey a message, Mr. Speaker, to the American people that there are kids in America that are not getting health care is not an accurate statement. And the gentleman from Florida, if he would examine his words and the meanings of the language, would know it's not an accurate statement.

This is a debate about how many Federal dollars we are going to extract from hardworking Americans to put into federally subsidized health insurance, hopefully for kids. That's what SCHIP is about. But it is not even about all kids, because today, under the current program, the program that was drafted up in 1997 and became law in 1998, was created by a Republican Congress, and it was created in the immediate aftermath of welfare reform.

Remember welfare-to-work? We had generations of people that had become so dependent on welfare that they forgot about working. We needed to move them off of welfare, and we called it "workfare" part of the time.

We also recognized that people that were low income, the working poor, when you would take them off of welfare, they didn't have enough funds to fund the health insurance for their children, so we created the State Children's Health Insurance Program. That's SCHIP. It's 10 years old now today and we are talking about reauthorizing it. That is federally funded health insurance premiums for kids.

But this program, even under the current law, has morphed into a program that if you go up to Minnesota and take a look, 87 percent of the recipients of SCHIP are adults. And most of those adults are not parents; they are single adults. And if you go to Wisconsin, 66 percent of those who are on SCHIP are adults. They have changed this program and they have morphed it away from being a program that was about health insurance premium subsidy for kids. That's a discussion they can't name.

And I challenge anyone over here, stand up now, I will yield to you. Name one kid in America that doesn't have access to health care, one health care provider that slammed their door in the face of a kid in America or anyone in America because they didn't have health insurance.

No. We take care of everyone's health care needs in America. That is not the crisis. If it was, you can bet the PELOSI side of the aisle would have marched them down here and maybe brought them up into the well for a photo op. But that population of this country doesn't exist. Everyone in America has access to health care, legal or illegal, for that matter.

□ 1600

And every child especially has access to health care.

Now, we would prefer that they all have health insurance because we be-

lieve that those who have health insurance do a better job of going for their regular check-ups, and the medical providers will track their cases and be able to monitor them and be able to get early warning signs of chronic diseases or illnesses, and be able to maintain their health in a far more effective fashion for two reasons.

One is it improves the quality of life for the children in this country, and the other is it saves money. That's why we established the SCHIP program in the first place. But it wasn't designed to take hard-earned taxpayer dollars and put them into the pockets of people who could afford health insurance for their own children; and especially it wasn't designed to be able to put the Federal incentive in place to push kids off, to talk kids off, to put an incentive so that their parents made a decision or their employer made a decision not to insure them when they were already insuring them.

And yet if you look at the numbers, the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office that the gentleman from Florida would have to acknowledge gives us the most objective number we have, says that under this proposal that the President appropriately vetoed and that this Congress refused to override would take 2 million kids today that are funded with private health insurance and push them off of that onto the government roll.

Now, why would we want to do that? What would be our incentive? If nobody's going without health care, if we have kids that don't have health insurance that are getting health care, why would we create a program or why would we grow a program that's going to take 2 million kids off of the private rolls and put them on the government? You have to be somebody that believes in socialized medicine to advocate for such a thing.

And when Republicans bring a policy that recruits more of the uninsured to go on the rolls at 200 percent of poverty and below, where I have voted and consistently supported this program and voted to appropriate funds to this program, both as a State senator and as a Member of Congress, 200 percent of poverty, I can take you to where it is in my State today, that's an example I know to be fact, we can always discuss what's fact and what isn't, but in my State today a family of four, that's mom and dad and two kids, qualifies for SCHIP, that in Iowa we call it Hawk-I, premium subsidy if they're making less than \$51,625 a year, Mr. Speaker. Now, that's probably a little above what's middle income for a family of four in the State of Iowa.

And so if we've already gone above the line of where the median is, this Pelosi Congress passed this SCHIP legislation, not over here at 300 percent of poverty, passed it over here at 400 percent of poverty, Mr. Speaker. That was the vision of the San Francisco values that have been brought here to the

gavel in the chair where you're seated right now, 400 percent of poverty. Now, was there a clamor from the public that we should take their tax dollars and subsidize health insurance premiums for already insured kids that families were making over \$103,000 a year? I didn't have a single letter that said so. I got a few that said, I think we ought to have socialized medicine. I think the Canadian plan is pretty good, the British plan is pretty good. The European model is all right.

They disregard the long lines and the poor care. They disregard the fact that when you go to socialized medicine you have companies created in Canada for the purpose of facilitating access to American health care systems, companies that have sprung up because the Canadian is barred from having any special pass to go in front of the line; they all have to get to the back of the line. And so people don't always live long enough to get to their health care provider in places like Canada. That's what I want to avoid.

And the companies in Canada that are created will set up this package and it will be, well, if you need a hip replacement, here's how we will do this. We will set it up so you can go to a clinic for a check-up, and we'll fly you down to whatever city it might be, let's pick one, let's say Minneapolis, and there we will give you a hotel room, or let's go to the Mayo Clinic, that's even better, in Rochester. We'll fly you down there. Here's the package; here's your hotel room; here's what it's going to cost you to go to the clinic; here's the surgeon, here's the anesthesiologist; here's the whole package.

Now you figure out you can write the check to take the weekend tour to go down to the Mayo Clinic in Rochester and get your new hip replacement and go back to Canada, because they can't get access to health care there because they have socialized medicine. That's what this debate is about, Mr. Speaker. It's about laying the cornerstone for socialized medicine in the United States of America.

Here we are in a country where every kid, every person, every adult, legal or illegal, has access to health care, and we would like to increase the numbers of insured. But a Nation that has the highest quality health care in the world, one who is the most innovative of all nations in the world, the ones that has produced more new pharmaceuticals, more new surgical techniques, more new medical technology than any other nation, however you want to measure it, as a percentage of our GDP, as a percent of our population, measure it just as the sum total of the contribution to health care in the world, this country's medical practitioners and providers are the ones that have done that.

And this cornerstone to socialized medicine that is attempted to be laid here by this Pelosi Congress undermines that innovativeness, that service, that quality that we have. And

that's why 150—some of us voted “no” on overriding the President's veto. That's why the President vetoed it, because your health care, Americans, is more important than the political demagoguery that's going on here on the floor of the United States Congress.

The confusion between health care and health insurance, this debate is about health insurance, it's about us on the Republican side wanting to increase the percentage of covered kids under SCHIP under the 200 percent of poverty here, those that are not covered now that can be and still qualify, and us, as Republicans on this side, wanting to roll down the numbers of adults that have found their way into this system to be 87 percent of the recipients in Minnesota, 66 percent in Wisconsin, and a dozen or so other States that have crossed this line.

That's a standard that we're for, and it's something that they are opposed to. They won't speak up to the real issue that's here, Mr. Speaker, but this isn't about health care. It's about Federal subsidy of health insurance; it's about taking dollars out of people's pockets.

And so at this level over here, Mr. Speaker, I will submit that it works this way: we have this thing called the alternative minimum tax, which was created to tax the wealthy. They weren't paying enough tax, so Congress created a new tax, the alternative minimum tax. And under this SCHIP proposal there will be, the one that passed Congress the first time, that's over here, 70,000 families in America would qualify for SCHIP subsidy, Federal taxpayer funding, and still have to pay the alternative minimum tax, the tax on the wealthy, at the same time they're being subsidized and they can't afford the health insurance for their kids.

Now, figure that out. Think about how the circle has crossed. One circle over here is those that are so poor they need help, and the other circle over here is those that are making so much money we've got to give them an extra tax. But when you cross those two circles together, Mr. Speaker, and where they cross, that crescent in the middle, is 70,000 families, 70,000 families paying the alternative minimum tax and qualifying for Federal benefits for health insurance. I think that tells you that the loop for socialized medicine would be closed with this, and that's another reason the President vetoed it.

Another subject matter that was brought up by the gentleman from Florida is this subject of the billions of dollars that are spent on the global war on terror, and of course he would focus it on Iraq, which is a battle ground in the global war on terror, billions of dollars. And the argument is we can spend billions of dollars on the war, but we can't spend \$35 billion subsidizing health insurance for middle-income and upper-income children of those parents that are middle- and upper-income.

Now, think about this: How cynical would you have to be to draw a diaboli-

cal argument that here we spend money over here on the war, if we've got enough money for the war, we surely have enough money for health insurance for these kids? I mean, if that's the case, if the gentleman from Florida is drawing a legitimate comparison, then you have to look at the resources over there for our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines and say, well, I'm sorry, we're going to have to take \$35 billion out of your resources and put them over here to subsidize health insurance for these kids, these kids that are getting health care, by the way.

So how many fewer bullets, how many fewer bullet-proof vests, how many MREs, how much tank fuel or aircraft fuel, how many repair parts for a Blackhawk helicopter, how much surveillance equipment out there we would have to sacrifice to take away from those soldiers to fund this Pelosi plan for SCHIP? That's the other side of the argument.

So if they're sincere, and I have heard Member after Member, Democrat after Democrat, come to this floor and go to the media and send out press releases that we're spending money on the war, we ought to be able to spend the money on the kids, well, if this is a zero sum game, then how many bullet-proof vests do they want to take away from our soldiers? How many Humvees? How much armor protection personnel? How much training, how much human intelligence would we be willing to take away and how much risk would we be willing to put our soldiers through so that we could justify this program?

I think when they're confronted with the reality of that argument, they would have to confess that they would never allow an amendment on the floor that would cause them to have to put up a vote and go on record to make that decision. But they will ask you to believe that somehow, that because we spend money on war, that gives justification to create a socialized medicine program here. We know what the agenda is: it is socialized medicine.

And then I would argue, also, that to lay this thing out clearly, I'm going to go down through these, if I can, Mr. Speaker. This is a bit of a surprise package, I'm not sure what's underneath here, but we'll go with what we have, and that is, how do we fund this SCHIP according to the Pelosi plan?

Well, we're doing it with an increase on tax on cigarettes. Right now, the Federal tax is 39 cents a pack. This bill that the President vetoed, that this Congress refused to override, adds 61 cents a pack to cigarettes. So now the Federal tax will be \$1 a pack. The States can do whatever they want. The idea is if you raise the price of cigarettes, people will smoke less. Well, that's kind of a good thing, I would think, Mr. Speaker.

But if we're going to fund this SCHIP program, these \$35 billion worth of increases, then over this period of time,

as we see here in this chart that is laid out, it takes it out to 22.4 million new smokers have to be recruited in order to fund this expansion of this socialized medicine program of laying the cornerstone by SCHIP; 22.4 million new smokers. Now, that runs directly against the belief, and probably to some degree of fact, that the more it costs, the less people will smoke. So we add \$1 a pack, and now we have to still raise, and even though the price goes up by a 156 percent increase, we still have to recruit 22.4 million new smokers. Now, I don't want to be involved in that, Mr. Speaker. I don't want that on my conscience. I don't want to have to bring Joe Camel back and run him through the schools so we can get new smokers to fund insurance for these kids.

And another thing I would add is that, if this is about the kids, every dollar that is added to this program is added to the national debt. Now, who is going to pay that national debt? Somebody that's 58 years old or somebody that's maybe 8 years old? And I'm going to say that the ruse that this is about the kids, while at the same time pushing that \$35 billion into the national debt and asking those same kids that you say you're trying to help to pay the debt they incurred, I think is where the real hypocrisy lands, Mr. Speaker. 22.4 million new smokers? Not a very sound plan.

This chart tells you what happens when you start raising the premium subsidy up for health insurance. When you get up here to this level and you get to 400 percent of poverty, which this Congress passed, then 95 percent of the kids that are on private health insurance will drop off of that private health insurance and they'll go on government. So even if they're making \$1 million a year, 95 percent of those kids go to the government premium side.

If you take it on down to 400 percent of poverty and below, it's 89 percent. And as we go down lower to where we are now, it's 50 percent. I contend that, if the parents have a job and the health insurance is with the job and the employer has put a health care package out, their health insurance package out there that includes the family, and most do, why would you put a program in place that's going to cause the employer to do this calculus: I don't know why I'm paying for that if the government will pay for that. I'm going to offer a proposal here that's going to save me money. I can take that and put it in my bottom line as an employer and call it profit and tell my employees, we're going to sign you up for SCHIP.

I had a conversation with my son and daughter-in-law a couple of weeks ago. They blessed us with two little beautiful granddaughters, so they're a perfect model family of four. And I said here in Iowa, where this number right here, Mr. Speaker, if this bill had been overridden today that the President vetoed, in Iowa, a family of four would qualify for SCHIP funding at \$77,437.50,

to be precise. Now, that's that family of four, that's my son and granddaughters and daughter-in-law. The calculus is pretty easy for them. They just say, well, we're self-employed, I guess we could do this. We could set our wages up to make sure that we don't break the cap on SCHIP and the kids would be funded then by the government, wouldn't they? And I said, I don't want to hear about that.

□ 1615

It was a bit of a levity kind of a conversation because they are going to take care of their responsibility and they have and they will continue to do that. But if that can be figured out in 5 seconds in the kitchen of my family, think how it can be figured out in every boardroom across America that will see an advantage here to push the kids, the children of their employees, off of their own privately funded health insurance, put them on the government-funded one, and put the profit, the savings, in their bottom line. You know that is going to happen. The people that will be the most believers of that have to be those on the other side of the line that don't believe in much for ethics and the free enterprise system that we have.

That is how that is going to work. You push people off health care and so you get to this, Mr. Speaker, and this is what this is really about, SCHIP. Some might think that is for the State Children's Health Insurance Program. But I will submit that the real motive behind this, we have Presidential debates going on and candidates all over this country concentrated in my State, New Hampshire, and others, and you can feel and sense they have been pushing health care 6, 7, 8 months to bring this debate to a head, and a delay in this Congress in coming to the negotiating table so we can actually extend this program in a responsible fashion is partly rooted in the Presidential politics and in the partisan politics in this Congress. I think the majority of it is rooted in that. So I will submit SCHIP really stands for Socialized Clinton Style Hillary Care for Illegals and Their Parents. And I hope the camera is on this so it doesn't get missed. SCHIP, Socialized Clinton Style Hillary Care for Illegals and Parents.

By the way, I did not get to that illegal component that was laid out by the gentleman from Florida. Well, one can point to language in the bill that says "you don't get to send any of this money to people who are otherwise deportable." That language is in the bill. But, Mr. Speaker, I will inform you, this body, the people in this country, that there is additional language in the bill that weakens the citizenship standards that exist today, not just for SCHIP, but for Medicaid as well. We have citizenship requirements for Medicaid that you have to demonstrate, you have to prove your citizenship. And of those conditions that will be producing a birth certificate and an-

other document, a photo ID perhaps or a passport or a list of other documents that demonstrate your lawful presence in the United States and your eligibility for SCHIP and for Medicaid; those are current law requirements. This bill that says in one paragraph "this money can't go to illegals" says in another paragraph "but if you know how to write down a Social Security number, that will be all that is required."

The Social Security Administration has put out information that says you cannot verify citizenship by a Social Security number. There are millions of Social Security numbers that are not numbers for citizens. There are millions out there that are nonwork Social Security numbers, and there are millions out there that have been given to people that are here on work visas, student visas, visitors, you name it, for one reason or another, so they can get a driver's license or buy insurance, or maybe qualify for a benefit, millions of Social Security numbers that do not connote citizenship. And the only standard that is left, that is required in this current bill is you have to submit a Social Security number. And it is implied, it might even be specific, that it be a valid one. But we know how well that works when we have 20 million illegals in America and we have somewhere between 7 and 12 million working illegals in America, many, in fact most of them, using phony Social Security numbers. So if they can get a job and that number can report their wages every week and we can't figure out where they are, how in the world can anyone over hear say, "well, none of this money is going to go to illegals" when the Congressional Budget Office has made it clear and issued their report that the net cost to taxpayers because of the opening up of the citizenship standard is 6.5 billion, that is with a B, \$6.5 billion, Mr. Speaker.

There isn't an argument on this that is seriously grounded in the facts. We take our facts from the Congressional Budget Office.

So I will roll this together. In my State, currently a family of four qualifies for hawk-i, SCHIP funding, for their health insurance. This isn't health care, remember; it is health insurance, at \$51,625 a year. A family of four. That is off the Web page of Governor Culver, by the way. And if this bill had passed, it would have qualified that same family of four at \$77,437 a year. But this Congress first passed 400 percent of poverty, which would have qualified that same family of four at 103,250 or so dollars in that legislation, over \$100,000, and not a fiscally responsible peep out of the Speaker, out of the Democrat side of the aisle that I heard, out of my Governor. No one stood up for the taxpayer on that side of the aisle. That is because they are actively engaged in laying the cornerstone for socialized medicine.

I will continue, 2.0 million children, taken off of their own private insur-

ance, nudged off, because the government will pay for it, why would you pay for it? If it is free or you have to write a check, which line are you going to get into? There will still be a lot of patriotic Americans who will get into the "I will pay for my own line." God bless you for that. That is, by the way, 2.0 million children. That is a Congressional Budget Office number, the highest standard we have here; \$6.5 billion for illegals to go on Medicaid and SCHIP? That is a Congressional Budget Office number.

You can't convince me that this isn't going to legalize access to health care services for illegals who, if we had the voucher delivered by ICE, the Immigration Custom Enforcement, would be compelled to pick them up and send them back to their own country. Think about that. If we made the couriers for vouchers for SCHIP to be ICE, they would have to come along and say, "Well, okay, here's your voucher, but you're not going to be able to cash it in because I am sending you back home again because that is the law."

How bizarre is it to hear the rhetoric coming out of that side of the aisle? These are the facts, Mr. Speaker. It weakens the citizenship requirement. It is a net loss to my State of \$226 million, more tobacco tax paid sent to Washington, we get \$226 million less. Bad deal, Governor Culver. You ought to understand that. That is also a number that is put out by a government office, and that is the Centers for Disease Control produced a number of a minus \$226 million just for Iowa. Other States did worse. Other States were net gainers. The tobacco tax, 156 percent increase, and then, Mr. Speaker, not forgetting about the 22.4 million new smokers that we will need to get this program funded.

So, all in all, Republicans have taken care of this. We created this program. State Children's Health Insurance Program is about providing help in health insurance premiums for the children in lower income families that don't qualify for Medicaid. It is about the transition off of Medicaid on to private, on to self-reliance, on to all the dignity that comes with carrying your own load, helping transition gradually and easily off on to that. It is about that.

It is about protecting and preserving our private health care system that is the best in the world. That is where we are on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker. That is where the President is on this. The other side of the aisle is about laying the cornerstone for socialized medicine, because once you get 95 percent of the people dependent on a program, they consider it an entitlement. Democrats know that. The Democrat leadership knows that at least. And that, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is the strategy.

I don't know how, when they come back with the next argument that was laid out by here by Bill Clinton that they wanted to lower Medicare eligibility to 55 years old, then you look at

this universe of people, people collecting SCHIP today at age 25, remember all those adults in places like Minnesota and Wisconsin, up to age 25, and if we lower Medicare eligibility to 55, now who is paying the bill for all the health insurance and health care in America? Well, it would be those folks between the ages of 25 and 55, Mr. Speaker. And don't you think that side of the aisle knows the resentment that will build when someone writes their own check for their health insurance premium and their check for the alternative minimum tax and their check for their income tax and they realize that they are paying for theirs and everybody else's. If they can't say no to this, then they are going to come back to us and say, "Give us the Canadian plan. I give up. I capitulate. Because I just can't fund it both ways. You have made it too easy for too many people. Now it is too hard for me."

That will be the calculus among the American people. That will be what ultimately closes this and builds this socialized medicine that they are trying so desperately to build. And by the way, there is no provision to fund this thing past these years that I have shown here, Mr. Speaker. That cliff in the funding drops off. It drops down to a very small percentage of the overall revenue stream. The reason is they believe that they will have a President and a majority in the House and in the Senate that will have given us the full-ride socialized medicine. So they don't have to worry about funding this through this program. Watch as this unfolds. Bill Clinton stood back in this well September 22, 1993, and he gave about an hour speech, 12 pages long, that lays out the game plan. Now his wife is poised to carry out the balance of it.

I stand here in resistance to socialized medicine or laying the cornerstone for it, but I stand with my colleagues in protecting the kids in America, protecting their freedom, protecting an investment in them. I refuse, I refuse to put this burden as a national debt upon those same kids and ask them to pay it when they get to be the age of adults.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of

California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and October 25.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and October 25.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 22, 2007, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 110th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts, Fifth.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Thomas H. Allen, Jason Altmire, Robert E. Andrews, Michael A. Arcuri, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, Tammy Baldwin, J. Gresham Barrett, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Melissa L. Bean, Xavier Becerra, Shelley Berkley, Howard L.

Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono, John Boozman, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Allen Boyd, Nancy E. Boyda, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Ginny Brown-Waite, Vern Buchanan, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Steve Buyer, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Chris Cannon, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, Christopher P. Carney, Julia Carson, John R. Carter, Michael N. Castle, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Cubin, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Artur Davis, Danny K. Davis, David Davis, Geoff Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Lincoln Davis, Susan A. Davis, Tom Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Charles W. Dent, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Joe Donnelly, John T. Doolittle, Michael F. Doyle, Thelma D. Drake, David Dreier, John J. Duncan, Jr., Chet Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Keith Ellison, Brad Ellsworth, Rahm Emanuel, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Phil English, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Terry Everett, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, Mary Fallin, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Tom Feeney, Mike Ferguson, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Luis G. Fortuño, Vito Fossella, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Elton Gallegly, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Gabrielle Giffords, Wayne T. Gilchrest, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Paul E. Gillmor, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Bob Goodlatte, Bart Gordon, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Raúl M. Grijalva, Luis V. Gutierrez, John J. Hall, Ralph M. Hall, Phil Hare, Jane Harman, J. Dennis Hastert, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Robin Hayes, Dean Heller, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Stephanie Herseth, Brian Higgins, Baron P. Hill, Maurice D. Hinchey, Ruben Hinojosa, Mazie Hirono, David L. Hobson, Paul W. Hodes, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Darlene Hooley, Steny H. Hoyer, Kenny C. Hulshof, Duncan Hunter, Bob Inglis, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, William J. Jefferson, Bobby Jindal, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Steve Kagen, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Ric Keller, Patrick J. Kennedy, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Ron Klein, John Kline, Joe Knollenberg, John R. "Randy" Kuhl, Jr., Ray LaHood, Doug Lamborn, Nick Lampson, James R. Langevin, Tom Lantos, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Ron Lewis, John Linder, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Betty McCollum,

Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McCrery, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, John M. McHugh, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Michael R. McNulty, Connie Mack, Tim Mahoney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Edward J. Markey, Jim Marshall, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Martin T. Meehan, Kendrick B. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Charlie Melancon, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, Jeff Miller, Harry E. Mitchell, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Christopher S. Murphy, Patrick J. Murphy, Tim Murphy, John P. Murtha, Marilyn N. Musgrave, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Charlie Norwood, Devin Nunes, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Solomon P. Ortiz, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Collin C. Peterson, John E. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Charles W. "Chip" Pickering, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Earl Pomeroy, Jon C. Porter, David E. Price, Tom Price, Deborah Pryce, Adam H. Putnam, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall II, Jim Ramstad, Charles B. Rangel, Ralph Regula, Dennis R. Rehberg, David G. Reichert, Rick Renzi, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas M. Reynolds, Laura Richardson, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, John T. Salazar, Bill Sali, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Jim Saxton, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Jean Schmidt, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Joe Sestak, John B. Shadegg, Christopher Shays, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Vic Snyder, Hilda L. Solis, Mark E. Souder, Zachary T. Space, John M. Spratt, Jr., Cliff Stearns, Bart Stupak, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Thomas G. Tancredo, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher, Gene Taylor, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Mark Udall, Tom Udall, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, James T. Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Zach Wamp, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Diane E. Watson, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Dave Weldon, Jerry Weller, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Robert Wexler, Ed Whitfield, Roger F. Wicker, Charles A. Wilson, Heather Wilson, Joe Wilson, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, Albert Russell Wynn, John A. Yarmuth, C. W. Bill Young, Don Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3772. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluazinam; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0234; FRL-8152-4] received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3773. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Charles L. Johnson II, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3774. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael W. Wooley, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3775. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Ronald A. Route, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3776. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting letter on the approved retirement of General Ronald E. Keys, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3777. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting letter on the approved retirement of General Paul V. Hester, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3778. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks [Docket ID OCC-2007-00014] (RIN: 1557-AD02) received October 3, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3779. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Multi-Year Individualized Education Program Demonstration Program (RIN: 1820-ZA41) received October 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3780. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Paperwork Waiver Demonstration Program (RIN: 1820-ZA42) received October 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3781. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Assistance on Data Collection-Technical Assistance Center for Data Collection, Analysis, and Use for Accountability in Special Education and Early Intervention — received October 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3782. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to Definition of

Cogeneration Unit in Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR), CAIR Federal Implementation Plans, Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR); and Technical Corrections to CAIR, CAIR FIPs, CAMR, and Acid Rain Program Rules [EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0012; FRL-8483-7] (RIN: 2060-A033) received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3783. 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 Central Indiana To Attainment of the 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-0173; FRL-8484-2] received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3784. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Commonwealth of Virginia; Control of Total Reduced Sulfur From Pulp and Paper Mills [EPA-R03-OAR-2005-VA-0012; FRL-8484-4] received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3785. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Transportation Conformity [EPA-R07-OAR-2007-0912; FRL-8483-3] received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3786. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Kentucky; Performance Testing and Open Burning [EPA-R04-OAR-2005-KY-0004-200733, FRL-8482-5] received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3787. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Georgia; Redesignation of Murray County, Georgia 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment for Ozone [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0549-200742; FRL-8482-4] received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3788. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2007-0718; FRL-8483-1] received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3789. 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; Pennsylvania; Redesignation of the Mercer County Portion of the Youngstown-Warren-Sharon, OH-PA 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Area's Maintenance Plan and 2002 Base Year Inventory [EPA-R03-OAR-2007-0344; FRL-8484-3] received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3790. 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; Commonwealth of Virginia; Control of Particulate Matter From Pulp and Paper Mills [EPA-R03-OAR-2005-VA-0011; FRL-8484-5] received October 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3791. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-12, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Australia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3792. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-24, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Australia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3793. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-05, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Egypt for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3794. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-03, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3795. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-04, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to United Arab Emirates for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3796. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-08 concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Kuwait for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3797. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Inspector General's semi-annual report for the period October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3798. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Removal of Migratory Birds from Buildings (RIN: 1018-AV10) received October 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3799. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, September 19, 2006, pursuant to 28

U.S.C. 331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3800. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2006 annual report on the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3801. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of the Bureau of Justice Assistance entitled, "Fiscal Year 2005 Annual Report to Congress," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3711; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3802. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of a draft bill to amend the reporting requirements of Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3803. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report on "data-mining" activities pursuant to Section 126 of the USA Patriot Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109-177; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3224. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to establish a program to provide grant assistance to States for the rehabilitation and repair of deficient dams; with an amendment (Rept. 110-386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3247. A bill to improve the provision of disaster assistance for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1483. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for certain national heritage areas, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 110-388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 505. A bill to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity (Rept. 110-389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3564. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States through fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-390). 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. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania: H.R. 3884. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for punishment for killing a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania: H.R. 3885. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on standard grade ferromniobium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 3886. A bill to optimize the delivery of critical care medicine and expand the critical care workforce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 3887. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2008 through 2011 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, to enhance measures to combat forced labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. KELLER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HOKSTRA, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 3888. A bill to provide for a 5-year SCHIP reauthorization for coverage of low-income children, an expansion of child health care insurance coverage through tax fairness, and a health care Federalism initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Rules, 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. BOOZMAN: H.R. 3889. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a longitudinal study of the vocational rehabilitation programs administered by the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 3890. A bill to amend the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 to waive

the requirement for annual renewal resolutions relating to import sanctions, impose import sanctions on Burmese gemstones, expand the number of individuals against whom the visa ban is applicable, expand the blocking of assets and other prohibited activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (for himself and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act to increase the number of Directors on the Board of Directors of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 3892. A bill to establish the Federal Labor-Management Partnership Council; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 3893. A bill to promote the deployment and adoption of telecommunications services and information technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BEAN:

H.R. 3894. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish requirements for providing negatively amortizing mortgage loans to first-time borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 3895. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend the food labeling requirements of the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act of 1990 to enable customers to make informed choices about the nutritional content of standard menu items in large chain restaurants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HARE, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont):

H.R. 3896. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new job creation through the establishment of a National Infrastructure Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the deduction for environmental remediation costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. POE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 3898. A bill to impose travel and other related restrictions on heads of state of countries that are state sponsors of terrorism who are attending events at the United Nations in New York City; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 3899. A bill to provide a civil action for a minor injured by exposure to an entertainment product containing material that is harmful to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 3900. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from tax income from domestic manufacturing activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 3901. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Deputy Chief of the State and Private Forestry organization, to provide loans to eligible units of local government to finance purchases of authorized equipment to monitor, remove, dispose of, and replace infested trees that are located on land under the jurisdiction of the eligible units of local government and within the borders of quarantine areas infested by the emerald ash borer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. HARE, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 3902. A bill to amend part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for the renovation of schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. BEAN):

H.R. 3903. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to require the development of a multi-stage product testing process to ensure compliance of children's products with consumer product safety standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 3904. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with regard to research on asthma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WELLER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. MEK of Florida):

H.R. 3905. A bill to provide for an additional trade preference program for least developed countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 3906. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction for State and local sales tax, the deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses, the deduction for mortgage interest premiums, and the modifications to the dependent care credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 3907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GERGER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HODGE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr.

FORTUÑO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. FOXX, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H.R. 3908. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to ensure that the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and the national motto "In God We Trust" are each displayed prominently in the Capitol Visitor Center on a permanent basis and to prohibit the Architect from removing or refusing to include language or other content from exhibits and materials relating to the Capitol Visitor Center on the grounds that the language or content includes a religious reference or Judeo-Christian content; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 3909. A bill to require a report on the size and mixture of the Air Force intertheater airlift force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3910. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow any Federal employee who has performed sufficient service to entitle such employee to the maximum annuity percentage allowable under the Civil Service Retirement System to terminate retirement deductions from pay; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. SCHMIDT (for herself, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring birthparents who carry out an adoption plan; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself and Ms. BERKLEY):

H. Res. 756. A resolution condemning the Wakf's digging activities at the Temple Mount site and deploring the destruction of artifacts vitally important to Jewish, Christian and Muslim faiths; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. COHEN):

H. Res. 757. A resolution requiring the House of Representatives to take any legislative action necessary to verify the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment as part of the Constitution when the legislatures of an additional three States ratify the Equal Rights Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. BERKLEY):

H. Res. 758. A resolution urging Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, who is also Chairman of his Fatah party, to officially abrogate the 10 articles in the Fatah Constitution that call for Israel's destruction and terrorism against Israel, oppose any political solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and label Zionism as racism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 759. A resolution recognizing the 40th Anniversary of the Mass Movement for Soviet Jewish Freedom and the 20th Anniversary of the Freedom Sunday Rally for Soviet Jewry on the Mall in Washington, D.C.;

to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. CASTOR (for herself and Mr. REICHERT):

H. Res. 760. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Children's Health Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF:

H. Res. 761. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the violation of the human rights of United Nations Special Rapporteur on Trafficking in Persons, Sigma Huda, and others, by the caretaker government of Bangladesh; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 39: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 121: Mr. WALSH of New York.
 H.R. 136: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 138: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mrs. CUBIN.
 H.R. 139: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 460: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 468: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 503: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 510: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 688: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 719: Mr. FEENEY.
 H.R. 826: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 871: Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 891: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 946: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1108: Mr. DICKS.
 H.R. 1174: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SESTAK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 1222: Mr. HARE.
 H.R. 1223: Mr. HARE.
 H.R. 1244: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1275: Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 1304: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 1314: Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 1418: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 1419: Mr. WATT and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 1422: Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
 H.R. 1459: Mr. BAKER.
 H.R. 1552: Mr. CLAY and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1576: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 1584: Mr. WATT.
 H.R. 1609: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1619: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1644: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 1655: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 1665: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 1747: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 1783: Mr. LOBIONDO and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 1881: Mr. CLAY, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1971: Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 1976: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 2016: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 2045: Mr. MARKEY.
 H.R. 2070: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 2091: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 2123: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 2138: Mr. SALI.

H.R. 2164: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 2169: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 2234: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2280: Mr. BARROW.
 H.R. 2329: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. CHANDLER.
 H.R. 2392: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2405: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. GILCHREST.
 H.R. 2408: Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 2457: Mr. WATT.
 H.R. 2464: Mr. KIND and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 2470: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2508: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 2537: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 2550: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 2566: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
 H.R. 2585: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2747: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2784: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 2834: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2860: Mr. JINDAL.
 H.R. 2933: Mr. PUTNAM.
 H.R. 2964: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3001: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 3005: Mr. BARROW and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 3012: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3016: Mr. TIAHRT.
 H.R. 3047: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 3187: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 3195: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3212: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 3224: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 3229: Mr. RENZI, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DENT, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. POE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. FURTUPO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SHULER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. KUHLE of New York, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 3273: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3281: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 3309: Mr. MCNULTY.
 H.R. 3320: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 3339: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 3363: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 3378: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 3413: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 3418: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 3461: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 3481: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3498: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3511: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3514: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 3533: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 3541: Ms. HIRONO and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 3543: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 3544: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 3545: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3569: Mr. HERGER, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3584: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 3585: Mr. WU.

H.R. 3609: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3622: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 3627: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 3635: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

H.R. 3654: Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PENCE, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 3664: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3691: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3697: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3710: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3711: Mr. SPACE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 3718: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 3726: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 3727: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3753: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CANNON, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3779: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. AKIN, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 3793: Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 3797: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3801: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3802: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 3806: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 3818: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SHAD-EGG, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. Fortuño, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 3824: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 3825: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 3827: Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 3837: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3841: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 3864: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. BONNER.
 H.R. 3875: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.J. Res. 54: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. BARROW.
 H.J. Res. 58: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H. Con. Res. 11: Mr. HONDA.
 H. Con. Res. 218: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H. Con. Res. 221: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H. Con. Res. 229: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H. Con. Res. 230: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H. Con. Res. 231: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H. Con. Res. 234: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. ISSA.
 H. Con. Res. 235: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H. Res. 237: Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H. Res. 322: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 542: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. COHEN.
 H. Res. 684: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr.

GRAVES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. KAGEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. MAHONEY of Florida.
 H. Res. 693: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H. Res. 735: Ms. BEAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KIND, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H. Res. 740: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H. Res. 748: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1396: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 106: Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 3, October 17, 2007, by Mr. MIKE PENCE on House Resolution 694, was signed by the following Members: Mike Pence, John A. Boehner, Roy Blunt, Adam H. Putnam, Eric Cantor, Marsha Blackburn, Adrian Smith, Michele Bachmann, Stevan Pearce, Greg Walden, Jeff Flake, Joe Wilson, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Todd Tiahrt, Vito Fossella, Michael K. Conaway, Doc Hastings, Joseph R. Pitts, Mary Fallin, John R. "Randy" Kuhl, Jr., David Davis, Jim Jordan, Tom Price, J. Dennis Hastert, Kevin McCarthy, Thomas M. Reynolds, Judy Biggert, David Dreier, Connie Mack, Pete Sessions, Jeb Hensarling, Sam Johnson, Gary G. Miller, Mary Bono, Edward R. Royce, Sam Graves,

John Campbell, Lee Terry, Dean Heller, Mike Ferguson, Gus M. Bilirakis, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, J. Gresham Barrett, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Ted Poe, Jeff Miller, Daniel E. Lungren, Jeff Fortenberry, Charles W. Dent, Michael T. McCaul, Steve King, Tom Feeney, Louie Gohmert, Bill Shuster, John Abney Culberson, Virginia Foxx, Harold Rogers, Ron Lewis, John Shimkus, Barbara Cubin, Dan Burton, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Rodney Alexander, Dennis R. Rehberg, John Kline, Frank A. LoBiondo, Mac Thornberry, Ric Keller, Fred Upton, Jo Bonner, Michael R. Turner, Scott Garrett, Chris Cannon, Ken Calvert, Jim Gerlach, Jerry Moran, Candice S. Miller, Thelma D. Drake, Dana Rohrabacher, Zach Wamp, Jo Ann Emerson, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Kay Granger, Darrell E. Issa, Kenny Marchant, Phil English, Tim Walberg, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Doug Lamborn, John B. Shadegg, Tom Latham, Ginny Brown-Waite, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Rob Bishop, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Patrick T. McHenry, Frank D. Lucas, John T. Doolittle, Wally Herger, John R. Carter, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Bill Sali, Kevin Brady, Don Young, Michael K. Simpson, Michael C. Burgess, Ander Crenshaw, Jean Schmidt, Dave Weldon, Mario Diaz-Balart, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Todd W. Akin, Terry Everett, Donald A. Manzullo, Nathan Deal, Paul C. Broun, Tom Cole, Christopher Shays, Todd Russell Platts, Ralph M. Hall, Geoff Davis, Dave Camp, Roger F. Wicker, Marilyn N. Musgrave, Phil Gingrey, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Robert B. Aderholt, Bob Goodlatte, Duncan Hunter, Spencer Bachus, Bob Inglis, Lamar Smith, James T. Walsh, Trent Franks, and Mark Steven Kirk.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 2 by Mr. BOEHNER on House Resolution 559: Barbara Cubin.