



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2007

No. 191

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,
December 13, 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: Lord God, Isaiah the prophet tells us: "The way of the just is smooth; the path of the just is made level by You. Yes, for Your way and Your judgments, O Lord, we look to You. Your name and Your guidance are the desire of our souls."

Since the making of just laws and the shaping of policy that is good for Your people, Lord, is the work of Congress, we pray that the same spirit that moved Isaiah may stir the hearts of the Representatives so they may seek Your

presence and desire Your help with greater intensity these days.

May their souls yearn for You in the night and be watchful for Your coming with inspiration, clarity of speech, and willful collaboration.

Then when Your judgment dawns upon the Earth, may Your people have justice. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

NOTICE

If the 110th Congress, 1st Session, adjourns sine die on or before December 21, 2007, a final issue of the *Congressional Record* for the 110th Congress, 1st Session, will be published on Friday, December 28, 2007, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT-60 or S-123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through Thursday, December 27. The final issue will be dated Friday, December 28, 2007, and will be delivered on Wednesday, January 2, 2008.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the *Congressional Record* may contain subject matter, or relate to any event that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be formatted according to the instructions at http://webster/secretary/cong_record.pdf, and submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at "Record@Sec.Senate.gov".

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at <http://clerk.house.gov/forms>. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, and signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT-60.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the *Congressional Record* may do so by contacting the Office of Congressional Publishing Services, at the Government Printing Office, on 512-0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

ROBERT A. BRADY, *Chairman*.

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.

H15417

last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ALTMIRE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4343. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify age standards for pilots engaged in commercial aviation operations.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3997. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide earnings assistance and tax relief to members of the uniformed services, volunteer firefighters, and Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1245. An act to reform mutual aid agreements for the National Capital Region

S. 2271. An act to authorize State and local governments to divest assets in companies that conduct business operations in Sudan, to prohibit United States Government contracts with such companies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board:

Patrick Murphy of Washington, DC, and reappoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board:

Andrew Ortiz of Arizona.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-398, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, and after consultation with the ranking members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, appoints the following individual as a member of the United States-China Economic Security Review Commission:

Patrick A. Mulloy of Virginia for a term beginning January 1, 2008 and expiring December 31, 2009, vice C. Richard D'Amato of Maryland, and reappoints the following individual to the United States-China Economic Security Review Commission:

William A. Reinsch of Maryland for a term beginning January 1, 2008 and expiring December 31, 2009.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches per side.

THE UNCERTAIN ECONOMY

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, a recent poll shows that the economy is now priority number one for the American people. With home prices continuing to fall and costs continuing to rise on everything from health care to college tuition, American families are becoming more and more pessimistic about our economy.

And it's not surprising that this poll showed that the American people trust Democrats more than Republicans to handle this issue by an 18-point margin. Since taking office earlier this year, the Democratic majority in this House has passed several pieces of legislation to assist working families during this uncertain economy.

We increased the minimum wage for the first time in a decade, cut loan interest rates in half, and just last week we passed an energy bill that addresses skyrocketing gas prices and will save American families up to \$1,000 per year at the pump.

Madam Speaker, this Democratic Congress will continue to work on public policy measures that help American families make ends meet during this difficult economic time.

FUNDING OUR VETERANS

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

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, this is day 74. That is 74 days since the start of the new fiscal year. Our veterans still do not have access to the increased funding provided in a bill that passed the House and Senate months ago and the President is waiting to sign.

This bill includes increased funding to improve access to medical services for all veterans, new initiatives for mental health and PTSD, increased funds for improved medical facilities, and increased funding to assist homeless veterans, to name just a few.

The Democrats have refused to move the bill forward. Our veterans have been operating on an extended shoe-string budget since October 1. We now know that instead of moving the bill forward, the Democrats will instead pass more temporary funding that does not include this increased funding for our veterans. Then our veterans will be

lumped together with other spending in a massive package.

I'm calling on the Speaker to move the bill forward. I am calling on all Americans to contact their Representatives and tell the Democratic leadership to send a clean veterans appropriations bill to the President now.

IN HONOR OF CAPTAIN ADAM SNYDER

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

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Captain Adam Snyder of Fort Pierce, Florida, who passed away on December 5, 2007, from battle injuries suffered in Iraq.

Adam was 26 years old.

Captain Snyder belonged to the 101st Airborne Division, stationed at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. He was the fourth generation Snyder to proudly serve the United States military. Adam was serving his second tour in Iraq.

Adam was a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, where one of his professors, John McVan, described Adam as "one of the best and brightest I've ever had."

Adam's brilliance was not limited to his military career. He impressed whomever he encountered in all walks of life. Adam looked forward to returning home and pursuing his dream of acting. His modesty, bravery, and humanity are qualities rarely found in such great measure in one man.

Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart but great pride that I stand here today in this sacred hall to honor Adam and his family. I want to thank Adam's family for giving America a hero who went to work every day defending his country so that we can enjoy liberty.

Adam, our Nation for all eternity will be in your debt for the ultimate sacrifice you have made.

HONORING FORMER LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR KARL OHS

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

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Montana's most dedicated public servants, former Lieutenant Governor Karl Ohs. Last month Karl passed away in his Helena home due to complications caused by brain cancer.

Born in Malta, Montana, in 1946, Karl was the portrait of a Montana farmer and rancher. Whether it was studying agricultural economics at Montana State University, meeting with fellow ag producers to discuss economic opportunities in the State, or working

the ranch, Karl was a vital supporter of our leading industry.

His work on behalf of rural priorities didn't stop there. During his three terms in the House of Representatives and his 4 years as Lieutenant Governor, Karl was a proven leader. As a member of the Governor's advisory task force on drought and chairman of the National Lieutenant Governors Association, Karl represented Montana's needs not only on the State but on the national level. Additionally, his prominent role as mediator between the antigovernment Freeman and the FBI during a 1996 standoff, for which he was awarded the FBI's highest civil service award, solidified Karl's status as a hardworking, straight-shooting cowboy.

Finally, in 2006, as chairman of the Montana Republican Party, Karl helped Republicans regain control of the State House, the only State in the Nation to see a legislative body change from Democrat to Republican control.

Most importantly, Karl was a dedicated father, a loving husband, and a good friend, who left a permanent impression on those who knew him.

God rest his soul.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

A JOURNEY FOR 9/11

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, next week retired New York Giants cocaptain and Super Bowl champion George Martin will walk the 1,000th mile of his 3,000-mile trek across America to raise funding and awareness for sick Ground Zero rescue and recovery workers, the heroes of 9/11. His walk from New York to California, called A Journey for 9/11, began just after the sixth anniversary of that tragic day. This week his walk continues through Tennessee as he approaches his 100th mile.

George is an inspiration and a true all-star. And as he walks, this Congress is responding to the need, providing \$109 million for treatment in this budget. But we need to pass the 9/11 Health Act to help all those suffering from 9/11 injuries. It is the least a grateful nation can do.

HONORING SPECIALIST
JOHNATHAN LAHMANN

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, the Old Book says if you owe debts, pay debts;

if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect.

Today I rise to pay a debt of gratitude and honor for a Hoosier lost in Operation Iraqi Freedom. I was deeply saddened to learn of the loss of Specialist Johnathan Lahmann of Richmond, Indiana, from wounds suffered in Bayji, Iraq on Monday when a vehicle-borne improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle.

Specialist Lahmann served in the 59th Engineering Company, 20th Engineer Battalion, 36th Engineer Brigade, part of the Army III Corp based in Fort Hood, Texas.

To be a U.S. Army soldier is to be a part of the strongest fighting force in the world. Specialist Lahmann embodied the American Army values of loyalty, duty, honor, respect, and selfless service. He continued that proud tradition as a combat engineer.

Specialist Lahmann was also the recipient of the Expert Rifleman Badge and Army Good Conduct Medal. And he will be posthumously awarded the Bronze Star and a Purple Heart, having died in the line of duty.

I rise to express my profound condolences to his parents, Alan Lahmann and Linda Lahmann, to family, neighbors and friends for the loss of this brave young man.

Eastern Indiana will never forget the service and sacrifice of Johnathan Lahmann. His name will be enshrined in the hearts of two grateful nations.

PAYGO

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the fiscal responsibility and accountability that PAYGO affords us.

PAYGO requires that increases in spending or tax cuts be offset and enables us to make the right choices with our Nation's revenue. It is a simple but tough rule that helped us lower the national deficit and balance the budget in the 1990s.

I'm glad that we are now working to pass legislation under PAYGO to ensure that the national deficit is not increased and that enables us to have the revenue on hand that we need to address the very important needs of our Nation. I am proud to support the kind of fiscal discipline that PAYGO has given us, and I hope to see that every piece of legislation continues with this PAYGO regulation.

Madam Speaker, I continue to support fiscal responsibility under PAYGO for the House of Representatives to ensure that future generations are not mortgaged any further with irresponsible spending.

JOHN EDWARD "HUTCH"
HUTCHINSON

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to ad-

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, Greensburg, Pennsylvania, a town in my congressional district, is lucky to have had their fire chief for 55 years. John Edward Hutchinson, who prefers to be known just as Hutch, first took office in 1952, and he has no intention of slowing down. Were he standing with me, he would say that he simply wants to help.

And help he has. From developing training programs and specialized teams in his department to establishing burn classes in local schools, Hutch has put in countless hours of service to the community.

But it's not just Southwestern Pennsylvania that has benefited from Hutch's time as fire chief. Hutch has organized his teams to assist the victims of natural disasters throughout the country from hurricanes to floods.

Hutch always shies from attention, but he deserves our recognition for 55 years of tireless service to the community.

□ 1015

MR. PRESIDENT, SIGN THE SCHIP
BILL

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, isn't this the season of giving? My colleagues, the Democratic majority has worked without stopping to provide funding for the health insurance of our children in America. Isn't it a shame that the minority and the administration want to be the scrooge of the season and deny millions of children health care in the Children's Health Insurance Plan; 966,000 children in the State of Texas, innocent children who cannot fend for themselves, now suffering because we have a veto on the SCHIP.

Madam Speaker, isn't this a season of giving? I'm grateful that the Democrats prevailed on the AMT, giving middle-class taxpayers a bounty this holiday season, but who will care for the children?

Again, Mr. President, sign the SCHIP bill. Don't take away Christmas from millions of children here in America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

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

MAKE THE R&D TAX CREDIT
PERMANENT

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

Mr. SALI. Madam Speaker, at the end of this month, a vitally important

research and development tax credit is due to expire again.

Since 1981, Congress has erratically extended this tax credit, and extensions have ranged from 6 years to 5 months. Sometimes extensions have applied retroactively. The tax credit even lapsed for a year. A permanent R&D tax credit is long overdue, and Congress should act now to make a permanent R&D tax credit a reality.

Congress was right to offer an R&D tax credit. Doing so boosted America's competitive edge in an increasingly cut-throat global marketplace of ideas, products, and services. Yet we ignore, to our economic peril, the fact that other countries, including Australia, Canada, China, France and India, also offer tremendous R&D incentives to their industries.

Now is the time to make R&D tax credits permanent. Doing so would remove an unnecessary burden on our industries, including roughly 35,000 Idahoans employed in high-tech jobs.

Madam Speaker, there is no reason for keeping this kind of tax credit temporary. Let us unleash the power of American ingenuity and make the R&D tax credit permanent.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2082, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 859 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 859

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2082) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, Representative HASTINGS. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for the purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am going to submit my full statement for the RECORD and abbreviate it. I, however, wish to commend Chairman REYES for the leadership on this bill. Under his leadership, and that of many others, consideration of this intelligence bill has been one of the most open intelligence authorization bills that we've seen. There may be some who will disagree with some of the report's content, but there should be none who disagree with the openness of the process.

Madam Speaker, over the past week, as we debate the CIA's destruction of videotapes of past interrogations, the Nation has realized the importance of congressional oversight of the intelligence community.

For far too long, Congress has been silent as a partner in the unchecked actions of this administration. In neglecting to do our jobs, we were failing the people of America.

With this new majority Congress, we are again conducting the necessary oversight of the executive branch. With this bill, we are fulfilling our responsibility to give the intelligence community the tools it needs to succeed.

One thing that I think Members will be particularly interested in is that interrogation techniques put forth in this measure are limited to those of the Army Field Manual, making it clear that harsh or aggressive interrogation techniques are prohibited.

I participated in the conference myself, Madam Speaker, and I saw the development of this report that we have here. I would like to take a moment of personal privilege to say that I took the liberty of leaving the Select Committee on Intelligence with the hope of returning in the successive year. It is my great hope that all of the Members of that committee and the tremendous staff that work under awesome pressure know how much I and others in Congress appreciate their work.

Madam Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the Intelligence Authorization Act conference report under the standard rule for conference reports. As the chairman of the Intelligence Committee noted here on the floor yesterday, Madam Speaker, Members wishing to view the classified portions of the conference report can do so in H-405 of the Capitol.

Madam Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the Intelligence Authorization Act Conference report under the standard rule for conference reports.

As the chairman of the Intelligence Committee noted here on the floor yesterday, Madam Speaker, Members wishing to view the classified portions of the Conference Report can do so in H-405 of the Capitol.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor today in strong support of the underlying Intelligence Authorization Conference Report for Fiscal Year 2008.

As a member of the Conference and a signatory of its Report, I take great pride in being

a part of a Majority which has successfully completed its work on the Intelligence Authorization bill after the previous Majority failed to do so for the last 3 years.

I commend Chairman REYES for his leadership on this bill. Under the Chairman's leadership, and that of many others, consideration of this intelligence bill has been one of the most open intelligence authorization bills that we've seen.

There may be some who will disagree with some of the Report's content. But there should be none who disagree with the openness of the process.

During the original consideration of this bill by the House in May, the House adopted multiple bipartisan amendments.

For example, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative ROGERS and I offered an amendment which took aggressive steps to limit the growth of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

The two of us share concerns that the Director of National Intelligence has grown without constraint and is adding an additional level of bureaucracy without providing the coordination that we hoped to see when we passed the Intelligence Reform Act.

This Conference Report addresses our concerns in a positive manner. Most importantly, so has the Committee, as it has held multiple hearings on the subject since May.

There were also amendments offered and adopted by the conferees that are included in the conference agreement. Indeed, every amendment adopted by the conferees, including the one offered by Ranking Member HOEKSTRA, enjoyed bipartisan support.

Madam Speaker, over the past week, as we debate the CPA's destruction of videotapes of past interrogations, the Nation has realized the importance of Congressional oversight of the intelligence community.

For far too long, Congress was a silent partner in the unchecked actions of this Administration. In neglecting to do our jobs, we were failing the American people.

With this new Majority, Congress is again conducting the necessary oversight of the Executive Branch. With this bill, we are fulfilling our responsibility to give the intelligence community the tools it needs to succeed.

In response to growing concerns here in Congress and throughout the public, this bill takes significant steps to address interrogation and detention programs. It limits interrogation techniques to those in the Army Field Manual, making it clear that harsh or aggressive interrogation techniques are prohibited.

It requires that the intelligence community report to Congress on compliance with the Military Commissions Act and the Detainee Treatment Act.

The American people should know that we have asked the Administration to provide us with all Department of Justice legal opinions about interrogation and detention programs—opinions which are sorely needed given the CIA's decision to destroy videotapes of interrogations.

This Conference Report also increases Congressional oversight ability by strengthening the inspectors general of the intelligence community.

The Report requires the CIA Inspector General to audit all covert action programs every three years. And it also requires the DNI to provide Congress a comprehensive listing of all special access programs.

Members of the Intelligence Committee are concerned, with good cause, that the intelligence community has not been keeping us fully informed of all their activities.

With this new Majority, the critical oversight which has been lacking for the last six years is finally being conducted. And unlike in the past, it is being done in an inclusive and bipartisan manner.

Madam Speaker, the underlying Conference Report provides the necessary reforms and funding to ensure that America's intelligence community continues to pave the way in effective counter surveillance, human intelligence collection, and analysis.

I urge my colleagues support for the rule and the underlying Conference Report.

Madam Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and namesake, Mr. HASTINGS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, authorizing the necessary resources for our Nation's intelligence community is one of the most important responsibilities of Congress. The attacks of September 11, 2001, showed us that we must be vigilant against the threat of terrorism, and our intelligence community is a critical part of protecting America from its enemies abroad.

I have strong concerns about what appears to be an unfortunate and utter lack of bipartisan work on the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008.

In addition to failing to incorporate Intelligence Committee Republicans in the development of this bill, the bill also fails to consider the input of Armed Services Committee Republicans.

Serious concerns exist about the bill's mandate that all 16 U.S. intelligence agencies be governed by the U.S. Army Field Manual on interrogation designed to cover combatants picked up in the battlefield. The Army manual was never designed to cover America's most dangerous enemies, such as Osama bin Laden and Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. At a minimum, we deserve to know, Madam Speaker, how these new standards would impact intelligence operations and, ultimately, U.S. national security before rushing to attach them to this legislation.

Proponents of this new requirement view this as a simple application of one organization's set of rules onto every other entity engaged in the activity. Madam Speaker, this isn't simple; I believe it's simplistic. And it could have dire consequences on our national security.

To illustrate the logic at work here, why not require the NBA and Major League Baseball to play by the NFL rule book and use a football in their games? They all use a ball, after all,

and if a football is good enough for the NFL, it should work for the NBA and for Major League Baseball. We all know that that would be a disaster, Madam Speaker, and before we require all Federal agencies to adhere to the Army manual, we should be certain it won't create a disaster for protecting our country in the war on terror.

This bill also includes provisions that are questionable as to whether or not they will help improve America's security. Specifically, the House Democrats included language to fund and pursue research into an intelligence assessment of global warming. At a time when our Nation is engaged in a global war on terrorism, our intelligence community should not be required to focus on reports about climate change.

I am also concerned that, despite bipartisan passage of a motion to instruct conferees that earmarks should not be included, this conference report contains more than \$75 million worth of intelligence earmarks. Intelligence funding should be based on national security, not potential special interests.

Instead of funding global warming studies, earmarks, and mandating Army Field Manual provisions, House Democrats should be taking steps needed to ensure that our intelligence officials are able to monitor foreign terrorists overseas.

House Democrats have stalled the passage of a permanent update on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA. The bipartisan Protect America Act expires in less than 2 months, and the American people deserve a permanent bill as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he has any remaining speakers. I am the last speaker for our side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I inform my good friend from Florida that I have no requests for speakers; and if he's prepared to close, I will close on my side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I will reserve my time until the gentleman has closed for his side and has yielded back his time.

□ 1030

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

Madam Speaker, on December 4, Mr. HOEKSTRA offered a motion to instruct conferees that earmarks should be eliminated from a final conference report. This motion passed by a bipartisan vote of 249-160. However, despite bipartisan agreement that earmarks should not be included, this conference report contains more than \$75 million worth of intelligence earmarks. Intelligence funding should be based on national security, not on special interests.

I am concerned with the level of earmark funding in this authorization conference report, and I am concerned that the House rules are flawed when it comes to the enforceability of earmarks. House Republicans believe every earmark should be debatable on the House floor, and for the last several months we have made repeated attempts to close loopholes in the House rules as they relate to earmarks.

So, Madam Speaker, today I will again be asking my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that I can amend the rule to allow the House to immediately consider House Resolution 479 introduced by Republican Leader BOEHNER that would improve the House rules and allow the House to debate openly and honestly the validity and accuracy of earmarks contained in all bills.

We must defeat the previous question so that American taxpayers are no longer left wondering what hidden earmarks are contained in bills before the House and this Congress.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and with that I yield back my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, if we have learned anything from the failures of the war in Iraq, it is that reliable intelligence is critical to ensuring America's national security. The terrorist attacks of September 11, combined with the continuing threats fueled by extremism, radicalism, hopelessness and poverty underscore the importance of this legislation.

The new Democratic majority is working every day to ensure that we congratulate our intelligence community for its successes but also hold it accountable for its failures. This report is a strong step in the right direction, and it enjoys bipartisan support. I am proud of our product and hope that my colleagues will agree. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the underlying conference report.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 859 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider the resolution (H. Res. 479) to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for enforcement of clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final

adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alter-

native views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 69, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 869 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 869

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 69) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. During consideration of House Joint Resolution 69 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the joint resolution to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations shall insert in the Congressional Record at any time during the remainder of the first session of the 110th Congress such material as he may deem explanatory of appropriations measures for the fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 4. House Resolution 839 and House Resolution 850 are laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during the consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 869.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, H. Res. 869 provides for the consideration of H.J. Res. 69, a simple, 1-week extension of the fiscal year 2008 continuing resolution.

Madam Speaker, every Congress has the constitutional responsibility to be good stewards of the money entrusted to it by the American people. It is one of our most important responsibilities. Voters do not expect us to abdicate that responsibility, or any other, for that matter.

I am proud to say that we here in the House of Representatives have fulfilled our fiscal responsibility to the American people by passing all of our appropriations bills on time. We in the majority have been absolute in our promise to construct and pass spending bills with broad bipartisan support, and I am proud to say we have delivered on those promises.

Of the 12 fiscal year 2008 appropriations bills that have passed the House this year, we have garnered an average of 50 Republican votes, with one bill collecting as many as 187 votes from the minority. And in that spirit of working together, we have successfully pushed ahead our bold and new agenda and passed legislation that prioritizes veterans health care, education and energy independence.

Madam Speaker, we all agree that it is unfortunate that we are forced to pass a continuing resolution. But, it is something that must be done to work out the remaining issues that we have. We all understand it is our prime duty to make sure that the government is running efficiently, from our children who need quality education to our veterans who need the benefits promised to them when they signed up to serve our country, and to our senior citizens who need access to health care and affordable prescription drugs.

Many on the other side still fought tooth and nail, with some Members holding up the legislative process, in fighting these bipartisan appropriations bills, but we remained focused and strong and passed our bills on time.

It is important to note that continuing resolutions are extremely common, with a CR being enacted for every fiscal year since 1954. Additionally, Congress has averaged five continuing resolutions per year. And I would like to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that over the last 10 years of Republican control, the House has considered 75 continuing resolutions.

Madam Speaker, this is an important resolution that will allow us to do the work necessary to fulfill our promises to the American people, and I urge its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, first, I would like to thank my friend, the distinguished chairwoman, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, here we are 74 days into the new fiscal year, and the new majority is requesting their third continuing resolution to fund the government because they failed to pass the necessary appropriations bills.

As of today, only one appropriations bill funding the Department of Defense has been signed into law. What is the status of the rest? Well, another one has made it to a conference committee, and the rest of the appropriations bills wait for the majority to decide what to do. They control both Houses of Congress, and yet they still have to decide what to do.

They had a chance to bring their record to two appropriations bills signed into law. But instead, the majority decided to play politics with a bill that had extraordinary bipartisan support, the Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, because the majority thought they could use it as a campaign ploy.

The new majority promised that they would finish their appropriations work. About a year ago, my friend, the distinguished chairwoman, Ms. SLAUGHTER, came to the floor and said things would be different under the leadership of the new majority. She said, and I quote, "The House will no longer avoid asking tough questions or fail to live up to its most basic duties."

Well, today we see that that has not been possible. Next week, the majority is expected to propose an omnibus appropriations bill for all the appropriations bills that haven't been finished. That bill will probably run into the thousands of pages and spend nearly half a trillion dollars. Members may not have enough time to read and digest that legislation before they are asked to vote on it. And unless the majority decides to move the omnibus appropriations bill through a conference committee, that bill will fall squarely within one of the loopholes to the majority's earmark rule, and the rules of the House then would not require any disclosure of earmarks that will be contained in that massive omnibus appropriations bill. The majority should not be asking Members to vote on a bill that may include numerous earmarks that no one is going to be able to vet and that most won't even be able to see.

Because of this loophole in the earmark rule, I, along with Mr. DREIER, Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. SESSIONS, sent a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, asking him to "adhere not just to the letter of clause 9 of rule XXI, but to its spirit as well and provide the Rules Committee and the House with a list of earmarks contained in the omnibus appropriations bill prior to the consideration by the Rules Committee."

I sincerely hope that Chairman OBEY will comply with our request. If he

does, that would, to an extent, provide Members with a bit of comfort when the bill comes to the floor.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 6, 2007.

Hon. DAVID R. OBEY,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OBEY: Today the Committee on Rules reported a "martial law" rule to provide for the same day consideration of an omnibus appropriations vehicle. That measure also includes a provision giving you the option of inserting extraneous explanatory material in the Congressional Record for appropriations measures for the remainder of this session.

During the markup of that measure, we offered an amendment to the rule to require that you provide the list of earmarks required by clause 9 of rule XXI for the omnibus appropriations measure. Unfortunately, that amendment to the rule was rejected along partisan lines.

Mr. Chairman, we know that you have made an effort during this Congress to provide transparency for earmarks contained in bills coming through your committee. However, because the omnibus appropriations bill will be considered as a Senate amendment to a House bill, it falls squarely within one of the loopholes of the earmark rule and the Rules of the House will not require any disclosure of earmarks that will be contained therein. As you were the presiding officer over the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 6, the energy bill, you are well aware that no list of earmarks was provided for that measure because it fell within the same loophole.

We respectfully request that you adhere not just to the letter of clause 9 of rule XXI, but to its spirit as well and provide the Rules Committee and the House with a list of earmarks contained in the omnibus appropriations bill prior to consideration by the Rules Committee. That kind of disclosure will be in the best interest of the House, its Members, and the Nation.

We appreciate your willingness to consider our request.

Respectfully,

DAVID DREIER,
DOC HASTINGS,
LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART,
PETE SESSIONS.

Madam Speaker, the new majority, again, has failed to live up to their promises to finish their work on time and many others, and the underlying third continuing resolution is just another example of their failure to lead.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I would ask my friend, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, if he has any speakers.

We have no speakers, either, so if the gentleman would like to close, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Again, I thank my friend.

Madam Speaker, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and move toward passing the conference report on the bipartisan Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act that I made reference to a few minutes ago. The House passed the veterans and military funding bill on June 15 of this year by a vote of 409-2. The Senate followed suit and named conferees on September 6 of this year.

Unfortunately, the majority leadership in the House has refused to move

the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act. They have even refused to name conferees. Instead, the majority plans to include the veterans funding in the massive omnibus appropriations legislation. But the status of the omnibus is still in doubt.

□ 1045

Negotiations apparently are ongoing, but we all know there is one bill that has extraordinarily wide bipartisan support and that the President will quickly sign it into law, the Veterans Affairs appropriations bill. We already know that we are going to be here next week. We should pass the Veterans Affairs appropriation bill and provide the veterans the funding they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to help move this important legislation and oppose the previous question. Our veterans deserve better than partisan gamesmanship holding back their funding.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 869 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. The House disagrees to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2642, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon. The Speaker shall appoint conferees immediately, but may declare a recess under clause 12(a) of rule I for the purpose of consulting the Minority Leader prior to such appointment. The motion to instruct conferees otherwise in order pending the appointment of conferees instead shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two additional legislative days after adoption of this resolution.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 869, if ordered; ordering the previous question on H. Res. 859; and adoption of H. Res. 859, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 184, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 1156]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—184

Aderholt	Boehner	Campbell (CA)
Akin	Bonner	Cannon
Alexander	Boozman	Cantor
Bachmann	Boustany	Capito
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Carter
Baker	Broun (GA)	Castle
Barrett (SC)	Brown (SC)	Chabot
Bartlett (MD)	Brown-Waite,	Coble
Barton (TX)	Ginny	Cole (OK)
Biggart	Buchanan	Conaway
Bilbray	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Davis (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Buyer	Davis, David
Blackburn	Calvert	Davis, Tom
Blunt	Camp (MI)	Deal (GA)

Dent	Kingston	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Regula
Diaz-Balart, M.	Klome (MN)	Rehberg
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Reichert
Drake	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Dreier	LaHood	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehlers	Latham	Roskam
Emerson	LaTourette	Royce
English (PA)	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Everett	Linder	Sali
Fallin	LoBiondo	Saxton
Feeney	Lucas	Schmidt
Ferguson	Lungren, Daniel	Sensenbrenner
Flake	E.	Sessions
Forbes	Manzullo	Shadegg
Fortenberry	Marchant	Shays
Fossella	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus
Fox	McCaul (TX)	Shuster
Franks (AZ)	McCotter	Simpson
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Smith (NE)
Gallely	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Garrett (NJ)	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Gerlach	McKeon	Souder
Gilchrest	McMorris	Stearns
Gingrey	Rodgers	Sullivan
Gohmert	Mica	Tancredo
Goode	Miller (FL)	Terry
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Granger	Moran (KS)	Tiahrt
Graves	Murphy, Tim	Tiberi
Hall (TX)	Musgrave	Turner
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Upton
Hayes	Neugebauer	Walberg
Hensarling	Nunes	Walden (OR)
Herger	Pearce	Walsh (NY)
Hobson	Pence	Wamp
Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (FL)
Hulshof	Petri	Weller
Hunter	Pickering	Westmoreland
Inglis (SC)	Pitts	Whitfield (KY)
Issa	Platts	Wicker
Johnson (IL)	Poe	Wilson (NM)
Johnson, Sam	Porter	Wilson (SC)
Jordan	Price (GA)	Wolf
Keller	Pryce (OH)	Young (FL)
King (IA)	Putnam	
King (NY)	Radanovich	

NOT VOTING—25

Bono	Hinojosa	Reynolds
Cardoza	Hoolley	Rodriguez
Carson	Jindal	Rogers (AL)
Chandler	Jones (NC)	Rogers (KY)
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Wasserman
Culberson	Mack	Schultz
Ellison	Miller, Gary	Waters
Engel	Paul	Young (AK)
Heller	Renzi	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1109

Mr. NEUGEBAUER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2082, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 859, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 189, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 1157]

YEAS—226

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

NAYS—189

Aderholt Biggart Boozman
 Akin Bilbray Boustany
 Alexander Bilirakis Brady (TX)
 Bachmann Bishop (UT) Broun (GA)
 Bachus Blackburn Brown (SC)
 Baker Blunt Brown-Waite,
 Barrett (SC) Boehner Ginny
 Bartlett (MD) Bonner Buchanan
 Barton (TX) Bono Burgess

Burton (IN) Hobson Platts
 Buyer Hoekstra Poe
 Calvert Hulshof Porter
 Camp (MI) Hunter Price (GA)
 Campbell (CA) Inglis (SC) Pryce (OH)
 Cannon Issa Putnam
 Cantor Johnson (IL) Radanovich
 Capito Johnson, Sam Ramstad
 Carter Jordan Regula
 Castle Keller Rehberg
 Chabot King (IA) Reichert
 Coble King (NY) Rogers (AL)
 Cole (OK) Kingston Rogers (MI)
 Conaway Kirk Rohrabacher
 Crenshaw Kline (MN) Ros-Lehtinen
 Davis (KY) Knollenberg Roskam
 Davis, David Kuhl (NY) Royce
 Davis, Tom LaHood Ryan (WI)
 Deal (GA) Lamborn Sali
 Dent Latham Saxton
 Diaz-Balart, L. LaTourette Schmidt
 Diaz-Balart, M. Lewis (CA) Sensenbrenner
 Doolittle Lewis (KY) Sessions
 Drake Linder Shadegg
 Dreier LoBiondo Shays
 Duncan Lucas Shimkus
 Ehlers Lungren, Daniel Shuster
 Emerson E. Simpson
 English (PA) Mack Smith (NE)
 Everrett Manullo Smith (NJ)
 Fallin Manchant Smith (TX)
 Feeney McCarthy (CA) Souder
 Ferguson McCaul (TX) Stearns
 Flake McCotter Sullivan
 Forbes McCrery Tancredo
 Fortenberry McHenry Terry
 Fossella McHugh Thornberry
 Foxx McKeon Tiahrt
 Franks (AZ) McMorris Tiberi
 Frelinghuysen Rodgers Turner
 Gallegly Mica Upton
 Garrett (NJ) Miller (FL) Walberg
 Gerlach Miller (MI) Walden (OR)
 Gilchrest Moran (KS) Walsh (NY)
 Gingrey Murphy, Tim Wamp
 Gohmert Musgrave Weldon (FL)
 Goode Myrick Weller
 Goodlatte Neugebauer Westmoreland
 Granger Nunes Whitfield (KY)
 Graves Pearce Wicker
 Hall (TX) Pence Wilson (NM)
 Hastings (WA) Peterson (PA) Wilson (SC)
 Hayes Petri Wolf
 Hensarling Pickering Young (AK)
 Herger Pitts Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Cardoza Hinojosa Renzi
 Carson Hooley Reynolds
 Cubin Jindal Rogers (KY)
 Culberson Jones (NC) Wasserman
 Engel Miller, Gary Schultz
 Heller Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1120

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 191, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 1158]

YEAS—227

Abercrombie Altmire Baca
 Ackerman Andrews Baird
 Allen Arcuri Baldwin

Barrow Herseth Sandlin Ortiz
 Bean Higgins Pallone
 Becerra Hill Pascrell
 Berkley Hinchey Pastor
 Berman Hirono Payne
 Berry Hodes Perlmutter
 Bishop (GA) Holden Peterson (MN)
 Bishop (NY) Holt Pomeroy
 Blumenauer Blumenauer Honda
 Boren Boren Hoyer
 Boswell Boswell Inslee
 Boucher Boucher Israel
 Boyd (FL) Boyd (FL) Jackson (IL)
 Boyda (KS) Boyda (KS) Jackson-Lee
 Brady (PA) Brady (PA) (TX)
 Braley (IA) Braley (IA) Jefferson
 Brown, Corrine Brown, Corrine Johnson (GA)
 Butterfield Butterfield Johnson, E. B.
 Capps Capps Jones (OH)
 Capuano Capuano Kagen
 Carnahan Carnahan Kanjorski
 Carney Carney Kaptur
 Castor Castor Kennedy
 Chandler Chandler Kildeer
 Clarke Clarke Kilpatrick
 Clay Clay Sarbanes
 Cleaver Cleaver Klein (FL)
 Clyburn Clyburn Kucinich
 Cohen Cohen Lampton
 Conyers Conyers Langevin
 Cooper Cooper Lantos
 Costa Costa Larsen (WA)
 Costello Costello Larson (CT)
 Courtney Courtney Lee
 Cramer Cramer Levin
 Crowley Crowley Lewis (GA)
 Cuellar Cuellar Lipinski
 Cummings Cummings Loeb sack
 Davis (AL) Davis (AL) Lofgren, Zoe
 Davis (CA) Davis (CA) Lowey
 Davis (IL) Davis (IL) Lynch
 Davis, Lincoln Davis, Lincoln Mahoney (FL)
 DeFazio DeFazio Maloney (NY)
 DeGette DeGette Markey
 Delahunt Delahunt Marshall
 DeLauro DeLauro Matheson
 Dicks Dicks Matsui
 Dingell Dingell McCarthy (NY)
 Doggett Doggett McCollum (MN)
 Donnelly Donnelly McDermott
 Doyle Doyle McGovern
 Edwards Edwards McIntyre
 Ellison Ellison McNeerney
 Ellsworth Ellsworth McNulty
 Emanuel Emanuel Meek (FL)
 Engel Engel Meeks (NY)
 Eshoo Eshoo Melancon
 Etheridge Etheridge Michaud
 Farr Farr Miller (NC)
 Fattah Fattah Miller, George
 Filner Filner Mitchell
 Frank (MA) Frank (MA) Mollohan
 Giffords Giffords Moore (KS)
 Gillibrand Gillibrand Moran (VA)
 Gonzalez Gonzalez Murphy (CT)
 Gordon Gordon Murphy, Patrick
 Green, Al Green, Al Murtha
 Green, Gene Green, Gene Nadler
 Hare Hare Obey
 Harman Harman Olver
 Hastings (FL) Hastings (FL)

NAYS—191

Aderholt Brown-Waite, Dent
 Akin Ginny Diaz-Balart, L.
 Alexander Buchanan Diaz-Balart, M.
 Bachmann Burgess Doolittle
 Bachus Burton (IN) Drake
 Baker Buyer Dreier
 Barrett (SC) Calvert Duncan
 Bartlett (MD) Bartlett (MD) Camp (MI)
 Barton (TX) Barton (TX) Campbell (CA)
 Biggart Biggart Cannon
 Bilbray Bilbray Cantor
 Bilirakis Bilirakis Capito
 Blackburn Blackburn Carter
 Bono Bono Castle
 Boozman Boozman Chabot
 Boustany Boustany Coble
 Brady (TX) Brady (TX) Cole (OK)
 Brown (GA) Brown (GA) Conaway
 Brown (SC) Brown (SC) Crenshaw
 Brown-Waite, Brown-Waite, Davis (KY)
 Buchanan Buchanan Davis, David
 Burgess Burgess Davis, Tom
 Dent Dent Deal (GA)

Gerlach	Manzullo	Ros-Lehtinen
Gilchrest	Marchant	Roskam
Gingrey	McCarthy (CA)	Royce
Gohmert	McCaul (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Goode	McCotter	Sali
Goodlatte	McCreery	Saxton
Granger	McHenry	Schmidt
Graves	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Sessions
Hastings (WA)	McMorriss	Shadegg
Hayes	Rodgers	Shays
Hensarling	Mica	Shimkus
Herger	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Hobson	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Smith (NE)
Hulshof	Murphy, Tim	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Musgrave	Smith (TX)
Inglis (SC)	Myrick	Souder
Issa	Neugebauer	Stearns
Johnson (IL)	Nunes	Sullivan
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Tancredo
Jordan	Pence	Terry
Keller	Peterson (PA)	Thornberry
King (IA)	Petri	Tiahrt
King (NY)	Pickering	Tiberi
Kingston	Pitts	Turner
Kirk	Platts	Upton
Kline (MN)	Poe	Walberg
Knollenberg	Porter	Walden (OR)
Kuhl (NY)	Price (GA)	Walsh (NY)
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Wamp
Lamborn	Putnam	Weldon (FL)
Latham	Radanovich	Weller
LaTourette	Ramstad	Westmoreland
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Whitfield (KY)
Lewis (KY)	Rehberg	Wicker
Linder	Reichert	Wilson (NM)
LoBiondo	Reynolds	Wilson (SC)
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Wolf
Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)
E.	Rogers (MI)	Young (FL)
Mack	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—13

Cardoza	Hinojosa	Paul
Carson	Hooley	Renzi
Cubin	Jindal	Wasserman
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Schultz
Heller	Miller, Gary	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1126

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, due to a pre-existing commitment to visit wounded heroes at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, I missed three rollcall votes this morning. I ask that the RECORD show that had I been present: For rollcall No. 1156—Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 869—I would have voted “nay”; for rollcall No. 1157—Ordering the Previous Question H. Res. 859—I would have voted “nay”; for rollcall No. 1158—Adoption of the Rule of consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2082—I would have voted “nay.”

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2082, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 859, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2082) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Com-

munity Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 6, 2007, at page H14462.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this conference report.

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

There was no objection.

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

Last week was a remarkable week in the intelligence community. It was the best of times and the worst of times.

First, the good news. The week began with a release of a new National Intelligence Estimate on Iran. That estimate was a careful, meaningful review of the intelligence on Iran, which many of us hope will bring about a significant change in our approach to Iran, which is still a significant concern to all of us.

Then came the bad news. We ended the week with the revelation that the Central Intelligence Agency destroyed videotapes of interrogations. This is also a subject of great concern to all of us in this House. The committee had a briefing on it just yesterday, and we will continue to investigate the issue thoroughly.

Both the good news and the bad news have one thing in common. They show that careful oversight of the Intelligence Community is absolutely essential and absolutely critical. The authorization process is where we do much of our oversight and it's where we can address problem areas.

Madam Speaker, today, for the first time in 3 years, the House will vote on a conference report on an intelligence authorization bill. I am proud of it, and I hope my colleagues are too. This is the largest intelligence authorization in the history of our country. It is the result of 11 months of work done by our committee.

The conference process was a challenge. The Senate bill and the House bill were substantially different, but we worked hard to arrive at a middle ground. In conference, we further improved the bill. The conference adopted amendments offered by Members from both Chambers and both parties. This includes an amendment by the distinguished ranking member of the intelligence committee.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bill that will strengthen our intelligence community and our Nation's security. It adds significant funds to most of the Nation's satellite architecture. It reduces funding for nonperforming intelligence activities in Iraq, while robustly funding activities against al Qaeda and terrorism in Afghanistan and around the globe.

I am particularly proud of the fact that it also includes funding for counterterrorism, human intelligence collection, analysis, training and languages. We have carefully tailored provisions to enhance the diversity of the intelligence community, which is a critical investment for the future of the intelligence community.

In another investment for the future, we've added significant funding for advanced research and development. This will also maintain our technical edge over our adversaries. We have also provided money to repair and replace aging infrastructure and to train and equip linguists and intelligence collectors, so vital and important in the global war on terrorism.

This bill promotes accountability within the intelligence community, and it puts the intelligence committee back in the business of oversight. It requires reporting to Congress on several issues of major concern to all of us, including a report on compliance with the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 and related provisions of the Military Commissions Act of 2006 regarding detentions and interrogations, as well as Justice Department legal opinions related to all of these activities. It includes provisions to strengthen oversight by the Inspector General in the intelligence community, including a provision establishing a confirmed communitywide Inspector General armed with essential authorities.

The conference report also provides for Senate confirmation of the Directors of the National Security Agency and the National Reconnaissance Office. For agencies with such significant budgets and acquisition authority and the potential to impact American privacy rights, we think the Congress ought to have a say in their Directors through Senate confirmation.

In short, Madam Speaker, the conference report is a result of a bipartisan, bicameral effort to strengthen both the intelligence community and congressional oversight. I will be proud to vote for it, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to my colleague from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT).

Mr. EVERETT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report to the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008. The process and the substance of the bill fall sadly short. As one of the crossover Members who serves on both the Select Intelligence and the House Armed Services

Committees, it's critical that the House Armed Services Committee and Select Committee on Intelligence work together on national security programs that serve both the military and national intelligence. Regretfully, the Armed Services Committee's ranking member, Republican, Mr. HUNTER of California, was denied any input into the joint programs that are shared by both committees.

On substance, I had hoped the bill would have improved from the House-passed measure in May. That didn't happen. The conference report includes even more politically charged provisions from the Senate bill that micro-manage and politicize the interrogation techniques of the intelligence community.

In case anyone in the Chamber has forgotten, we're at war with terrorists. Should we really be publishing our interrogation manuals for the entire world and for terrorists to see?

On a positive note, I would like to mention two specific program areas that are important to both the military and intelligence communities: the U-2 aircraft and space radar programs. The conference report language keeps the U-2 and its critical intelligence capabilities flying until we are truly transitioned over to the Global Hawk.

And I am also pleased that the bill authorizes funding for space radar capabilities, though at a lower funding level than I would like. This is an essential capability that combat commanders and service intelligence chiefs have continuously requested.

Madam Speaker, we can do better than this, and I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on the conference report.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I just want to note for the record that Mr. SKELTON was not available to provide input to the conference group, and Mr. HUNTER was there but had to leave, so that is the reason they did not provide input.

I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, this bill, our first in 3 years, will strengthen the oversight of the intelligence community, require reports on the administration's compliance with the Detainee Treatment Act, and reduce the overall number of contractors employed by intelligence agencies.

But for me, the most important element of this bill, the main reason I am supporting this conference report, was added just 1 week ago during conference. When the intelligence oversight committees gathered to consider the conference report, we inserted an amendment that would require all intelligence agencies to comply with the U.S. Army Field Manual on interrogations. This would mean no more torture and no more questions about what the CIA is allowed to do behind closed doors. The Army Field Manual is unclassified, and explicitly prohibits waterboarding, use of hoods, electric

shocks and mock executions. The military has voluntarily imposed these restrictions upon itself, and now we must impose the same rules on the intelligence community.

I'm a new member of the Intelligence Committee. The Speaker called me at the beginning of this session and asked if I would serve my country by joining this important and distinguished group, and I consider my work on this bill to be just that.

The intelligence agencies we oversee operate in the shadows, and on the Intelligence Committee, we learn about policies and priorities and problems that no one in the broader public will ever see. Some of these issues are very troubling. Some of them keep me up at night.

The question of interrogation techniques is one of the most important I've dealt with on the committee, and I'm gratified we're having this debate today in a public forum.

My colleagues in the minority complain that the inclusion of this provision will make it impossible for our intelligence officers to protect the American people from terrorists. As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I assure you that those claims are false. But don't take my word for it. Please consider the advice of General David Petraeus, who said in a May 10 memo to the members of the Armed Forces that the Army Field Manual allowed intelligence officials to get the information they need. Among the things he said is, quote, "our experience in applying the interrogation standards laid out in the Army Field Manual on human intelligence collector operations that was published last year shows that the techniques in the manual work effectively and humanely in eliciting information from detainees."

If we don't pass this bill with this provision, how can we assume the moral authority to criticize Burma or any other nation for its treatment of prisoners?

In the end, we have hurt our own country and undermined the real source of our strength, the rule of law and the sanctity of our Constitution. We're fighting for the soul of our country today. I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise in disappointment, really, of this bill. There is no doubt that there are a number of good provisions in it, thanks to the work of the chairman, ranking member and others. But I believe that we could and we should have done better. And I'll say this, Madam Speaker, in the context of the intelligence issues of the moment.

As the chairman noted, there is a great deal of turmoil about the product of the intelligence community on specific issues today, and I would recommend that all our colleagues read

two editorials in today's Washington Post, one by Dr. Henry Kissinger that talks about the politicization of intelligence and the other by Mr. Ignatius that talks about the congressional oversight of intelligence, which has broken. We need to do things to improve that oversight, to increase the credibility of the community and congressional responsibilities in overseeing the intelligence community, but, unfortunately, this bill does not do the things, many of the things that could help improve our credibility and improve the community. For example, just a few days ago, this body voted for a motion to instruct to remove all earmarks in this bill and to increase human intelligence collection.

Now, part of the reason I believe we should have done that is to increase the credibility of Congress in overseeing the intelligence community because there have been problems in this area. But, unfortunately, the conference report that comes back to us today did not follow the clear bipartisan vote of the House in removing earmarks and in maximizing human intelligence collection, which is very critical. And it is a missed opportunity to improve the community and to improve ourselves in our responsibilities. And I don't think we can emphasize enough the importance of human intelligence collection in the face of the threats we face today. Much of the intelligence that will keep Americans safe is not going to come from satellites or other sorts of technical collection. It's going to come from human beings who understand the capabilities and the intention of another small group of human beings hidden in a cave or in a compound somewhere. And that's where we have to put the emphasis. Unfortunately, this bill does not do as much as it should.

□ 1145

Lastly, Madam Speaker, I would say that I believe it's a mistake to telegraph to al Qaeda or other potential enemies exactly what we're going to do when we capture you. And I believe that that provision of this bill that basically gives your playbook to our enemies increases the danger to American lives. As the gentlelady from Illinois said, it does not eliminate our ability to protect this country, but it increases the danger; and for that reason, the bill should be rejected.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), a fellow Vietnam veteran and a valued member of our House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Our intelligence professionals are on the front lines of a critically important campaign, a campaign against a determined enemy, an enemy that's ruthless, cunning, and does not abide by the rules.

In my past, I served our Nation on the front lines in a different campaign

against another determined enemy. My experience in Vietnam taught me a lot about what our Nation needs to do when it sends its best and brightest off to protect itself from threats abroad.

It taught me that a Nation needs to invest in its national security professionals to ensure that its men and women on the front lines have the best and most effective training possible. One of the principles of war is intelligence. You cannot have a successful strategy without knowing your enemy. Absolutely essential, saves lives.

I'm proud to say that the conference report does, in fact, invest in our intelligence professionals.

It increases spending on language training at the DNI level, Department of National Intelligence, so languages can be leveraged across the intelligence community. Because of bipartisan concerns about language skills, it also requires an annual report on language proficiency.

It fully funds our Nation's counterterrorism effort to ensure that our human intelligence officers have what they need to collect against our Nation's most important intelligence targets.

It increases training and funding for analysts to ensure that when our intelligence collectors gather important information on the front lines that we have trained and qualified professionals back home that can piece the information together and inform policymakers about the important issues of our time.

Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to highlight one provision of the conference report that I worked hard to include. It will require significant and critical reporting on the nuclear programs of Iran and North Korea, once in the 2008 fiscal year and twice in 2009. Last week's National Intelligence Estimate showed us that the intelligence can change significantly over time and that we have to constantly reassess our beliefs. I don't want us to forget about the threats that are a little further down the road while we're focused on today. That's why I've been pushing this provision for 2 years, and I'm glad it's in the conference report.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report today. I'm disappointed. I do compliment the chairman in an effort to move in a bipartisan direction. I think it's something that both he and I feel is essential, that at a time of risk, whether we're facing radical jihadists or whether we're facing the threat from China, North Korea, Iran, or other threats around the globe, it would be to the betterment of the country if we could reach a position on a bipartisan basis where we could come to the floor in support of a reauthorization or an authorization of the intelligence community. I can't do that today. I don't believe that this bill moves us in the direction that we need to go.

Earlier, a colleague talked a little bit about interrogation methods and these types of things. One of the problems that has happened over the last number of years, it's talked about in the editorial that my colleague from Texas referenced, the administration on a bipartisan basis reaching out to Congress, briefing Members of Congress on various programs that they felt were essential to keeping America safe and actually have kept the homeland safe ever since 9/11, have enabled us to put together the strategies and the tactics that have ensured that we have not been attacked again.

The problem is these programs have leaked out, whether it's from the community, whether it's perhaps from Congress, or wherever they have leaked out, even though Congress has been involved in the process and has reviewed these processes at their inception. These Members who were briefed and at one time said, yeah, we support these programs, have moved away from them and now that they're public said, well, yeah, we never had all the information; there's nothing that we could do about that. These programs need to be done in secret.

There are problems with this bill. I will detail more of these as we go through.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), who serves as the chairman of the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, the conference report in front of us today, imperfect as it is, addresses several key issues facing our intelligence community today: attracting and retaining people with foreign languages and cultures; bringing speed to security clearance processes for new hires; the provision directing the Director of National Intelligence to establish a multilevel security clearance process; and a number of other things.

But as the person appointed by Speaker PELOSI to chair the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel, I'm especially interested and supportive of the provisions of this legislation that will improve the ability of Congress to exert oversight of the intelligence activities of this country, such as requirements that the intelligence community report to Congress and requirements that strengthen the Inspectors General in the intelligence community.

Intelligence is among the most important functions of our government because intelligence can save lives, prevent war, and assist our soldiers and protect Americans. But it is also among the most dangerous, dangerous because of the damage of intelligence poorly done, the damage that can be done to American interests and America's reputation and the freedoms and humane behavior that Americans hold dear. So these oversight provisions are particularly important.

Another provision of this legislation that I'm pleased to see is the requirement that the DNI produce National Intelligence Estimates on Iran and North Korea. I'm pleased to see that it seems that some reforms are now reflected in the way that the intelligence community does these National Intelligence Estimates. The recent Iran report appears to be a product of a reformed intelligence process.

Now, I've argued for years that we should have only one policy on how to handle detainees, and this bill addresses that issue head-on by requiring that the U.S. Government personnel and contractors, anyone involved in detainee operations, adhere to the Army Field Manual.

The bottom line is this: no torture of detainees, period. I'm thankful that we're finally taking that issue straight on; and in light of last week's news involving the CIA's detainee operations, I think it's clear that we still have more work to do.

The revelations surrounding and the ongoing investigations of the CIA's destruction of videotapes of detainee interrogations only underscore why Congress must establish clear policies for the video recording of detainee interrogations. I'm offering legislation in addition to what we're dealing with today that will deal with this, and I look forward to working with Chairman REYES and the House leadership to bring that measure to the floor for a vote very soon.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), a member of the committee.

Mr. MCHUGH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Like my colleague from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), I rise today in disappointment, and I congratulate the ranking member and the chairman. But in his opening comments, the chairman spoke about last week's NIE on Iran as the best of times; and, clearly, we all take heart in the possibility that Iran has put aside its program to develop nuclear power for weapons systems. It's an opening we need to vigorously pursue and cautiously monitor.

But I would argue, Mr. Speaker, this is hardly all good news because it also, in a less noted part of the report, talked about what we missed. It confirmed that they had an active program. It confirmed that that was going forward, and it confirmed that it happened without our knowledge, and many of the shortcomings that made that reality come about are contained in this bill.

There were a number of reasons for that failure, but some, sadly, are reflected starkly in this bill. And, indeed, for all of its good intentions, for all of its considerable effort, this legislation is sadly an example of high rhetoric that clouds stark reality.

As Mr. THORNBERRY and as the distinguished ranking member have said, there are a number of deficiencies,

things that threaten the viability of our intelligence services. In my opinion, most importantly, the failure again to provide adequate resources for human intelligence collection, whether we're talking about Iran or any other highly denied theater, it is that ability to get on the ground, to find the intelligence that would have helped us not have incorrect NIEs in places like Iran in the past and protect each and every American there.

As also has been noted, this bill really does fail to provide key surveillance authorities the kind of legislation authority that is necessary to streamline surveillance of foreign terrorist targets in foreign countries, again harkening up the issue that we're clouding the reality of today's world with high rhetoric and ideals.

On that point, let me make another observation. Mr. THORNBERRY spoke of not telegraphing our interrogation techniques to our enemy. I would disagree with Mr. THORNBERRY a little bit there in that I think we're not just telegraphing; we are actually giving them the entire playbook. None of us, none of us in this government, none of us in this Chamber support torture. We have made that clear. But to give the clear playbook to our enemies, those that would do the greatest harm, as we saw on September 11, through our interrogation techniques, I think, is a very unwise step to make.

For those reasons, I would urge we take this bill, defeat it here today and rework it in a way which better serves the interests of each and every American citizen.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), who serves as our subcommittee chairman of our Technical and Tactical Intelligence Subcommittee.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. We all should be proud of the bipartisan, bicameral product. I want to thank Chairman REYES and also Ranking Member HOEKSTRA for your leadership in helping us put this together. It's very important for our country and our national security.

It has been 3 years since an intelligence authorization bill has been in front of the President for signature. We worked across the aisle with our Republican counterparts to put America first. We must pass this conference report.

We are the most powerful country in the world because we control the skies. Our country faces serious threat from China and Russia. These countries are working continuously to outpace our security efforts, particularly in space.

This intelligence authorization addresses those, as well as other critical national security issues. This past year, we have scrutinized all aspects of the intelligence community and insisted upon accountability and results.

My congressional district includes the National Security Agency. The

men and women of the NSA work tirelessly to keep our soldiers and our civilians on the the front lines safe. They're fighting the war on terrorism 24 hours a day all over the globe. I'm proud that this conference report gives NSA the infrastructure and tools they need to protect our country.

This conference report also addresses some critical satellite issues. I assure you this Congress is looking into the problems associated with the space industry. We have made hard decisions. We've recommended changes, and we look to hold the administration accountable in the days ahead.

I support this conference report, and I recommend its passage.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from the State of Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today a bit disappointed but unfortunately not surprised. On December 4, just a week ago, the House of Representatives passed a motion to instruct conferees to remove the earmarks from this authorization.

□ 1200

That vote passed by a margin of 249-160.

Now, I have a little bit of experience with amendments trying to strike earmarks, and I don't think I've ever come close to 249. That's a significant number of votes. That was a bipartisan total, in that 60 Democrats joined Republicans to oppose these earmarks; yet these earmarks remain in the conference report. Every House earmark that was added remain in the conference report.

Simply put, if controversial earmarks like these can remain in a report and aren't eliminated, what earmark will ever be eliminated? When will we ever get around to eliminating these?

Let me just remind you that procedural irregularities surrounded the consideration of this bill when it came to the House. The earmark list required by the House rules was not submitted with the House report. The amendment review procedure was flawed. Members didn't have the critical time necessary to review these earmarks. In fact, the earmark list, when we finally got it, was submitted after the deadline to go to the Rules Committee to offer the amendments that would be considered. So we got the list of earmarks after the deadline to oppose them. So we had considerable irregularities going into this. And then we have a vote where the majority of this House, a clear majority, 249 Members, 60 Members of the majority party, said please remove these earmarks; yet they remain. They're still here. Why are we doing that? Why are we doing that? If we can't remove these controversial earmarks, when will we ever remove any earmarks?

Let me remind you as well there have been numerous, numerous newspaper

articles, media accounts since that time about these same earmarks; some of the private companies they are going to, what kind of consideration or scrutiny was given. I can tell you, very little, if we don't even get the list in time to be able to offer amendments to strike them and then we're presented with a conference report where we have no opportunity to strike individual earmarks after a majority of the House has said let's remove them all. Why are we bringing this bill up? Why are we being urged to vote "yes" on this? I would ask the majority, please tell us.

As mentioned, I attempted before to convene a secret session to provide a review of the classified earmarks in the bill. That was defeated. But I would ask my colleagues who are associated with the 23 House earmarks in this bill to please voluntarily give them up. Concede that no proper scrutiny was given. And I will offer legislation in the next session to actually defund each of these earmarks in this authorization bill.

And I would encourage all of those, and I look forward to having all of the 249 Members who voted to remove these earmarks, to join me in pushing that legislation.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to the time left on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO). The gentleman from Texas has 15½ minutes and the gentleman from Michigan has 18 minutes.

Mr. REYES. With that, I will reserve my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield myself 2 minutes.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the 2008 intelligence authorization bill. I think that this report does move us in the wrong direction and sets some of the wrong priorities.

It rejects the bipartisan approach for congressional authorization of the intelligence community at a time when we really do need to be working together. There were efforts to do this on a bipartisan basis. The end result of the product is that it is not a bipartisan bill. As my colleague from Arizona just stated, last week we had an overwhelming vote to remove earmarks from a national security bill. It went to conference. All the earmarks were maintained in the bill.

When we were at conference, my colleague from the Armed Services Committee DUNCAN HUNTER wanted to share his concerns about the bill. Ranking Member HUNTER was denied an opportunity to speak at the conference. It is why today DUNCAN HUNTER, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, is opposed to this intelligence bill. At a time when intelligence and defense ought to be integrated and seamless, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee is opposed to this bill.

One of the strategies that the President outlined in his reform for the intelligence community was to increase

HUMINT, to significantly increase the size of the HUMINT individuals, people collecting human intelligence, put us on a glide path to significantly increase that critical asset. This bill falls far short of funding that glide path that I thought we had agreed upon on a bipartisan basis, saying if we are going to be effective, we need to have more human intelligence.

For these and other reasons, I oppose this intelligence bill.

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I am pleased that this conference report will improve our security and protect the freedoms that make this country so great. It includes critical funding for counterterrorism, human intelligence and counterintelligence efforts, as well as making strong progress in improving our overhead architecture. And on that point in particular, I commend not only Chairman REYES but also Congressman RUPPERSBERGER, as well as the staff for their hard work in this area, and I was proud to be a part of that effort.

Furthermore, as my colleagues have discussed, it brings the intelligence community in line with the rest of our national security professionals by requiring it to abide by the Army Field Manual when conducting interrogations. As a member of the Intelligence Committee and, in general, members of the Intelligence Committee, we devote many hours behind closed doors addressing some of the most important national security issues facing our Nation. This conference report reflects the high priority that the committee, led by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), places on congressional oversight of the intelligence community. And I commend the chairman for his stepped-up efforts to ensure that oversight is a greater priority for the Intelligence Committee.

We have included a number of provisions to restore a greater role for the Congress and to ensure that our intelligence activities are not subject to political influence. This measure requires the Central Intelligence Agency's Inspector General to audit all covert action programs every 3 years, for example. It also requires the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to provide Congress with a comprehensive listing of all special access programs to ensure that the intelligence community is keeping us fully informed of these activities.

It requires a report on compliance with the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 and provisions of the Military Commissions Act of 2006 regarding detentions and interrogations and mandates that the administration provide Congress with the Justice Department's legal opinions related to these activities. And it requires semi-annual reports on what we know about nuclear programs of Iran and North Korea to make sure that we have accurate and timely information.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, strong oversight is essential to effective government and to the ability of our intelligence community to respond to the threats that we face today. This conference report will demand accountability and give our intelligence professionals the resources that they need to keep Americans safe.

I want to thank, again, the chairman for his hard work, as well as the ranking member on this bill and as well as Members of the Senate for their hard work on this conference report.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield myself 2 minutes.

As we continue to talk about the various weaknesses in this bill, let me highlight a few more.

The report fails to provide for long-term authorities to streamline the surveillance of foreign terrorist targets, foreign countries. We need this capability to detect and prevent potential attacks to the United States.

It has been talked a little bit about that this bill prohibits torture. Torture is already prohibited. The insinuation is that the Members of Congress who were briefed on the interrogation methods back in 2002, 2003, as they were briefed by the administration, that these Members signed off on interrogation methods that constituted torture. I don't believe that the current Speaker of the House signed off on those types of methods. The current Speaker of the House was one of the people that was briefed back in 2002 and 2003, along with other Members. Congress participated fully and had the opportunity to review the interrogation methods.

As we capture individuals and decide to determine exactly what information, I don't think we should treat them as outlined in the Army Field Manual. These are not normal enemy combatants, they don't wear a uniform, and we shouldn't be applying military rules to the intelligence community.

We talked about priorities. The report on Iran perhaps last week was a significant improvement over the National Intelligence Estimates that we had gotten from the community in previous years. We hope it was better. The one in 2005 the community now says was totally wrong. The conclusions they reached were very, very different.

We need to improve our intelligence capabilities. What this report says is one of the key National Intelligence Estimates that we need to develop over

the next year is on global warming. We've got lots more important targets and resources. Number one is rebuilding the capability of actually doing estimates and doing assessments before we start moving on to those targets. As we improve that process, let's focus on hard targets, not global warming, which is being discussed in just about every other committee on the Hill today.

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman.

As I said in my opening comments, this is the first time in 3 years that we've had an authorization bill. It's not a perfect bill and I think all of us acknowledge that, but the concept of democracy is that we work together. There are provisions in this bill by both Democrats and Republicans, and just because you don't like every aspect of it, you don't gather up your marbles and go home. It's about protecting our country. That's what we are trying to do. And I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), who is the chairwoman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Intelligence and is the former ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank Chairman REYES for yielding, and I'm proud to be part of this debate along with him, Ranking Member PETE HOEKSTRA and other friends from my long service on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this committee for 8 years, the last 4 as ranking member, I remain passionate about intelligence issues and very proud of the thousands of my constituents who comprise the industrial base that builds our intelligence satellites.

As we have heard, this is the first intelligence authorization conference report in 3 years. It is the House's main tool for setting directions and conducting oversight of our intelligence community. It includes new tools, record funding, investments in language training, and a provision I have pushed for years: multilevel clearances.

I honor and support the work of the brave women and men of our intelligence community around the world. Often their families cannot accompany them on their assignments and in many cases don't even know what they do. I visit them often, and if they are tuning in, let me say thank you again on behalf of a grateful Nation.

Two items. First, interrogations policy. For years I have urged a clear legal framework around detention and interrogation policy in the post-9/11 world. The scandal over destruction of the interrogations tapes was avoidable. As ranking member in 2003, I urged in writing that planned destruction of tapes was ill advised. The committee was not advised in 2005 that the tapes

were destroyed, and the thorough hearings now in progress may reveal that the committee was deliberately misled. That would be disgraceful. There should not be a separate interrogations program. That's why I support the Senate language requiring all interrogation procedures to conform to the Army Field Manual.

□ 1215

Second, the Iran NIE. I've read it in its entirety, and I'm proud of those who wrote it. They did careful work, and they spoke truth to power.

Intelligence is not policy. It is a tool which helps wise policymakers develop policy. Instead of blaming the messenger, policy experts and security experts should use the conclusions in the NIE to support tough sanctions, which we need, and diplomacy, which we lack. They should also understand that this NIE identifies gaps in what we know.

This policymaker is wary of Iran's possession of advanced missiles, its work on many dual-use technologies that could be part of a restarted nuclear weapons program, and its ongoing sponsorship of terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, on balance, this conference report is responsible and it is needed. Vote "aye."

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

As we continue to talk about this bill, and I agree with my colleague, the chairman of the committee, that as we go through this process, it is a democratic process, that you're not going to get everything that you would like to have. I appreciate the chairman's support on the amendment that we put in place in conference that said if the administration doesn't fully brief both intelligence committees on what happened and what we knew and what we didn't know about the attacks in Syria on September 6 by Israel, that we would fence off funds and they would not be available to the community to spend, because I believe that's an instance where the committee's being fully informed will enable us to better do our jobs because oversight is absolutely essential.

But when I take a look at the totality of the bill, I don't believe that it moves us in the right direction. As my other colleague from California just stated, in 2005, when the National Intelligence Estimate came out and talked about their weapons programs, we both, together, voiced skepticism about the quality of the intelligence, not the quality of the analysis, but do we really have in place the sources and methods to make the kinds of conclusions that were made in that National Intelligence Estimate. And I think we both concluded that back in 2005, reaching those conclusions with high confidence, we weren't sure you could do that.

Now, in 2007, we find out that in 2005 we were right and the community was wrong. We share some of those same concerns today. It is why it is so im-

portant that we build an intelligence community and where I think that this bill comes up short.

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 9 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan has 12 minutes.

Mr. REYES. With that, I will reserve my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. At this time, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

As we talk about the totality of the bill and why this bill comes up short, let me highlight a couple of other areas.

The conference report would subject four key positions, including the head of the NSA, the NRO, to the politicized Senate and confirmation process. If there is one thing that we've recognized through this process and through what's happened over the last few years, it is that the less politics, the less politicalization that we have in the intelligence arena, the better off we are. Creating four new confirmed positions in the Senate takes us in exactly the wrong direction.

The conference report would create a duplicate of a cumbersome new DNI Inspector General that would provide little significant new oversight. This is not about whether there should be an Inspector General with very clear powers in the Office of the DNI, but let's make sure that those responsibilities are clearly aligned with the accountabilities and the responsibilities of the Inspector General in the Department of Defense.

A number of these agencies in the community are dual functioned. What does that mean? It means that they have reporting responsibilities to the Director of National Intelligence, and they have responsibilities to the Secretary of Defense. And if we're going to create an Inspector General in the DNI, let's make sure that that Inspector General is coordinated with the activities in the Department of Defense. This bill fails to do that.

This bill also takes the DNI in a couple of other directions. It grows the staff on a bipartisan basis in the House in a very different position than from where the Senate is. We want to cap the size of the DNI. It's not a doing function. This bill not only grows the size of the DNI; it gives them new responsibilities in terms of science and technology. The DNI was never intended to be a doing function; it was intended to be a coordinating function. This moves it again in the wrong direction.

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is an important bill with an important objective, and the objective is to protect our country and to protect our Constitution.

Ironically, the ranking member has just said that by having oversight, by having checks and balance on the intelligence community, somehow we politicize it. Our Founding Fathers, in the best sense of politicalization, wanted the civil sector to be involved. That's the purposes of this committee, I suggest to my friend.

The fact of the matter is the intelligence community conducts critically important activities that we want them to conduct. But we give them extraordinary powers, and because of that, we need to make sure that they're not politicized. In fact, the irony is that I think most objective observers would say two things: first of all, that the defense establishment of our country has been probably the most politicized it's been in my 26 years in the Congress of the United States. That is not true, in my opinion, with the present Secretary, by the way, or with the present Deputy Secretary.

Secondly, they have abandoned oversight. I have said many times that the previous Congress and the Congress before that and the Congress before that exercised less oversight than any previous Congress in which I've served. In fact, there was much more oversight by the Democratic Congress of the Clinton administration, in terms of oversight hearings, numbers, depth, than there was in the entire framework of the last 6 years under Republicans in the House, the Senate, and in the White House. This is a serious piece of legislation; it requires serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, my good friend, Congressman REYES of Texas, and Mr. HOEKSTRA as well, who I think brings experience and judgment to this issue, although we have significant disagreements.

This, as the chairman has said, is the first authorization bill in 3 years to come to this floor. This authorization bill ought to come to the floor every year. Let me say briefly that this conference report enhances oversight. The reason, in my opinion, authorization bills didn't come to the floor in the last Congress is because oversight was not, as I said, as important. I've been disappointed with the oversight that's been exercised not only by this committee, but by others.

This conference report comes to the floor to enhance oversight and effective management of the intelligence community and expects and requires accountability. It enhances the management authority and flexibility of the Director of National Intelligence. Why? Because we want to have a more effective intelligence organization. And it authorizes new funding to improve the effectiveness of intelligence programs and activities. I would think all of us support those two efforts.

This legislation also includes an important provision, added in conference, that I want to talk about. It requires all American intelligence agencies and those under contract or subcontract with intelligence agencies to comply with the U.S. Army Field Manual on interrogations. Some find fault with that. I want to speak to that.

Mr. Speaker, every Member here believes that our Nation must take decisive action to detect, disrupt and, yes, eliminate terrorists who have no compunction about planning and participating in the mass killings of innocent men and women and children in an effort to advance their twisted aims. No one on this floor should gainsay that that is not the objective of every Member of this body.

We can and we will act to prevail in the war on terror. However, in the pursuit of those who seek to harm us, we must not sacrifice the very ideals that distinguish us from those who preach death and destruction. Yet, under the current administration, we have seen that line blurred between legitimate, sanctioned interrogation tactics and torture. And there is no doubt our international reputation has suffered and been stained as a result. Who said that? That's not a quote, but who said that essentially? Secretary Colin Powell, former four-star Army general, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Secretary of State in this administration.

The excesses at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo are well known, as are the administration's belief that the Geneva Convention against torture is "quaint," and the Vice President's persistent effort to undermine the ban on torture championed by whom? Senator JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona, Republican candidate for President.

Just last week we learned that the Central Intelligence Agency destroyed, perhaps illegally, videotapes or interrogations conducted by American agents. These incidents unfortunately sully our great Nation's well-deserved good reputation. They raise questions about our commitment to human rights and the rule of law. And they allow our enemies to foment fear and stoke hatred.

This provision requires all intelligence agencies to comply with the Army Field Manual on interrogations. It is an attempt by this Congress to repair the damage that has already been done.

Furthermore, the techniques permitted by the Army Field Manual have been endorsed by a wide array of civilian and military officials as both effective and consistent with our international commitments, and very importantly, with the safety of our members of the Armed Forces.

At this time I will include a letter in the RECORD. The letter is signed by, and I will not take the time to read all of the generals, but there are four four-star generals. A four-star general is as high as you can go in the Armed Forces

of the United States, except when we're in a world war, in which we accord a fifth-star.

DECEMBER 12, 2007.

Hon. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence,
Washington, DC.

Hon. SILVESTRE REYES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN REYES AND CHAIRMAN ROCKEFELLER: As retired military leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces, we write to express our strong support for Section 327 of the Conference Report on the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, H.R. 2082. Section 327 would require intelligence agents of the U.S. government to adhere to the standards of prisoner treatment and interrogation contained in the U.S. Army Field Manual on Human Collector Operations (the Army Field Manual).

We believe it is vital to the safety of our men and women in uniform that the United States not sanction the use of interrogation methods it would find unacceptable if inflicted by the enemy against captured Americans. That principle, embedded in the Army Field Manual, has guided generations of American military personnel in combat. The current situation, in which the military operates under one set of interrogation rules that are public and the CIA operates under a separate, secret set of rules, is unwise and impractical. In order to ensure adherence across the government to the requirements of the Geneva Conventions and to maintain the integrity of the humane treatment standards on which our own troops rely, we believe that all U.S. personnel—military and civilian—should be held to a single standard of humane treatment reflected in the Army Field Manual.

The Field Manual is the product of decades of practical experience and was updated last year to reflect lessons learned from the current conflict. Interrogation methods authorized by the Field Manual have proven effective in eliciting vital intelligence from dangerous enemy prisoners. Some have argued that the Field Manual rules are too simplistic for civilian interrogators. We reject that argument. Interrogation methods authorized in the Field Manual are sophisticated and flexible. And the principles reflected in the Field Manual are values that no U.S. agency should violate.

General David Petraeus underscored this point in an open letter to the troops in May in which he cautioned against the use of interrogation techniques not authorized by the Field Manual:

What sets us apart from our enemies in this fight . . . is how we behave. In everything we do, we must observe the standards and values that dictate that we treat non-combatants and detainees with dignity and respect. . . . Some may argue that we would be more effective if we sanctioned torture or other expedient methods to obtain information from the enemy. They would be wrong. Beyond the basic fact that such actions are illegal, history shows that they also are frequently neither useful nor necessary. Certainly, extreme physical action can make someone "talk;" however, what the individual says may be of questionable value. In fact, our experience in applying the interrogation standards laid out in the Army Field Manual (2-22.3) on Human Intelligence Collector Operations that was published last year shows that the techniques in the manual work effectively and humanely in eliciting information from detainees.

Employing interrogation methods that violate the Field Manual is not only unnecessary, but poses enormous risks. These meth-

ods generate information of dubious value, reliance upon which can lead to disastrous consequences. Moreover, revelation of the use of such techniques does immense damage to the reputation and moral authority of the United States essential to our efforts to combat terrorism.

This is a defining issue for America. We urge you to support the adoption of Section 327 of the Conference Report and thereby send a clear message—to U.S. personnel and to the world—that the United States will not engage in or condone the abuse of prisoners and will honor its commitments to uphold the Geneva Conventions.

Sincerely,

General Joseph Hoar, USMC (Ret.).
General Paul J. Kern, USA (Ret.).
General Charles Krulak, USMC (Ret.).
General David M. Maddox, USA (Ret.).
General Merrill A. McPeak, USAF (Ret.).
Admiral Stansfield Turner, USN (Ret.).
Vice Admiral Lee F. Gunn, USN (Ret.).
Lieutenant General Claudia J. Kennedy, USA (Ret.).
Lieutenant General Donald L. Kerrick, USA (Ret.).
Vice Admiral Albert H. Konetzni Jr., USN (Ret.).
Lieutenant General Charles Otsstott, USA (Ret.).
Lieutenant General Harry E. Soyster, USA (Ret.).
Major General Paul Eaton, USA (Ret.).
Major General Eugene Fox, USA (Ret.).
Major General John L. Fugh, USA (Ret.).
Rear Admiral Don Guter, USN (Ret.).
Major General Fred E. Haynes, USMC (Ret.).
Rear Admiral John D. Hutson, USN (Ret.).
Major General Melvyn Montano, ANG (Ret.).
Major General Gerald T. Sajer, USA (Ret.).
Major General Antonio "Tony" M. Taguba, USA (Ret.).
Brigadier General David M. Brahms, USMC (Ret.).
Brigadier General James P. Cullen, USA (Ret.).
Brigadier General Evelyn P. Foote, USA (Ret.).
Brigadier General David R. Irvine, USA (Ret.).
Brigadier General John H. Johns, USA (Ret.).
Brigadier General Richard O'Meara, USA (Ret.).
Brigadier General Murray G. Sagsveen, USA (Ret.).
Brigadier General Anthony Verrengia, USAF (Ret.).
Brigadier General Stephen N. Xenakis, USA (Ret.).

There are many lieutenant generals, admirals, vice admirals, brigadier generals, major generals, all of whom are concerned about defeating terrorism. And this is what they say:

"As retired military leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces, we write to express," on December 12, 2007, just a few days ago, "we write to express our strong support for section 327 of the conference report on the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008."

And then this paragraph, and I ask all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to listen to this paragraph from those who have worn the uniform of the United States of America, who have themselves, before they became generals, fought in the battles that America has sent them to, and fought for the freedom of this country, and

confronted the terrorists of their day and today. Hear this paragraph from those who have been at war and who want to protect their troops, our troops, American men and women.

□ 1230

They say this: "We believe it is vital to the safety of our men and women in uniform for the United States not to sanction the use of interrogation methods it would find unacceptable if inflicted by the enemy against captured Americans." That is the critical point.

We are a nation that believes in the premise of doing unto others what we would have them do to us. Our own enemies do not accept that premise. Our enemies do not accept that value. Our enemies are different than we are. We must not become what we confront. The techniques permitted by the Army Field Manual, as I say, are endorsed by all of these generals. General Krulak in particular wrote a very compelling op-ed piece on this issue in the Washington Post. General Krulak is probably known as one of the toughest commandants the Marine Corps has ever had. I served with him on the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy. He is as tough as they come. And he says, Protect our people, adopt this sanction.

Here, in fact, is what General David Petraeus wrote to members of the Armed Forces in Iraq in May, just a few months ago, General Petraeus, four-star general, heading our effort to confront, supposedly, terrorism and, I believe, terrorism in Iraq. "Some may argue that we would be more effective if we sanctioned torture or other expedient methods to obtain information from the enemy. They would be wrong. Beyond the basic fact that such actions are illegal," Petraeus's words, General Petraeus's word, "history shows that they also are frequently neither useful nor necessary." General Petraeus continued, "Certainly, extreme physical action can make someone 'talk'; however, what the individual says may be of questionable value. Our experience in applying interrogation standards laid out in the Army Field Manual shows that the techniques in the manual work effectively and humanely in eliciting information from detainees."

This is General Petraeus who wants to keep his troops safe and wants to prevent terrorist attacks on his people under his command.

Inexplicably, the administration has issued a veto threat on this conference report because it would require all intelligence agencies to abide by the Army Field Manual. I believe that the administration's position is indefensible. This is not a question of whether we must combat and defeat terrorists. Of course, we must. However, we must never let it be said that when this generation of Americans was forced to confront evil that we succumbed to the tactics of the tyrant, that we stooped to the depths of the dictator.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle not for party but for country,

not for partisanship but for a reverence for the constitutional oath we took, I urge us all, let's demonstrate our commitment to the values that make us Americans. Let's begin to repair and restore this Nation's reputation. Let's adopt this conference report.

I thank the chairman for the time. I thank him for his leadership. I thank Mr. HOEKSTRA, as well.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, defeating the threat from radical jihadists is a difficult job. It requires input from the legislative branch. It requires leadership from the executive branch. After 9/11, the administration outlined a series of initiatives. It didn't outline it to the entire Congress because the threat was so new, or some thought so new. The decision to respond to it was very different than what happened in the 1990s, but we recognized we needed to take different steps. The administration brought in people from Congress, the people that the leadership and our colleagues had entrusted with the responsibility to shape an intelligence community.

Everyone talks about the President's terrorist surveillance program, the President's financial tracking system, and now, it is the President's interrogation system. What they forget to note, as pointed out in the editorial today, is that in each of those cases, membership from the House and the Senate were involved in the process, in reviewing and setting the direction and implementing the strategies and the tactics that they thought needed to be put in place to keep America safe. Some of those Members that were briefed have moved on to other careers and they are no longer in Congress. Some of those who were briefed back in 2002 and 2003 specifically on the terrorist surveillance program, specifically on interrogation, are still Members of the House. Some are still members of the committee. Others are serving on other committees. Some have moved into leadership positions in the House of Representatives.

It is interesting, as the majority leader is speaking and laying out his arguments, it is the Speaker of the House, elected by the entire House, today, who serves the entire House, who is briefed on these programs. Some who have looked at, who have remarked on those meetings said, not only did the people that were in those meetings support the techniques and the methods that were put in place, some actually even asked the question, Is it enough? These things were decided in a process that the House and the Senate and the administration participated in and decided jointly that these were the things that were necessary to keep America safe. Only when they became public, all of a sudden did some of these individuals get cold feet, feet of clay and say, Oh, well, I really didn't know. But when the rubber hit the road in terms of what we needed to do to

keep America safe, these people said these are the techniques and the processes, and these are the programs that we need to have in place.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my good friend from Michigan that this bill, the funding level is above the President's request, and it makes an investment in human intelligence of historic proportions.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who serves as the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to affirm America's values and our respect for the rule of law. This bill includes language drawn from the American Anti-Torture Act, introduced by myself and Representative DELAHUNT, that would extend the interrogation standards in the U.S. Army Field Manual to all interrogations conducted on persons in the custody or effective control of any element of the intelligence community. This will ensure a single, uniform baseline standard for interrogations. That means no more torture, no more waterboarding, no more clever word play, no more evasive answers, no more dishonesty.

People in nations do terrible things in war, but civilized nations long ago recognized that there must be limits on their conduct even during military conflict. Our Army Field Manual is an outstanding example of a modern military dedicated to observing international norms of conduct while waging war effectively. It is a credit to our men and women in uniform that they continue to abide by these rules. It is unforgivable that some civilians here in Washington seem to think that they know better and we must be more brutal than our military and professional interrogators.

I understand the critical role that intelligence plays in protecting ourselves, but torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, besides being contrary to American values and traditions, have proven not to be effective in obtaining actionable intelligence.

Current and former members of the military have made this clear. General David Petraeus, the commander of U.S. forces in Iraq, recently wrote in an open letter to U.S. troops that the standards in the Army Field Manual "work effectively and humanely in eliciting information from detainees."

Lieutenant General Kimmons, Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence similarly stated "no good intelligence is going to come from abusive practices. Any piece of intelligence which is obtained under duress through the use of abusive techniques would be of questionable credibility."

The Bush administration has long argued that it does not torture but it does waterboard. And we prosecuted, we sent to jail Japanese officers for waterboarding prisoners after World

War II. We knew then that waterboarding was torture, and despite statements from the Bush administration or the nonstatements, we know now that it is torture. Torture places our servicemen and women and our allies at grave risk. We must accept that whatever we authorize and use against our enemies will be turned against our own men and women.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to restore the honor of the United States. It is time to restore the good name of the United States in a world that has been so sullied by the conduct of this administration. It is time to compel the administration to act in a manner consistent with the Constitution of the United States.

I applaud the leadership of the conferees in including the antitorture language in this bill. I urge support for the conference report. I hope this will begin the process of restoring the honor and the integrity of the United States.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

As we talk about this authorization bill, I think it is also important to talk about it in the larger context in terms of some of the other things that are going on that I believe are weakening our ability to effectively combat the threat from radical jihadists. What are some of these things? Policies that are being advocated by individuals on the other side who are committed to defeating terrorism. I just think they have the wrong strategy.

Terrorist phone calls cannot be monitored without court warrants even when all parties are outside of the United States or if the lives of American soldiers are at risk. They want to provide habeas corpus rights for foreign terrorists. Terrorists when captured overseas shall have the right to challenge their captivity in U.S. courts. The right of terrorists to incarceration in the United States. Foreign terrorists being held in facilities outside the United States, including Guantanamo Bay, will be removed from detention abroad and brought into American communities, ending the distinction between lawful versus unlawful combatants.

The United States henceforth will recognize al Qaeda terrorists as legitimate combatants and grant them the rights of lawful combatants under the Geneva Conventions. Terrorists shall be afforded due process, attorneys, and protection from self-incrimination. Terrorists will also be protected from enhanced interrogation, even when they have information on pending terrorist attacks.

In terms of priorities, funds shall be diverted from tough antiterrorism intelligence programs targeted at apprehending and killing terrorists through intelligence analysis in connection against global warming because some folks from the other side may have implied or said that individuals join terrorist groups not because of radical

Islam or hatred of the United States, but because they are unhappy about rising global temperatures and sea levels. Extend Fourth Amendment rights barring unreasonable search and seizures to terrorists. The rights of radical jihadists to avoid searches and seizures shall be protected, even if they are granted more protection than American citizens.

Some believe that terrorists have the rights to intelligence leaks. Terrorists have the right to read about classified and antiterrorist intelligence programs in the press because there has not been a vigorous effort either through this committee or through the intelligence community to stop the leaks. And then actually when corporations may help us like the telecommunications companies may have, people who agree to help us will not be protected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding I have the right to close. I have no more requests for time, and I am prepared to close and would ask the gentleman if he is prepared to close.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't all that long ago that this House voted 249-160, a difference of 89 votes, to instruct House conferees to eliminate all earmarks from the fiscal year 2008 Intelligence authorization bill and to fully fund human intelligence collection. The vote was clear, overwhelming, and bipartisan, and 62 Democrats supported the motion to instruct. It appears, however, that my colleagues on the other side have said one thing and done another on earmarks, as the conference refused to eliminate earmark projects from the classified annex to this bill.

Today, we are going to offer a motion to recommit that provides all Members, including those 62 Democrats who supported the motion to instruct, to take a decisive step to eliminate earmarks in national security bills. If you are for that motion to instruct, you shouldn't be against this motion to recommit. Putting it in the positive, you should be for this motion to recommit because you were for eliminating earmarks a week ago.

This motion would make our priorities clear by eliminating provisions providing for earmarks to allow those funds to be directed to improve intelligence collection. As I explained on the floor last week, and as the bipartisan support for the motion indicated, I believe that a consensus is developing among Members that programmatic authorizations should be determined solely on their national security merits, absent other compelling circumstances.

This motion is clearly about priorities. America is at war. We are engaged in a struggle against radical jihadists, as well as facing threats from China, North Korea, Iran, drug cartels, and those types of things. Taxpayer

dollars that are currently slated to be earmarked to individual Member projects should be applied to our most critical areas of need and should serve our Nation as a whole during this crucial time.

It is clear that the earmarks that are in the bill generally have not gone through the same rigorous substantive review and evaluation that intelligence programs receive in the formulation of the President's budget. It is critical to our world position that we fully understand the military capability of, and threat posed by, other nations. It is essential that human intelligence activities are fully funded so that we may make fully informed decisions concerning our national interest.

Our dedication of resources to human intelligence is a direct investment in the security of this Nation as a whole and the safety of the men and women serving on our behalf. It is also a direct investment in those areas that we know we are weakest in: human intelligence. This motion would eliminate all earmarks. It shouldn't be controversial. But these funds could be put to far better use in human intelligence and other programs. These are programs that we need.

Some of these earmarks have been described clearly as wasteful government spending. This bill has not provided adequate support to the intelligence community activity at the forefront of the ability to protect our national security.

It is not possible to describe all of these programs. Many of them are classified in their nature. But I can't emphasize enough the importance of these programs and the funding and the necessity to fund these programs at this time.

We are a Nation locked in a struggle, facing continued uncertainty and other threats around the globe. The men and women of the front lines of this struggle rely heavily on human intelligence for their own safety every day. The House should not diminish its support for a robust, empowered, and capable intelligence community that provides our first line of defense. It is time to properly focus our priorities.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this motion to recommit and will support me in my opposition to this bill.

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman and others are concerned about the presence of earmarks in this conference report. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could take them seriously with those concerns. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have now "seen the light" on earmarks, now that they are in the minority. But we all know that the most heavily earmarked bills in history were passed in the last few Congresses, when my colleagues controlled the Chamber.

The fact of the matter is that never, never in the history of this institution have we had the kind of process and transparency on earmarks that we have had in this bill, in this Congress. We have validated every single earmark in this bill to ensure that we believe that it is a good use of the taxpayer money. We take that seriously, and as something that will help the intelligence community. These earmarks have been vetted through the intelligence community.

In terms of the arguments about the motion to recommit, there has never been an intelligence authorization bill with this level of earmark process, with this level of transparency, and with this level of accountability. Every earmark in this bill has been vetted, as I mentioned, to make certain that the activity that the earmark proposes and the funds going to that activity are ones that make our country safer. Each earmark has been fully disclosed with the name of the requesting Member, the purpose, the amount. In previous Congresses, no such disclosures were ever required. For each earmark, a public record has been established, which is available for review; and they have been reviewed.

As chairman, along with my colleague, the distinguished ranking member, I have personally reviewed each and every earmark. These earmarks improve the bill and will help our intelligence community to keep this country safe. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a motion to recommit on this bill, as the gentleman has indicated, it will kill this bill. It will also kill this bipartisan process. It will kill our oversight, and it will kill our funding so desperately needed to keep our country safe and to provide the resources to our brave intelligence professionals. I urge my colleagues to oppose such a motion to recommit.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides the aisle who have spoken in favor of this conference report. As I said at the outset, I am proud of this conference report. A lot of hard work has gone into this process on a bipartisan basis, and I want to thank the staff on a bipartisan basis as well. It is a bipartisan, bicameral product. It strengthens the intelligence community and congressional oversight.

I would just remind every Member that this authorization is above the President’s budget request for human intelligence funding. No authorization bill is perfect. No one gets everything that they want in this legislative process. But at the end of the day, this conference report reflects a bipartisan process that will make our country safer, that will give our intelligence professionals the resources and the tools that they need to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve the conference report.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2082, the conference agreement on the Fiscal Year 2008 Intelligence Authorization Act.

As a former member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, I believe it is vital that we provide the United States intelligence agencies with the tools and resources necessary to ensure our security. Therefore, I strongly support funding in this bill for human intelligence activities, intelligence analysis, and training, infrastructure, and global intelligence improvements. I also support the authorization in the bill providing emergency funding for counterterrorism operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Furthermore, I support language in the agreement prohibiting the use of any interrogation techniques not authorized by the U.S. Army Field Manual on Human Intelligence Collector Operations against any individual in the custody or effective control of any element of the intelligence community. Our soldiers and interrogators need to know exactly where the line is when engaging prisoners and there should be absolutely no question about what is acceptable behavior and what is not. In fact, I recently cosponsored legislation to require the anti-torture provisions included in this conference agreement.

Nevertheless, I will oppose this bill because it fails to implement the 9/11 Commission’s recommendations for reforming congressional oversight of intelligence funding. In its final report, the 9/11 Commission concluded that: “Of all our recommendations, strengthening congressional oversight may be among the most difficult and important. So long as oversight is governed by the current congressional rules and resolutions, we believe the American people will not get the security they want and need.”

Earlier this year, the Democratic leadership attempted to apply a “Band-Aid” to this problem by creating a powerless Intelligence Oversight Panel that has very little control over actual funding decisions. This is clearly not what the 9/11 Commission recommended. In fact, its report plainly states that “tinkering with the existing committee structure is not sufficient.” In May, I offered a simple amendment to the bill before us, calling for Congress to implement these crucial recommendations—but it was prevented from being considered for inclusion in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have insisted that we implement all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations—even those that are difficult. We will be doing this country a disservice until we put in place an effective committee structure capable of giving our national intelligence agencies the oversight, support, and leadership they need.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and, in particular, in support of Section 327 of the report, which prohibits interrogation techniques not authorized by the Army Field Manual on Interrogation.

Despite White House claims that the United States does not torture prisoners, we continue to learn about administration actions that seem to condone the use of coercive techniques in questioning prisoners.

A few months ago, we learned about a classified Justice Department memo from February 2005 allowing waterboarding and other coercive techniques. Then there was the Ex-

ecutive Order signed in July of this year that effectively opened a loophole for the CIA to practice interrogation techniques that go beyond those allowed by the U.S. military.

Reports this week of destroyed interrogation tapes showing CIA operatives using waterboarding and other “enhanced” techniques are deeply disturbing, and suggest a double standard, whereby these techniques are approved for use by the CIA but not by the Department of Defense and its intelligence agencies. All this points to the need for a common standard for humane and effective interrogation techniques across the Government, which is what this conference report provision calls for.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN has called the Army Field Manual techniques “humane and yet effective,” and has argued for a policy by which “we will never allow torture to take place in the United States of America.” In May 2007, General Petraeus wrote to U.S. troops serving in Iraq that “our experience in applying the interrogation standards laid out in the Army Field Manual . . . published last year shows that the techniques in the manual work effectively and humanely in eliciting information from detainees.”

There is no reason why interrogation techniques that work effectively and humanely for our military interrogators cannot also work effectively and humanely for CIA and other intelligence agency interrogators. Section 327 of the Intelligence Authorization report sends a message that the United States believes no part of its government is above the law, and that no interrogation method is acceptable that could not also be used on Americans in enemy custody.

I strongly urge passage of this important legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2082, the Fiscal Year 2008 Intelligence Authorization Act. I share many of the concerns raised by Ranking Member Hoekstra, but my primary purpose in speaking today is to express my distaste for the bloated bureaucracy created by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, 3 short years ago the House voted to create a Director of National Intelligence: a small, agile intelligence shop meant primarily to improve coordination and information analysis among and between the various intelligence—gathering agencies.

At that time, Democrats fought hard to turn the new agency into a large bureaucracy, replete with a chief information officer, a chief human capital officer, a chief financial officer, an out-of-control inspector general, a comptroller, an ombudsman, multiple privacy officers, and a civil liberties board with unlimited subpoena power—layer upon layer upon layer.

But we remained focused on creating better government rather than bigger government, and efforts to create more redundant bureaucracy were ultimately defeated.

For better or for worse, the party of smaller government is no longer in control, and this legislation is a perfect example.

Evidence of bureaucratic creep is marbled throughout this legislation, from the creation of new offices to forcing even more officials through the cumbersome and slow Senate confirmation process.

But nowhere is the problem more prevalent than in the creation of an inspector general for the intelligence community.

On the surface, no one can argue against the need for a robust inspector general within the disparate intelligence community. In fact, the creation of one, unified and cohesive IG to oversee all intelligence activities of the Federal Government would probably be a step in the right direction.

But that's not what this legislation does.

Instead, this bill creates a new IG and places that office awkwardly on top of the many existing IGs at the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

As if creating another layer of unnecessary bureaucracy within the intelligence oversight community was not enough, the legislation goes the extra step of elevating the IGs at the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

It's inevitable the existence of six separate IGs within the intelligence community will lead to duplication of effort and turf battles between them. The conferees admit it. Conceding they're creating more problems than they're solving, they direct the IGs to "expeditiously resolve" any disputes or turf battles that may arise between them.

After spending years trying to find ways to make the intelligence gathering and analysis more streamlined and efficient, this legislation does an about-face, loading up the intelligence community with more bureaucracy and bigger government.

Which leads me to my next concern with the legislation: H.R. 2082 represents a significant step backwards in our efforts to modernize our security clearance process.

Several years ago, the 9/11 Commission recommended an overhaul of the government's woefully backlogged security clearance process, proposing uniform application, investigation and adjudication procedures as well as a single database to store clearance information. In 2004 Congress responded by enacting the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act, which placed a single Federal agency in charge of security clearance processes Government-wide and established a unified database for information related to security clearances.

Rather than assisting that ongoing effort, H.R. 2082 compounds past problems by allowing the intelligence community to continue to operate in isolated stovepipes.

The conference report does this in two ways. First, it places the Director of National Intelligence in charge of developing a "multi-level security clearance approach" only for the intelligence community. Separate from the otherwise "government-wide" system now being developed, the mandated multi-level system would somehow allow the intelligence community to clear foreign-born applicants better and faster than everyone else. It's not clear how. It's not even clear what this mythical "multi-level" approach would do differently in terms of current clearance levels: Confidential, Secret, Top Secret and SCI. But it is painfully clear this is an effort to keep the intelligence agencies from taking part in the larger reform effort. Second, as if to underscore the drive to make sure there are no uniform clearance standards, the bill specifically exempts the Na-

tional Geospatial-Intelligence Agency from the Government-wide system so they can duplicate the whole process on their own.

As the primary sponsor of the 2004 legislation calling for a modernized, uniform security clearance process for the Federal Government, I fear these supposed "reforms" will do nothing to help improve the security clearance backlog and will likely exacerbate the problems of inconsistent standards, slow processing and a lack of clearance reciprocity.

As the former Chairman of the Government Reform Committee, I invested considerable time and energy into highlighting overlap and duplication in Government and finding ways to streamline federal programs and processes. And I think we made some progress in that regard.

But H.R. 2082 represents a stark contrast to our efforts to streamline Government. It expands the Federal bureaucracy and propagates the existing stovepipes that have long hindered our efforts to bring the federal government into the 21st century.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that after failing to reauthorize our Intelligence programs for the past 2 years under Republican leadership, the Democratic majority has taken the health of our Nation's intelligence community seriously. I support the critical improvements to this bill: strengthening the offices of the Inspector Generals, authorizing increased attention to climate change, and strengthening contractor oversight.

Most importantly, I support this bill because of its torture prohibition. Torture violates not only the laws and values of our country, but all standards of decent human conduct. I have consistently spoken out against the stonewalling and equivocation surrounding this administration's "interrogation" of prisoners. It is clear that the American people will not get satisfactory answers from the administration, and that it is now Congress's duty to set interrogation standards worthy of our great Nation.

Extending the rules of the Army Field Manual to intelligence personnel is a significant step. I am proud that Congress will send the message to our Nation and the world at large that Americans do not approve of, and will not stand for, torture.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay" on the motion to recommit H.R. 2082 with instructions to conference committee because such a vote would have killed the bill. H.R. 2082 includes a provision to ban torture and authorizes the intelligence activities of the United States. While I would have strongly preferred for the Conference Committee to follow the instructions adopted by the House, I believe the intelligence programs and ban on torture included in this bill are too important to the national security of the United States to endanger it by returning it to conference.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Yes, I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hoekstra moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 2082 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of the conference, to—

(1) eliminate any House or Senate provisions providing for earmarks as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; and

(2) insist on provisions authorizing the maximum level of funding permissible for human intelligence collection activities in the classified annex.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 215, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 1159]

YEAS—205

Aderholt	Cannon	Fossella
Akin	Cantor	Fox
Alexander	Capito	Franks (AZ)
Bachmann	Carter	Frelinghuysen
Bachus	Castle	Galleghy
Baker	Chabot	Garrett (NJ)
Barrett (SC)	Coble	Gerlach
Barrow	Cole (OK)	Giffords
Bartlett (MD)	Conaway	Gilchrest
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Gingrey
Bean	Culberson	Gohmert
Biggart	Davis (KY)	Goode
Bilbray	Davis, David	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Davis, Tom	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Deal (GA)	Graves
Blackburn	Dent	Hall (TX)
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hayes
Bonner	Donnelly	Hensarling
Bono	Doolittle	Herger
Boozman	Drake	Hobson
Boustany	Dreier	Hoekstra
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Hulshof
Broun (GA)	Ehlers	Hunter
Brown (SC)	Ellsworth	Inglis (SC)
Brown-Waite,	Emerson	Issa
Ginny	English (PA)	Johnson (IL)
Buchanan	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Burgess	Fallin	Jones (NC)
Burton (IN)	Feeney	Jordan
Buyer	Ferguson	Keller
Calvert	Flake	King (IA)
Camp (MD)	Forbes	King (NY)
Campbell (CA)	Fortenberry	Kingston

Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran (KS)

Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Townes
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watson

Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Levin
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCullum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre

McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1318

Messrs. KIND, McDERMOTT, RUPPERSBERGER, COSTA, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Messrs. GUTIERREZ, MEEK of Florida, GENE GREEN of Texas, RUSH, HINCHEY, BERMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WEINER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. OBERSTAR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GINGREY, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. FEENEY, LAMBORN, ROSKAM, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Messrs. WALBERG, SHUSTER, GOODE, PICKERING, WILSON of South Carolina, KING of New York, and MCINTYRE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 199, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 1160]

AYES—222

Abercrombie
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Gillibrand
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Bralley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo

Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herse th Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hincey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Oberstar
Obey
Holde n
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Salazar
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewi s (GA)
Lipinski
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton

McCarthy (NY)
McCullum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Bralley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza

Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Lincoln
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herse th Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hincey
Hinojosa
Hirono

Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herse th Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hincey
Hinojosa
Hirono

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

NOES—199
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lee

Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher	Simpson	Walsh (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	Wamp
Roskam	Smith (TX)	Waters
Royce	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Stark	Weller
Sali	Stearns	Westmoreland
Saxton	Sullivan	Whitfield (KY)
Schmidt	Tancredo	Wicker
Scott (GA)	Terry	Wilson (NM)
Sensenbrenner	Thornberry	Wilson (SC)
Serrano	Tiahrt	Wolf
Sessions	Tiberi	Woolsey
Shadegg	Turner	Young (AK)
Shays	Upton	Young (FL)
Shimkus	Walberg	
Shuster	Walden (OR)	

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman	Hooley	Paul
Carson	Jindal	Wasserman
Cubin	McNulty	Schultz
Heller	Miller, Gary	

□ 1327

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-493) on the resolution (H. Res. 873) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 869, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 69) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 69

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 110-92 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting “December 21, 2007”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 869, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 69.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1330

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

It is now 1:30 in the afternoon, very late into December and we have to decide how soon we want to get out of town so that we don't have to look at each other for the remainder of the year.

This vehicle is necessary to simply keep the government open while we're making the final decisions on all remaining appropriations for the fiscal year.

There have been numerous meetings going on this week all over Capitol Hill, and there have obviously been many communications going on between the Hill and other locuses of influence and power in the city. And I would hope that those would bear fruition sometime soon.

Meanwhile, if we want to keep the government open, we have no choice but to pass this continuing resolution. It simply extends, it keeps the government open for another week, to December 21, 2007. I think it's self-explanatory.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the last time that Chairman OBEY and I were on the floor together, I was heard to quote our friend, Will Rogers, and it had to do about sometimes we talk more than we should. I was intrigued by the fact that while he advised us to never miss the opportunity to shut up, that recently in Latin America there's discussion among Latin leaders in which a fellow by the name of Chavez kept talking and talking and talking, and this is by way of suggesting that we don't really have to keep talking today. I think it was the King of Spain, DAVID, who said, “Por que no te calles?” If I could repeat that, “Por que no te calles?” That is, if we don't talk too much, we'll be all right here today.

Mr. Speaker, it is kind of hard to believe that Christmas is less than 2 weeks away and that DAVID OBEY provides me with material for my own presentation one more time.

While most Americans are Christmas shopping and decorating their Christmas tree, Congress continues to stumble its way to completing its business for the year. Unfortunately, we still have a long way to go, so we find ourselves today considering yet another continuing resolution.

It was just 1 year ago the House passed a series of continuing resolutions to ensure the continuation of government funding programs into the new fiscal year. My friend Chairman DAVID OBEY came to the House floor as the ranking member during that debate to criticize Republicans in the House and Senate for their failure to

pass the annual spending bills by the end of the fiscal year. He spoke of the breakdown in the budget process and vowed that things would be different under a Democratic majority.

We are now only, I say, 74 days in the new fiscal year, and once again the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee is on the floor decrying the breakdown of regular order. The only difference is that DAVID OBEY is now Chairman OBEY, and I'm the committee's ranking member.

The breakdown of regular order, particularly in the Senate, is largely to blame for our failure to complete our work in a timely manner. Earlier this year, my chairman was absolutely beating us all over the room because of our failure to pass bills at the end of the year.

The Senate leader held up our bills. Mr. OBEY knew that we'd passed all of our bills in the House by July 4. The year before we'd done the same thing, and all the bills had been signed by the President. And lo and behold, Mr. OBEY finds himself. Frankly DAVID, I thought you had much closer relationships with the Senate than I, but here we are. The breakdown of regular order, particularly in the Senate, is largely to blame for our failure to complete our work in a timely fashion.

The President has been very clear all year long that he would veto any spending bill or any omnibus package that exceeded his budget request. All told, the House-passed spending bills exceeded the President's budget request by \$23 billion, and yet the Democrat majority chose to dismiss or ignore the President's clear intent, that is, until now.

A short time ago, Chairman OBEY instructed the committee staff to prepare an omnibus spending bill and pare spending back to exceed the President's request by \$11 billion. Not included in this total, there was over \$7 billion being designated as emergency spending.

Just in the last several days, maybe even hours, the Democratic leadership finally got the message. They came to the realization that the President was, indeed, serious. So it all appears that, after months of work by our exhausted committee staff, work can finally begin on a spending package that the President may be able to sign. I say may be able to sign because the President has not yet seen the details of the omnibus package that will come forward.

For good measure, let me make very clear the President will veto any omnibus spending package that contains any controversial policy provisions, any gimmicks or any consequential budgetary sleight of hand.

I urge Chairman OBEY to resist the urge on his part to add any so-called contingency spending anywhere in this package, as it may lead to a presidential veto.

I'd like to close by quoting my friend, Mr. OBEY, from a past CR debate. He said, and I quote, “We are here

today with not a single dollar having been appropriated to any government program that has anything whatsoever to do with the domestic operations of this government. That is a disgraceful performance. And so we are left with the choice of passing this continuing resolution or having the government shut down."

Again, my friends, these are the words of Chairman DAVID OBEY from last year, then Ranking Member OBEY. They are particularly meaningful today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I had thought that perhaps once this session we could simply do our jobs straightaway without having the usual, trite partisan slogans uttered again and again. I'd hoped that we wouldn't continue to chew the same cud over and over again. But evidently we can't. So I will simply take a couple of minutes to respond to the gentleman's comments.

For me to take lectures from the minority party on fiscal management or the management of appropriations would be akin to Willie Sutton lecturing the House on bank security. It wouldn't be taken very seriously.

But let me, nonetheless, since the gentleman has chosen to engage in yet another round of carping, let me simply point out that the gentleman is now making a fuss, once again, because we have not passed appropriation bills singly and now face the prospect of an omnibus appropriation bill with all domestic appropriations tossed into one budget document. If that, in fact, occurs, what it will mean is that the President sent us one budget document and we sent him one back. That's hardly a Federal offense, the last time that I checked.

Secondly, I would simply point out that this Congress has passed and sent to the President appropriation bills totaling about 75 percent of all of the discretionary spending in the budget. The reason that none of the domestic bills have been finalized is because the President chose to veto the Labor, Health, Education appropriation bill. So we are now engaged in the only action left open to us, which is to reach a negotiated agreement between the Senate and the House and between the Congress and the President. We are trying to achieve the required negotiated result between the two branches of government and between the two branches of the legislative portion of the government.

Let me simply say that there will be, at the end of this year, there will be one critical difference between this Congress and the previous Congress controlled by our friends on the other side. In the previous Congress, they were able to pass not a single domestic appropriation bill through the Congress. They had passed them through the House, just as we passed all of our

appropriation bills through the House. In fact, they didn't pass all of their appropriations bills through the House. They didn't get the Labor-H bill passed last year, which was the major domestic appropriation because they did not see fit to provide a minimum wage increase for workers, and so they preferred to bury the bill rather than have a bill pass which carried a minimum wage increase for America's workers.

But the critical difference between them and us is that when we took over this Congress in January, we had to spend the first six weeks passing appropriation bills to make up for the fact that they had not passed a single domestic appropriation bill. And so, as a consequence, we will have one critical difference when our work is done, hopefully at the end of next week. We will have passed all of the appropriation bills necessary to keep the government running for a full fiscal year. We may not have done it in single fashion, as they would prefer, but the fact is that, whether they like the packaging, we will have done our jobs, and I would submit we will have done our jobs on a bipartisan basis.

There were, on average, 60 Republicans who helped us every step of the way in trying to pass these appropriation bills. I think that demonstrates that we had bipartisan legislation before us in virtually all instances on those appropriation bills, and that was reflected in the fact that, on average, we had over 60 Republicans supporting each of those bills.

We could not get the bills through the Senate, but they will, in the end, be passed, and that, in the end, will be a critical difference between the result of the record produced by our friends on the other side last year and one that will be produced, I would hope, on a bipartisan basis this year under different management.

So with that, if the gentleman has any further comments, I'll withhold. If he has any further speakers, I'll withhold. If he doesn't, I'm prepared to yield back.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I really don't have any other speakers, but I did want to apologize to my colleague and take just a moment to do that. If, indeed, I have lectured the gentleman, I certainly would want to apologize to the House for that, for the House knows he's never lectured us or anybody else. Now I'm not certain what may have gone on in his own caucus, but certainly he doesn't lecture us.

And if my quoting his own words takes the term "carping," I guess it's difficult not to quote him exactly, and if that's carping, so be it.

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

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply take a moment to indicate where I think we are on the appropriation matters. I think we have a reasonable prospect of finishing our work for the year come the

middle of next week. I had originally been predicting that we would be out of here on the 22nd of December and reconvene after the 27th. I'm now slightly more optimistic than I was initially. And I think that, while none of us may be particularly enamored of the final result, I think that we are getting closer to having a result which can be supported by many people on both sides of the aisle, at least in the House itself.

□ 1345

I cannot speak for what the Senate will produce, but I would hope that Members would familiarize themselves. As soon as we have the final product available, we will try to make that product available to Members so that they have an opportunity to review it before we actually vote on it next week.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 869, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am, in its present form.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of California moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 69 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with the following amendment:

At the end of the joint resolution, add the following:

Sec. 2. Public Law 110-92 is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"Sec. 151. Appropriations, funds, and other authority made available by this joint resolution that are related to the provisions of title IX of the Act referred to in section 101 (1)—

"(1) shall be available, notwithstanding section 106, until enactment of a supplemental appropriations Act for fiscal year 2008 that provides supplemental appropriations for one or more of the appropriation accounts included in such title IX; and

"(2) are designated as being for overseas deployments and related activities pursuant to subsections (c)(2)(E) and (d)(1)(E) of section 207 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin insist on his point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have had virtually no time to understand what the content of this resolution is; but as I read it, I would make a point of order against the amendment on germaneness grounds because the resolution adheres to a December 21 delimiting date, whereas the instructions in the proposed amendment refers to matters outside of the time period in question, and I will, therefore, suggest that the motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I will just speak on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit that I was about to present is quite simple. The motion will ensure that we continue to provide funding for our troops in harm's way until Congress takes the necessary action to pass a bridge fund or a full-year war supplemental.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman speaking on the point of order or on the motion to recommit? The question is whether the point of order is well taken. If the gentleman doesn't wish to speak on the point of order, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the amendment proposed in the motion to recommit exceeds the temporal ambit of the joint resolution beyond the delimiting date in section 106 of Public Law 110-92. Accordingly, the point of order is sustained, and the motion to recommit is ruled out of order.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further debate or proceedings in recommittal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 194, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 1161]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—194

Aderholt	Boozman	Chabot
Akin	Boustany	Coble
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Cole (OK)
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Conaway
Bachus	Brown (SC)	Culberson
Baker	Brown-Waite,	Davis (KY)
Barrett (SC)	Ginny	Davis, David
Barrow	Buchanan	Davis, Tom
Bartlett (MD)	Burgess	Deal (GA)
Barton (TX)	Burton (IN)	Dent
Biggett	Buyer	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bilbray	Calvert	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bilirakis	Camp (MI)	Doolittle
Bishop (UT)	Campbell (CA)	Drake
Blackburn	Cannon	Dreier
Blunt	Cantor	Duncan
Boehner	Capito	Ehlers
Bonner	Carter	Emerson
Bono	Castle	English (PA)

Everett	Latham	Reynolds
Falin	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)
Feeney	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)
Flake	Linder	Rohrabacher
Forbes	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Fortenberry	Lucas	Roskam
Fossella	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Fox	E.	Ryan (WI)
Franks (AZ)	Mack	Sali
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Saxton
Gallely	Marchant	Schmidt
Garrett (NJ)	Marshall	Sensenbrenner
Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Gilchrest	McCaul (TX)	Shadegg
Gingrey	McCotter	Shays
Gohmert	McCrery	Shimkus
Goode	McHenry	Shuster
Goodlatte	McHugh	Simpson
Granger	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Graves	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Hall (TX)	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Souder
Hayes	Miller (MI)	Stearns
Hensarling	Moran (KS)	Sullivan
Herger	Murphy, Tim	Tancredo
Hobson	Musgrave	Terry
Hoekstra	Myrick	Thornberry
Hulshof	Neugebauer	Tiahrt
Hunter	Nunes	Tiberi
Inglis (SC)	Pearce	Turner
Issa	Pence	Upton
Johnson (IL)	Peterson (PA)	Walberg
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Walden (OR)
Jones (NC)	Pickering	Walsh (NY)
Jordan	Walsh (KY)	Wamp
Keller	Platts	Weldon (FL)
King (IA)	Poe	Weller
King (NY)	Porter	Westmoreland
Kingston	Price (GA)	Whitfield (KY)
Kirk	Pryce (OH)	Wicker
Kline (MN)	Putnam	Wilson (NM)
Knollenberg	Radanovich	Wilson (SC)
Kuhl (NY)	Ramstad	Wolf
LaHood	Rehberg	Young (AK)
Lamborn	Reichert	Young (FL)
Lampson	Renzi	

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Hoolley	Paul
Carson	Jindal	Regula
Crenshaw	McNulty	Rush
Cubin	Mica	Waters
Heller	Miller, Gary	Waxman

□ 1411

Messrs. JOHNSON of Georgia and UDALL of Colorado changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 1161, I was in the Chamber and trying to cast my vote as the rollcall was closed. Had I been permitted to enter my vote, I would have been recorded as “nay.”

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, December 12, 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 Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Secretary of State, the State of Ohio, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held December 11, 2007, the Honorable Robert E. Latta was elected Representative to Congress for the Fifth Congressional District, State of Ohio.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

OHIO SECRETARY OF STATE,
Columbus, Ohio, December 12, 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 Election held on Tuesday, December 11, 2007, for Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio, show that Robert E. Latta received 56,387 votes of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Robert E. Latta was elected as Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio.

To the best of our 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 all 16 counties of the Fifth Congressional District involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

JENNIFER BRUNNER.

PROVIDING FOR SWEARING IN OF
THE HONORABLE ROBERT E.
LATTA, OF OHIO, AS A MEMBER
OF THE HOUSE

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT E. LATTA, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1415

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, December 12, 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 Ms. Nancy Rodrigues, Secretary, State Board of Elections, the Commonwealth of Virginia, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held December 11, 2007, the Honorable Robert J. "Rob" Wittman was elected Representative to Congress for the First Congressional District, Commonwealth of Virginia.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
Richmond, VA, December 12, 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 Election held on Tuesday, December 11, 2007, for Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of Virginia, show that Robert J. "Rob" Wittman received 50,079 of the total number of votes cast, 84,252 for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Robert J. "Rob" Wittman was elected as Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of Virginia.

To the best of our 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 the counties of Caroline, Essex, Fauquier, Gloucester, James City, King & Queen, King George, King William, Lancaster, Mathews, Middlesex, Northumberland, Prince William, Richmond County, Spotsylvania, Stafford, Westmoreland and York, and all or part of the cities of Fredericksburg, Hampton, Newport News, Poquoson and Williamsburg involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law on December 20, 2007.

Sincerely,

NANCY RODRIGUES,
Secretary.

PROVIDING FOR SWEARING IN OF
THE HONORABLE ROBERT J.
WITTMAN, OF VIRGINIA, AS A
MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable ROBERT J. "ROB" WITTMAN, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

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

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

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE
ROBERT E. LATTA, OF OHIO, AND
THE HONORABLE ROBERT J.
"ROB" WITTMAN, OF VIRGINIA,
AS MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Representatives-elect and the members of their respective delegations present themselves in the well.

Mr. LATTA and Mr. WITTMAN 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 Members of the 110th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE
ROBERT E. LATTA TO THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce the newest Member of our body from Ohio, Mr. ROBERT LATTA.

There is a lot that I can say. He has an outstanding record in the Ohio legislature. He has a lot of community activities. One that I especially like is he was very active in the 4-H program, and that's something close to my heart.

But let me say, BOB, you have a wonderful legacy to uphold here. Your father served here for 30 years, an outstanding Member, Del Latta, for a few of us that still remember him well, a great Member. And then you succeed Paul Gillmor, who had 20 years of outstanding service. So the 5th District of Ohio has had 50 years as a legacy of great service. And looking at your record in the Ohio legislature, I know that you will carry on the same record of great service to the people of that district and to the State of Ohio. And I'm happy, as the senior Member, to welcome you as a new Member of this great body.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman.

And on behalf of our entire Buckeye delegation, and with poignancy on this occasion, during this season of new light, please let me welcome Congressman ROBERT LATTA of Wood County, Ohio, to the ranks of the 110th Congress of the United States.

I can share with our colleagues that BOB is a man who has lived the commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother." Delbert and Rosemary must be so elated today.

BOB also has honored his in-laws, Mr. and Mrs. Vern and Carol Sloan of Williams County, such very, very good citizens. BOB's father Delbert, as RALPH has said, served dutifully for three decades in this Chamber until 1989. What a Christmas gift this swearing-in must be for the Latta and Sloan families.

BOB has been a loving husband to his gifted wife, Marcia, and a real father to his daughters, Elizabeth and Maria. I know how proud they all are today.

His public service has been exemplary, with 15 years of service in the Ohio legislature. We welcome him warmly to the ranks of the Ohio delegation. Indeed, we need his help to pull our Buckeye State forward in more than football.

Let me wish you and your family Godspeed on behalf of our entire delegation with healthy and productive years of service to our blessed Nation. Onward, and congratulations.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTI. Thank you, Madam Speaker, for allowing me a brief moment.

I want to thank Representative REGULA. Representative KAPTUR, thank you very much for your nice remarks. I really appreciate that. I know that my dad always enjoyed serving with you and riding on the plane back and forth from Toledo.

It's a great honor to be here today. I'll tell you, it's a humbling experience. Because of all the years when I was younger and Dad was in Congress here and being able to come onto this floor, I never dreamed there would be a day when I would be standing in this well to address the Members.

I just want to say this, that as we were walking here today from the Metro and walking between the Cannon and Longworth and looking up the street and seeing that dome of the Capitol Building, I understood how humbling of an experience this really is. I truly believe we are truly blessed to be one of 435 to represent such a great Nation.

I look forward to working with all of you in the future. And I just want to thank you very much for this ability to be here with you today, and also, Madam Speaker, again, for allowing me to speak. I really appreciate it. Thank you very much.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE ROBERT J. "ROB" WITTMAN TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the entire Virginia congressional delegation, it is a great privilege to introduce the newest Member of the 110th Congress, the gentleman from the First Congressional District, ROB WITTMAN.

ROB WITTMAN has been a public servant for more than 20 years, serving as a town councilman, mayor, county supervisor and board chairman, and member of the Virginia House of Delegates.

ROB holds a doctorate degree in public policy and administration, a master of public health degree in health policy and administration, and a bachelor of science degree in biology. Throughout his career, ROB's wife, Kathryn, a public school teacher, has been at his side. They are the parents of two children, daughter, Devon, and son, Josh.

Madam Speaker, ROB WITTMAN is ready to get to work following the decades-long tradition of former Congressman and Senator Paul Trible, of former Congressman Herb Bateman, and our beloved Member, who just left us to go home to be with the Lord, Jo Ann Davis, in providing outstanding and dedicated representation in Congress for the people of Virginia's First District.

I present to you the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Virginia, ROB WITTMAN.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is, indeed, an honor and a privilege to be with you today. Representative WOLF, thank you very much for those kind words; I really appreciate that.

It is, indeed, a humbling experience to be here. I look forward to working with each and every one of you in the days to come to make sure that we do the best job that we can collectively here for our Nation. As I said, it's a very humbling experience, and I thank you.

May God bless 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 of office to the gentlemen from Virginia and Ohio, the whole number of the House is 434.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. LEWIS OF California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 27, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 1162]

YEAS—385

- | | | |
|---------------|----------------|------------|
| Abercrombie | Boehner | Capuano |
| Aderholt | Bonner | Cardoza |
| Akin | Bono | Carnahan |
| Alexander | Boozman | Carney |
| Allen | Boren | Castle |
| Altmire | Boswell | Castor |
| Andrews | Boustany | Chabot |
| Arcuri | Boyd (FL) | Chandler |
| Baca | Boyda (KS) | Clarke |
| Bachmann | Brady (PA) | Clay |
| Baird | Braley (IA) | Clyburn |
| Baker | Broun (GA) | Coble |
| Baldwin | Brown (SC) | Cohen |
| Barrow | Brown, Corrine | Cole (OK) |
| Bartlett (MD) | Brown-Waite, | Conaway |
| Barton (TX) | Ginny | Conyers |
| Bean | Buchanan | Cooper |
| Becerra | Burgess | Costa |
| Berkley | Butterfield | Costello |
| Berry | Buyer | Courtney |
| Biggert | Calvert | Cramer |
| Billbray | Camp (MI) | Crowley |
| Bilirakis | Campbell (CA) | Cuellar |
| Bishop (GA) | Cannon | Cummings |
| Bishop (NY) | Cantor | Davis (AL) |
| Bishop (UT) | Capito | Davis (CA) |
| Blunt | Capps | Davis (IL) |

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Davis (KY) | Kennedy | Pomeroy |
| Davis, David | Kildee | Porter |
| Davis, Lincoln | Kind | Price (GA) |
| Davis, Tom | King (NY) | Price (NC) |
| Deal (GA) | Kingston | Pryce (OH) |
| DeFazio | Kirk | Putnam |
| DeGette | Klein (FL) | Radanovich |
| DeLauro | Kline (MN) | Rahall |
| Dent | Knollenberg | Ramstad |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Kuhl (NY) | Rangel |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | LaHood | Regula |
| Dicks | Lampson | Rehberg |
| Dingell | Langevin | Reichert |
| Doggett | Lantos | Renzi |
| Donnelly | Larsen (WA) | Reyes |
| Doolittle | Larson (CT) | Reynolds |
| Doyle | Latham | Richardson |
| Drake | LaTourette | Rodriguez |
| Dreier | Latta | Rogers (AL) |
| Edwards | Lee | Rogers (KY) |
| Ehlers | Levin | Rogers (MI) |
| Ellison | Lewis (GA) | Rohrabacher |
| Ellsworth | Lewis (KY) | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Emanuel | Linder | Roskam |
| Emerson | Lipinski | Ross |
| Engel | LoBiondo | Rothman |
| English (PA) | Loeb | Roybal-Allard |
| Eshoo | Loftis | Royce |
| Etheridge | Lofgren, Zoe | Rush |
| Everett | Lowe | Ryan (OH) |
| Fallin | Lucas | Ryan (WI) |
| Farr | Lungren, Daniel | Salazar |
| Fattah | E. | Sali |
| Feeney | Lynch | Sánchez, Linda |
| Ferguson | Mack | T. |
| Filner | Mahoney (FL) | Sánchez, Loretta |
| Forbes | Maloney (NY) | Sarbanes |
| Fortenberry | Manzullo | Saxton |
| Fossella | Marchant | Schakowsky |
| Fox | Markey | Schiff |
| Frank (MA) | Marshall | Schmidt |
| Frelinghuysen | Matheson | Schwartz |
| Galleghy | Matsui | Scott (GA) |
| Garrett (NJ) | McCarthy (CA) | Scott (VA) |
| Gerlach | McCarthy (NY) | Serrano |
| Giffords | McCaul (TX) | Sessions |
| Gilchrest | McCollum (MN) | Sestak |
| Gillibrand | McCotter | Shays |
| Gingrey | McCrery | Shea-Porter |
| Gonzalez | McDermott | Sherman |
| Goode | McGovern | Shimkus |
| Goodlatte | McHenry | Shuler |
| Gordon | McHugh | Shuster |
| Granger | McIntyre | Simpson |
| Graves | McKeon | Sires |
| Green, Al | McMorris | Skelton |
| Green, Gene | Rodgers | Slaughter |
| Grijalva | McNerney | Smith (NE) |
| Gutierrez | Meek (FL) | Smith (NJ) |
| Hall (NY) | Meeke (NY) | Smith (TX) |
| Hall (TX) | Melancon | Smith (WA) |
| Hare | Mica | Snyder |
| Harman | Michaud | Solis |
| Hastings (FL) | Miller (FL) | Space |
| Hastings (WA) | Miller (MI) | Spratt |
| Hayes | Miller (NC) | Stark |
| Herger | Miller, George | Stupak |
| Herseth Sandlin | Mitchell | Sullivan |
| Higgins | Mollohan | Sutton |
| Hill | Moore (KS) | Tanner |
| Hinche | Moore (WI) | Taylor |
| Hinojosa | Moran (KS) | Thompson (CA) |
| Hirono | Moran (VA) | Thompson (MS) |
| Hobson | Murphy (CT) | Tiahrt |
| Hodes | Murphy, Patrick | Tiberi |
| Holden | Murphy, Tim | Tierney |
| Holt | Murtha | Towns |
| Honda | Musgrave | Tsongas |
| Hoyer | Myrick | Turner |
| Hulshof | Nadler | Udall (CO) |
| Inglis (SC) | Napolitano | Udall (NM) |
| Inslee | Neal (MA) | Upton |
| Israel | Neugebauer | Van Hollen |
| Issa | Nunes | Velázquez |
| Jackson (IL) | Oberstar | Visclosky |
| Jackson-Lee | Obey | Walberg |
| (TX) | Olver | Walden (OR) |
| Jefferson | Ortiz | Walz (MN) |
| Johnson (GA) | Pallone | Wamp |
| Johnson (IL) | Pascrell | Wasserman |
| Johnson, E. B. | Pastor | Schultz |
| Jones (NC) | Payne | Waters |
| Jones (OH) | Pearce | Watson |
| Jordan | Pence | Watt |
| Kagen | Perlmutter | Waxman |
| Kanjorski | Peterson (MN) | Weiner |
| Kaptur | Peterson (PA) | Welch (VT) |
| Keller | Pickering | Weldon (FL) |
| | Pitts | Weller |
| | Platts | |

Westmoreland	Wilson (OH)	Wu
Wexler	Wilson (SC)	Wynn
Whitfield (KY)	Wittman (VA)	Yarmuth
Wicker	Wolf	
Wilson (NM)	Woolsey	

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1201

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1201, the Freedom and Innovation Revitalizing U.S. Entrepreneurship Act of 2007.

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

There was no objection.

it would be hopefully ready for consideration.

I want to say that the energy legislation will be considered, assuming we get the bill from the Senate, assuming we are ready to do that, considered done on Tuesday.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that, and let me just clarify in my own mind. The energy legislation would not be considered on Monday, but if we get it, I am anticipating it would be considered on Tuesday.

Mr. HOYER. Energy legislation will be considered on Tuesday.

Mr. BLUNT. And then further clarification on your observation about more action on the children's health insurance program as it relates to the doc fix. I am a little unclear on your information on that.

Mr. HOYER. As you know, in our bill that we sent to the Senate, which the Senate did not pass, and it is still pending in the Senate, we made provision for the doctors reimbursement, which is going to be cut by 10 percent, as you know, on January 1. As a result of that, we are very concerned that there are some providers that may feel they no longer can afford to give services to those under Medicare. We think that is something that none of us want to have happen, so I wanted to put you on notice, so you knew that that was a possibility if their agreement could be reached on that issue. As you know, the Senate has not passed it.

But I am mentioning SCHIP, they may be combined, they may not be, I don't know, because that is a health care issue, and we have been talking about it as a combined. I wanted you to simply know that when I mentioned SCHIP that may well be subsumed in that or a separate item, if, in fact, agreement can be reached.

Mr. BLUNT. I will take that information and thank you for that information.

On the AMT, on the alternative minimum tax, the status on that right now is the Senate has sent over a bill without an offsetting tax pay-for, has passed one. Can you give me some information of where that bill is at this moment?

Mr. HOYER. The Senate bill is still in the Senate, as I understand it. We have passed, as you know, a House bill with a different pay-for so that the deficit is not increased by our actions. As you know, on this side of the aisle we feel very strongly, I underline "very," strongly that the alternative minimum tax, I think to a Member, agree was not intended to affect some of the people that it will affect if it is not modified. We want to modify it, but we don't want to modify it at the expense of our children and grandchildren having to fill the hole that will be left by the loss in revenues on which the administration has counted in its budgets for not this year but succeeding years for the next 9 years. If that money is not there and expenditures are not cut, or revenues are not raised, then we will

NAYS—27

Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Petri
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Poe
Blumenauer	Hensarling	Sensenbrenner
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Shadegg
Burton (IN)	Hunter	Souder
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Stearns
Culberson	King (IA)	Tancredo
Duncan	Kucinich	Thornberry
Flake	Lewis (CA)	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman	Cubin	Miller, Gary
Berman	Heller	Paul
Blackburn	Hookey	Ruppersberger
Boucher	Jindal	Tauscher
Carson	Kilpatrick	Terry
Cleaver	Lamborn	Walsh (NY)
Crenshaw	McNulty	Young (FL)

□ 1433

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina changed his vote from "yea" to "nay." So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1162, I was delayed because I was meeting with constituents from my district and I was taking them on a tour of the Capitol. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained over the past few days to come to the floor of the House of Representatives to cast my vote on certain rollcall votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" for rollcall Nos. 1125 and 1160. I would have voted "yea" for rollcall Nos. 1124 through 1138, rollcall No. 1142, rollcall No. 1145, rollcall Nos. 1152 through 1158, and rollcall Nos. 1161 and 1162.

I would have voted "nay" for rollcall No. 1159.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for a series of votes today due to personal family reasons. I request that my votes be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On rollcall No. 1156 on Ordering the Previous Question on House Resolution 869, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 1157 on Ordering the Previous Question on House Resolution 859, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 1158 on passage of House Resolution 859, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 1159 on the motion to recommit the Conference Report (H.R. 2082) with Instructions, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 1160 on agreeing to the Conference Report (H.R. 2082), I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 1161, to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 1162, on passage of H.J. Res. 69, I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for information about what I hope to be the last week's schedule of this working year.

Mr. HOYER. One week longer than I had hoped.

I thank the gentleman. On Monday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business with any votes ordered postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules, and most of those bills will be announced before the close of business tomorrow.

We will also expect further action on the following items: energy legislation, terrorism risk insurance, the fiscal 2008 appropriations package, the alternative minimum tax, the children's health insurance program. And there may be within the children's health program, depending on what the Senate does, dealing with the reimbursement of providers under Medicare, the docs.

I might also add to that, Members ought to know it is possible that depending upon the administrative work that can be accomplished over the next 4 or 5 days, it is possible that Monday night we might consider the omnibus appropriation bill. I mention that, but I want you to know that that is possible.

Mr. BLUNT. On that topic, my friend, I wonder, do you have any sense on what time over the weekend or on Monday it would become obvious, the Monday evening work, because we have had many Members, as I am sure you have, inquire about that specific issue.

Mr. HOYER. The chairman of the committee, Mr. OBEY, has made it very clear that he wants to, although this is essentially an amendment, he wants to meet the 24-hour notice so that Members have 24 hours. So that would require Sunday night, we hope we can reach Sunday, for the posting of the bill on the Rules Committee Web site, which is usually how notice is given. And we are hopeful that will be done by Sunday night so that by Monday night

increase the budget deficit by a very substantial amount, billions and billions of dollars, at least \$100 billion just by this one action. So we have passed a bill. The Senate has passed a bill. The Senate still has its bill. It has not passed over here.

Mr. BLUNT. I will look forward to that coming back from the Senate. I would say whether the administration does it or we do it, this policy of taking revenue we don't have now, that we don't think we should be collecting and creating a situation where we have to come up with another tax to collect it, and you mentioned the administration did that, and I believe you are right, that they did anticipate that, I think that was a wrong thing for them to do. I think it is unfortunate we have let this tax get into this situation.

Mr. HOYER. I understand the gentleman's position, but you understand for the last 5 or 6 years the Republican budgets have done the same thing.

Mr. BLUNT. And I understand for the last 5 or 6 years we have taken the initial step necessary by June to not let this encumber the tax collecting system. And even if we now are able to clarify this, it is so late that it is going to have impact on how people can file their taxes next year. I certainly would agree with any premise to suggest this should have been taken care of long ago. And as my good friend knows, we did send a bill that I voted for to President Clinton in 1999 that would have eliminated this tax. We should have done that at that time. I am sorry we couldn't figure out a way to work together and eliminate that tax then so we wouldn't have to wrestle with this issue every year between then and now.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's observation about the 1997. I don't believe that was paid for either. I am not absolutely positive on that, but that is why I believe the veto occurred. But we all agree we ought to eliminate the AMT. But there is no doubt there is a very significant philosophical and policy difference between the President and your side and our side in terms of whether or not, when you eliminate and you make the patch, there is no money to do the patch. So when you take that money away, you have to fill it either with borrowing, as we have done over the last number of years, or you fill it with additional revenues. If you fill it with additional revenues, future generations are not paying the bill. If you fill it with borrowing or just leaving the emergency spending hole, future generations have to pay for it.

Now, I know we disagree on that, but it is, I think, a very honest philosophical and policy difference, and the bills reflect that.

Mr. BLUNT. They do, and it is a difference. I think the third thing that should be considered, that unfortunately we still are not able to bring ourselves to consider, is how you manage to deal with that revenue shortfall by savings and spending, by just not planning to spend it. But the Presi-

dent's budget did, your budget did. I don't agree with the President's budget and I voted against the majority's budget, and we do have to look at savings as one of the options. The President's budget, the President would have increased spending by over 6 percent, by over 4½ percent in the bills left, and I think that is the number right now we are trying to deal with. I look forward to working with the gentleman as we deal with that, get the work of this year's Congress done, and let our Members go home and talk about what we have done or what we have failed to do.

Mr. HOYER. I think we all agree that we want to get our work done. We have had great difficulty doing that. Not so much in this body because this body, whether your side is in charge or my side is in charge, we have a Rules Committee, we can structure debate, and the majority rules.

Unfortunately, in the Senate, the majority does not rule. The Senate has decided that they will let the minority rule. They did that when we were in the majority, and it was done when your party was in the majority. We have both discussed the problems that causes a body that can, in fact, allow the majority to rule. Having said that, we are working towards trying to do what the gentleman suggested, getting our work done. To the extent that we can cooperate with one another, that will facilitate that objective.

□ 1445

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that. I do know whoever is in the majority on this side has to spend a lot of time explaining why an apparent majority on the other side of the building doesn't really become a majority on that side of the building.

I thank the gentleman for his information.

Mr. HOYER. We do find agreement from time to time, apparently.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SARBANES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

LOUISVILLE CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL 3-A CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, we watched two African American coaches make history in the Super Bowl. This week, Ty Scroggins made history again, guiding Louisville's Central High School to the Kentucky 3-A Championship, becoming the first African American football coach to win a Kentucky State title. As alma mater to Muhammad Ali, Central is no stranger to athletic success. Still, it took a total team effort, led by Darrell Taylor's inspired rushing, to give the Yellow Jackets their first championship.

As the first predominantly and historically black high school to win the Kentucky Gridiron State trophy, their landmark win is a victory for a Commonwealth proud of overcoming adversity as we progress toward real equality. The school that began 125 years ago as Louisville Colored High School now sends 92 percent of its students to college. Renowned for economic excellence, successful magnet programs, and unique entrepreneurial opportunities, few schools so thoroughly prepare students for careers in business, law, technology, and medicine.

Four decades ago, Central gave us The Greatest. Today, the school continues to give us greatness. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Central High School, Coach Scroggins, and Kentucky's 2007 3-A football champs.

THE NON-ENERGY BILL

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, this winter it's going to be cold in the Northeast. Home heating oil is needed for those who want to keep warm in the northern States. Gasoline prices continue to rise above \$3 a gallon, and crude oil may go to \$100 a barrel. So what does the House of Representatives do? Makes it more expensive for American oil companies to do business in America. How so? The non-energy bill that passed this House contains a \$21 billion tax increase on the production of oil and natural gas in America. That tax will be passed on to the consumer in the higher prices of energy.

The bill doesn't open up new sources of exploration off our coast or in ANWR. Now, only Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama allow drilling off the coast. You see, States like California, Florida, and northeastern States don't want drilling off their coast but they don't have a problem with consuming the crude oil from States that allow offshore drilling. This bill punishes oil-producing States like my home State of Texas. The Wall

Street Journal stated, In this bill, the biggest winner is OPEC. So, Mr. Speaker, maybe to survive, Texas and the other oil-producing States should just join OPEC and get a better deal on our crude oil.

And that's just the way it is.

NON-INTERVENTION AND NEUTRALITY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Bruce Fein is a nationally syndicated columnist who was a high-ranking official during the Reagan administration. He does not support a neocon, globalist, world policeman-type of foreign policy for the U.S., a foreign policy that used to be considered as the policy of liberals.

Last week, Mr. Fein wrote a column describing the traditional conservative view. He wrote: "Non-intervention and global neutrality should be the national security creed of the United States. Every soldier deployed abroad should be returned to deter and defend the United States at home. Non-intervention and neutrality everywhere, coupled with the threat to annihilate any United States attacker would make the country safer, freer, and more prosperous. Foreign adventurisms create more enemies than they destroy.

He also quoted George Washington's farewell address, in which President Washington warned against "overgrown military establishments which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the traditional conservative view is what was expressed by President Bush during the 2000 campaign when he came out very strongly against nation building and said the U.S. needed a more humble foreign policy.

AMT PATCH

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, at \$2.9 trillion, the Federal budget is bigger than the entire economy of every single country on Earth, except Japan. Bigger than the economies of China, bigger than the economy of Britain, bigger than the economy of Germany. Just the Federal budget is larger than all of those economies.

So, Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle, I want to ask them this question: Out of \$2.9 trillion, can't you trim enough money to stop impending tax increases on the middle class and every American in this country, rather than proposing new tax increases? Unfortunately, the actions of this Congress say no, that the Demo-

crat majority is intent on raising taxes in order to grow and expand this rather large and bloated Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important the American people know what the Democrats in Congress are intending to do, and that is to raise taxes and grow government.

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.

STOPPING YOUTH VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an extraordinarily important issue, one that, quite frankly, is not often discussed on this very floor and needs in so many ways to be brought forward, not only to the attention of the Members of this body, but a dialogue that needs to reach out all across this country to discuss the devastating trends of youth violence. I am pleased to note that colleagues today, including STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES, BOBBY SCOTT, YVETTE CLARKE, DONALD PAYNE, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE and LINDA SANCHEZ, will be coming to the floor under these 5-minute Special Orders to also address this issue of youth violence.

There isn't a day that goes by that we don't thank our veterans for the sacrifice that they have made and note the loss of life that has taken place in Iraq and in Afghanistan and the wounded. And we take great pride, and rightfully so, in this Chamber for making sure that we are providing for our veterans, providing especially for those that come home with post-traumatic stress syndrome, and addressing these concerns in a meaningful and significant way. And yet here in our own country, in our cities, in our suburbs, most recently out in Nebraska, violent deaths and shootings take place and seemingly go unnoticed.

JOHN LEWIS traveled with me to Hartford, Connecticut, to address there a group of citizens concerned about violence in the neighborhood, where in 2006, 16 shootings took place in a single week. At that hearing, a Vietnam veteran, Steven Harris, stood up and said, I appreciate what Congress is doing on behalf of veterans and providing them with post-traumatic stress syndrome relief. But what about the kids in my neighborhood who have to deal with this on a regular basis? What about the youth all across this country who are perishing?

There are incredible statistics, Mr. Speaker, that this body needs to discuss in a way that will send hope out to

our communities and our neighborhoods. Homicide is the second leading cause of death among 15 to 24-year-olds overall. Homicide is the leading cause of death for African Americans between the ages of 10 to 24 and the second leading cause of death for Hispanics of that age. Guns are a factor in most of these homicides.

In a nationwide survey of high school students, 6 percent reported not going to school on one or more days in the 30 days preceding the survey because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to and from school. Children who have witnessed violence in their communities are vulnerable to serious, long-term problems. This country stood and paused and we said the world had changed forever after September 11. But for grandmothers in their communities, the world had changed before that, because this kind of senseless violence continues.

This Nation, this Congress, must solve this problem. The problem cannot be addressed explicitly through incarceration. We have ample amounts of punitive measures that exist on our books today. What we don't have is a comprehensive approach to it, reaching out into these communities, assisting and helping and providing the plans such as BOBBY SCOTT has outlined, "From Cradle to College," that provide the hope, that provide the leadership for communities coming together in a manner in which they care about our children.

We are aware of what is happening all around the world, and we can come to this floor and chronicle it. But in our own cities, in our own States, we must begin to speak and save our children there.

□ 1500

BORDER AGENTS CAMPION AND RAMOS

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the year, it is common for whatever President is in power to review requests for pardons and for commutations of sentence. And yesterday, the President exercised his constitutional authority and pardoned numerous individuals, at least 29 of them, and I have all of their names here. I count seven drug dealers that were pardoned, one individual for receiving kickbacks in defense procurements contracts, and he commuted one sentence of an individual that was aiding and abetting the distribution of cocaine.

I want to make it clear; the President has the absolute power under the Constitution to pardon anybody he wishes or commute the sentence. And I want to read part of the Constitution, a pocketbook Constitution that many

of us here carry that says, "The President shall have the power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States."

You notice, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't give any conditions, except he can't pardon someone who has been impeached. It doesn't require that a committee decide who is to be pardoned. It doesn't require that the Justice Department do anything or be even involved in the process. It gives the power of pardon and commutation to the President; and he has that right to pardon anyone he wishes, and I uphold his right to do so.

But in jail today in the Federal penitentiary somewhere across our United States are two individuals who I think should be pardoned, or at least their sentences should be commuted. And numerous people on the House, on both sides, have asked the President to look at these cases and pardon these two individuals, especially in light of their appellate court hearing that took place just a few weeks ago in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans, Louisiana. Of course, those two people are Border Agents Ramos and Campion, who I feel like were unjustly convicted by an overzealous prosecution, a comment that was made by one of the Federal judges on appeal, "overzealous prosecution."

But be that as it may, and it seems to me that they have been imprisoned a year now, most of that time they have been serving solitary confinement. For what crime? Well, because they supposedly violated the civil rights of a drug smuggler bringing drugs in from Mexico worth about \$1 million. And the United States Government, rather than prosecute the drug dealer, prosecuted the Border Agents because they didn't follow policy, protocol, filling out appropriate forms after this shooting took place. But they go make a deal with the drug dealer. They make a deal with the devil, and they get testimony from the drug dealer in their trial. Talking about the Federal prosecution made a deal with him.

But, you see, that whole case kind of has some bad things that happened. We had learned, several of us, that while the drug dealer, granted immunity, that means they are not going to prosecute him, to testify, and before the trial took place, he brought in another load of drugs from Mexico to the United States worth about \$700,000.

The U.S. Attorney's Office, in a carefully worded propaganda piece, denied that that ever occurred. But since we saw, and I have seen the DEA report, we knew a second drug deal took place. And now, finally, after this took place and many of us knew about it, the Federal Government has decided to prosecute the drug dealer on that second case; conspiracy to import drugs into the United States, and charging a new indictment with three offenses, conspiracy to commit crimes against the United States.

So the Federal Government makes a deal with the drug dealer. He brings in drugs after the deal is made. Now he is in jail. And it seems to me, justice would demand that these two Border Agents be released at least until this appeal is over with. But I think they should have their sentences commuted or even they should be pardoned by the President.

But I say all that to say the bureaucrats say, Oh, these two Border Agents haven't followed protocol. They haven't applied the right way, they haven't filled out the right forms for a pardon and a commutation of sentence. Well, the Constitution that I just read doesn't require forms to be filled out for people in prison to get a pardon. I don't remember Mr. Scooter Libby filling out some kind of form to get a pardon. He didn't even ever go to jail. He just got a Get Out of Jail Free card. He was pardoned. The President had the absolute right to do that. I don't quarrel with that. President Nixon got an absolute pardon by President Ford. He didn't fill out any forms to get that pardon.

So, Mr. Speaker, I recommend and urge the President to commute the sentences of these two Border Agents. And he can do it on his own. He doesn't need permission from some bureaucracy, and I hope he does so and does so quickly.

And that's just the way it is.

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

(Mr. SNYDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DRUG SENTENCING REFORM AND COCAINE KINGPIN TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2007; AND YOUTH VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening for two important matters. And I believe that when we listen to our colleagues speak about fairness, as my good friend from Texas, Congressman POE, just did, I happen to agree with him that there are instances where we must respond to the unfairness of the justice system in the instance of these two Border Patrol agents who are incarcerated while the drug dealer goes free. But there are also commonsense approaches that we must make to address the question of the overall unfairness in the system.

Today, I introduce H.R. 4545, which is the Drug Sentencing Reform and Cocaine Kingpin Trafficking Act of 2007, and it responds to the cry of the U.S. Sentencing Commission and the U.S. Supreme Court, by no means liberal bastions, that have argued and have

been convinced that the disparities in sentencing between crack cocaine and cocaine is patently unconstitutional and unfair. And it was the Supreme Court on December 10 that restored the broad authority of Federal District judges to sentence outside the sentencing guidelines and impose shorter and more reasonable prison sentences for persons convicted of offenses involving crack cocaine.

Right now, we know it takes \$20,000 to incarcerate someone in the prison. But these justices and the U.S. Sentencing Commission said that it is important to end the disparity and not to give more for crack used, unfortunately, by the poorest of Americans, and allow those who use the high-priced cocaine, not really that different, to get off almost scot-free.

This bill tracks the Supreme Court decision, but, more importantly, it includes an offender drug treatment incentive grant program, and it places and increases an emphasis on certain abrogating factors such as selling drugs to children. And it has penalties for the real bad guys, and those are the major drug traffickers.

We must get a grip on the inequity of the justice system that allows some who can sit in their living room and smoke cocaine to get off easier than those who are on the streets with crack. We want to get rid of all uses of drugs, but we have to be fair in the justice system.

I also rise, Mr. Speaker, and I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring H.R. 4545. We introduced it today with 20 sponsors, including a member of the leadership, and we are grateful and hopeful that we will get a hearing on this legislation. But I also join my good friend, Congressman JOHN LARSON, to be able to step on the line, to stomp out the violence that our children are participating in.

Some few years ago, I was on the select committee against violence headed by my former colleague Martin Frost. Let me just say to you that homicide is the second leading cause of death among 15- to 24-year-olds. Twenty-seven thousand young African Americans were murdered in this country over the last 5 years of the Iraq war; there have been fewer than 1,500 killed in Iraq. The murder of a teenager costs about \$1 million in loss and accrued costs. A teenager disabled by gunshot costs about \$2 million. Seventy-one percent of police chiefs and sheriffs and prosecutors nationwide agree that there must be programs for preschool children and after-school programs. But, more importantly, parents and teachers and the faith community and Members of Congress must stand against this violence.

The killing of Sean Taylor by those under 20 years old. The killing of Deputy Constable in my district, Odom, whose funeral I went to, killed by those who were 11th and 12th graders in one of Houston's high schools.

We have to stand and denounce violence, but we must intervene with

proactive preventative programs. And I would call upon this leadership to establish a select committee against youth violence. It is that much of a crisis. The question of the proliferation of guns in the hands of youth, the kind of youth that would go in and commit suicide but kill eight individuals or more in a Nation's shopping mall, or the kind of youth that would leave his Christian home of homeschooling and shoot those innocent persons at a missionary training school in one of the Nation's churches.

What is going on in America? What is going on is silence. And, therefore, we are here today joining with Congressman LARSON and my colleagues to stand against silence. Let us establish a youth commission, a youth select committee against youth violence in the United States Congress, and let our voices ring out so that we can save our children.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Drug Sentencing Reform and Cocaine Kingpin Trafficking Act of 2007. I am introducing this important legislation today so that we may finally eliminate the unjust and unequal Federal crack/cocaine sentencing disparity in America. The time has come to finally right the wrongs created with the original drug sentencing legislation in 1986.

As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I have always been an outspoken advocate for justice and equality in our criminal justice system. For the last 21 years, we have allowed people who have committed similar crimes to serve drastically different sentences for what we now know are discredited and unsubstantiated differences. For the last 21 years, the way we have punished low-level crimes for crack cocaine and powder cocaine have been unjust and unequal.

In 1986, Congress linked mandatory minimum penalties to different drug quantities, which were intended to serve as proxies for identifying offenders who were "serious" traffickers (managers of retail drug trafficking) and "major" traffickers (manufacturers or the kingpins who headed drug organizations).

Since 1986, the severity of punishment between those sentenced for crack cocaine offenses and powder cocaine offenses has been extremely disproportionate, a 100 to 1 ratio to be exact. This has resulted in not only an unequal and unjust criminal justice system, but also a prison system which is overflowing and overburdened with individuals who were not in actuality major drug traffickers.

The U.S. Sentencing Commission recently issued a report that unanimously and strongly urged Congress to: (1) act swiftly to increase the threshold quantities of crack necessary to trigger the five- and ten-year mandatory minimum sentences so that federal resources are focused on major drug traffickers as intended in the original 1986 legislation; and (2) repeal the mandatory minimum penalty sentence for simple possession of crack, the only controlled substance for which there is a mandatory minimum for a first time offense of simple possession. The Sentencing Commission also unanimously rejected any effort to increase penalties for powder since there is no evidence to justify any such upward adjustment.

Moreover, numerous reputable studies comparing the usage of powder and crack cocaine

have shown that there is little difference between the two forms of the drug, which fundamentally undermines the current quantity-based sentencing disparity.

Accordingly, I am introducing this legislation based on these recommendations and after the U.S. Supreme Court released two opinions in 7-2 decisions this past Monday, December 10th, restoring the broad authority of federal district court judges to sentence outside the Sentencing Guidelines' range and impose shorter and more reasonable prison sentences for persons convicted of offenses involving crack cocaine. In the most high-profile of the cases, *Kimbrough v. United States*, the Court held that sentencing judges could sentence crack cocaine defendants below the Guidelines' range to reflect a view that crack sentences have been set disproportionately high in comparison to cocaine sentences.

Additionally, the U.S. Sentencing Commission has been urging Congress to drop its 100-1 crack-to-cocaine ratio approach, and the Court held that judges may take into account the evolving view that both drugs merit equal treatment when calculating prison time.

It is time for Congress to act. This bill will eliminate the disparities in cocaine sentencing and the current mandatory minimum for simple possession. In addition, this bill will increase emphasis on certain aggravating and mitigating factors, create an offender drug treatment incentive grant program and increase penalties for major drug traffickers. Most importantly, this resolution will enact the measures that the U.S. Sentencing Commission has requested from Congress.

This legislation will also fundamentally change the way we punish drug traffickers. This legislation dramatically increases the monetary punishment for those convicted of trafficking drugs and at the same time creates grants for States to create incentive based treatment programs for low-level drug offenders.

Blatant and unjust inequality under the law must end. This bill will ensure that those individuals who have violated the law will be punished fairly, relative to the punishment. We cannot allow this injustice to continue, and I urge you to support this timely resolution, which is supported by the Open Society Policy Center, the Sentencing Project, the ACLU, the American Bar Association, and the Drug Policy Alliance. I also want to thank Senator BIDEN for introducing the companion to this legislation in the Senate earlier this year.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to join Congressman LARSON and a number of my other colleagues to discuss the very serious issue of youth violence. As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have placed the protection and promotion of the rights of our nation's children at the forefront of my legislative agenda, and I am deeply troubled and concerned about the rising tide of violence among America's children.

Madam Speaker, news stories in recent weeks and months have illustrated a painful fact: that violent crime is again on the rise in the United States, and that the specter of violence is increasingly affecting our nation's children. Earlier this year, we were all stunned by the shooting spree that transpired on the campus of Virginia Tech, and only last week we witnessed the tragic rampage by a 19-year old young man in a Nebraska shopping mall. Only yesterday, according to media reports, six stu-

dents were injured, two critically so, when their school bus came under gunfire in Las Vegas, in an attack which investigators believe may have been linked to a school fight earlier in the day.

These tragic anecdotes are emblematic of a larger problem: the rising prevalence of violent crime in our society. According to news reports, the past two years have seen a trend of increased violence; last year violent crime rose 2 percent in the United States. Children are not immune to this brutality. Homicide is now the 2nd leading cause of death among 15- to 24-year olds. Gang violence is certainly linked to many of these cases, and youth-gang related homicides have risen by more than 50 percent since 1999.

Madam Speaker, according to the Centers for Disease Control, in 2003, 5,570 people between the ages of 10 and 24 were murdered. This works out to a shocking average of 15 young people killed every single day. Of these victims, 86 percent were male, and 82 percent, a clear majority, were killed with firearms.

Some sectors of our society are more vulnerable to this rising tide of violence. Homicide is now the leading cause of death for African Americans between the ages of 10 and 24, and the 2nd leading cause of death for Hispanics in that age range. For American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Asian/Pacific Islanders, it is the 3rd leading cause of death. Over the past five years, there have been 27,000 young African Americans murdered in our nation, as compared to less than 1,500 African Americans killed, in the same period of time, in the Iraq war.

These disparities are evident in my home state of Texas. In 2003, the child death rate in Texas was 24.4 deaths per 100,000, a slight increase over the previous year. The rate of death for African American children in Texas was significantly higher than the rate for their White or Hispanic peers. In addition, in 2003, all Texas children were most likely to die from accidents, but while the second most prevalent cause of death for White and Hispanic children was disease, the second most common cause of death for African American children was homicide. For teenagers, deaths by accident, homicide, and suicide accounted for the majority of deaths among 15-19 year olds. While White teens were 50 percent more likely to commit suicide than their Hispanic peers, and almost 2.5 times as likely as their African American peers, African American teens were over twice as likely to die of homicide as Hispanic teens, and seven times more likely than White teens.

Our children should not have to grow up under a shadow of fear. In a nationwide survey of high school students published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, about 6 percent of respondents reported not going to school on one or more days in the 30 days preceding the survey because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to or from school. Madam Speaker, this is absolutely unacceptable. We cannot tolerate our children being scared away from the classroom by the threat of violent crime. We cannot allow violence to keep the young people of our Nation from receiving the education they need to fulfill their goals and dreams.

Our Nations' cities are paying a high cost for their violent crime. While I am extremely wary of attaching monetary value to the lives of our children, I believe it is worth noting

that every murder of a teenager, according to estimates, costs the city in which it is committed roughly one million dollars. I mention this statistic only to highlight the economic benefit of working to prevent youth violence, on top of the obvious social and humanitarian motivations. Analysis has shown that for every dollar spent on youth violence prevention, \$14 is saved that would be spent in the justice system. If prevention is made a priority, studies show, preemptive programs will reap dividends in the future.

The rising rate of incarceration is of great concern to me, particularly as it harshly affects communities of color. According to the Justice Department, if the 2001 rates of incarceration were to continue indefinitely, a white male born in the U.S. would have a 1 in 17 chance of going to state or federal prison during his lifetime, a Latino male would have a 1 in 6 chance, and a Black male would have a 1 in 3 chance of going to prison. These disturbing statistics speak to the ongoing racial divides in our society, as well as to the lack of opportunities for young men in many of these communities. I believe that, in this Congress, we have made some progress toward creating and proliferating opportunities for all the young people of our nation to improve their potential; I also believe we have a great deal of work left to do in this regard.

Madam Speaker, despite a spate of recent shootings that have demonstrated the prevalence of school violence, the news is not all bad. Studies have shown that school-associated violent deaths account for less than 1 percent of homicides among school-aged children and youth.

However, even if schools are the safest place for our children, it remains indisputable that young people are increasingly the victims of violent crime, and that crime and violence in schools remains far too prevalent. In 2004, over 750,000 young people, ages 10–24, were treated in emergency departments for injuries sustained due to violence, according to the Centers for Disease Control. In a CDC survey conducted in 2004 of high school students across the nation, 33 percent reported being in a physical fight at least once in the year preceding the survey. Seventeen percent reported carrying a weapon on one or more of the 30 days preceding questioning. Another survey estimated that 30 percent of 6th to 10th graders were involved in bullying, either as a bully, a target, or both.

Madam Speaker, Americans pay \$90 billion in taxes every year for the criminal justice system. They pay an additional \$65 billion annually in total private security costs. This works out to approximately \$535 a year for every man, woman, and child in America. I would suggest that addressing the causes of youth violence in our country, and working to prevent it in the future, would be a much better direction to concentrate our efforts. Doing so will save American taxpayer dollars, but, far more importantly, it will save the lives of our sons and daughters.

Madam Speaker, youth violence has a profound affect on communities across our nation. In addition to tragic injury and death, youth violence escalates the cost of health care, reduces productivity, decreases property values, and disrupts social services.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to make a reduction in youth violence a reality. According to 71 percent of police chiefs, sher-

iffs, and prosecutors nationwide, providing more pre-kindergarten programs for pre-school age children, as well as after-school programs for school-age children, would be the most effective strategy for reducing youth violence. I believe we, as a Congress and as representatives of the American people, must ensure that the protection of our children is at the forefront of our legislative agenda.

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MCDERMOTT 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 Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McCOTTER 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 California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. KING of Iowa 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 (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CLARKE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

YOUTH VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to speak to this important issue that we have been talking about that has been brought to the floor by Congressman LARSON.

As we all know, the pendulum seems to be swinging in an opposite direction as relates to our young people. According to the Center for Disease Control, homicide is the second leading cause of death among 15- to 24-year-olds in this country. More closely, homicide is a leading cause of death for African Americans the ages of 10 to 24, the second leading cause of death for Hispanics ages in the same category, and the third leading cause of death for Native Americans, Alaskans, and Asian Pacific Islanders.

The recent shootings in Omaha, Nebraska; Cleveland, Ohio; Blacksburg, Virginia; and actually my own hometown of Newark, New Jersey, have shone a harsh light on the rising crime epidemic plaguing our country. Our country has a proliferation of weapons. It is estimated that there are 300 million weapons in this country, one for every man, woman, and child. There seems to be a romance in some areas with guns, the fact that they can be purchased so easily in many parts of our country. Our State of New Jersey has one of the strongest antigun laws in the country; however, people can come in from other States and bring them in. We had four children, four young people, college students executed, four at one time, in a playground, almost gangster type.

And so we have to do something to stop this epidemic which is plaguing

our country. We as a Nation, and particularly here in Congress, have a sobering choice to make: We can either continue to bury our heads in the sand and hide behind our tough-on-crime rhetoric and placing the sole blame on things like violent music and video games, or we can be proactive so that we can start seeing real reduction in crime. There are options available to us that are more cost-effective and life-saving than throwing increased resources into cameras and metal detectors and security guards and prisons.

Let it not be misconstrued that I believe that these are not important factors in our society. We certainly have to segregate violent criminals from the society. However, if we continue to unwisely spend an overwhelming amount of our constrained resources on this, we will continue to lose on the war on crime.

According to CNN, cost analyses show that for every dollar spent on youth violence prevention, \$14 is saved on what would have otherwise been spent in the criminal justice system. And so many times an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

As a matter of fact, as earlier mentioned, the disparity between crack cocaine and powdered cocaine led the sentencing commission once again to say this is discriminatory, it is absolutely wrong to have a 5-year minimum sentence, mandatory, for crack cocaine. But for the same amount, or even 10 times more, and I believe it even goes up to 100 times more for powder cocaine, you can have a suspended sentence. That is absolutely wrong. I am glad that the sentencing commission and the judiciary now are saying we should change this.

Also, I am proud to say in New Jersey, just this past week, for the first State in the Union to ban by legislative action the death penalty in the State senate, and today that is being considered in the assembly, is I think really a just way for our State to move. So let me say that I commend Congressman LARSON.

□ 1515

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

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

APPOINTMENT OF HON. STENY H. HOYER TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH DECEMBER 17, 2007

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 13, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STENY H. HOYER to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign

enrolled bills and joint resolutions through December 17, 2007.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

MENTAL HEALTH PARITY NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, this evening I have an opportunity to address an issue that our country has long seen unaddressed in the many years that we have tackled many issues but failed to address the underlying issue that we seek to talk about this evening. We have just heard many people talk about the issue of gun violence. We have had many people talk about drug smuggling. Well, these are just two examples of the issue that we are going to talk about tonight, in the examples that point to the fact that we are failing to address the underlying problem.

The issue of gun violence, we fail to address the underlying problems of violence in our society when we fail to address the underpinnings of violence. What is it that created the mind of that young man in Omaha that led him to act out in such a way that led to the death so tragically of those innocent people in the mall in Omaha, Nebraska? Why was it that he could not get the help that he needed such that he had to act out in such a way? Why was it that he had to resort to violence?

Why is it in this country that homicide amongst young people is the second leading cause of death for young people? Why is it that suicide is the third leading cause of death for young people 15 to 24?

It is important to ask these questions because if we do, we start to dig below the surface of these questions about whether the issue is really about simply the question of whether we are talking about locking people up or addressing a more fundamental problem and that is addressing people's needs in this country which aren't going to be addressed simply by locking them up, but rather by, as was just addressed by Mr. PAYNE from New Jersey, addressing these problems before they become problems.

What we are here tonight to talk about is addressing people's emotional and mental health needs in this country so that as a Nation we don't have our criminal justice system become the mental health system that it has become in our society.

We as a country incarcerate more people in this country of ours than any other free country on the face of the Earth. We imprison more people in this

country than any other free country on the Earth. It begs the question, why is it that America, which calls itself the land of the free, why do we jail so many people? We jail so many people because we fail to get ourselves prepared to come to grips with the violence in our society. We jail so many people in this country because we fail to come to grips with the drug epidemic in our society.

You just heard Mr. POE from Texas talk about Border Patrol and the fact that these border agents are being held in jail because of drug smuggling charges and the problems that they have in interdicting drug smugglers. We heard from Ms. JACKSON-LEE about the problem of charging criminals, the disparity in sentencing between crack cocaine and powder cocaine and how disparate the charges are.

We are talking around the issue. We are talking around the issue. The issue is: What are we doing as a Nation to address this as a health problem that it is? Why in the world would people choose to keep using drugs if they know it is going to end up putting them in jail? Why would people continue to use drugs when they know it is going to cause them to either die or lose their families or lose their lives? But that is what it does to millions of Americans every year, and yet people continue to go on using.

Why do they go on using? Because this is an addiction. Because this is a physical disease, because this is a compulsion of the mind, of the body of the soul. And unless our country comes to grips with treating this disease for what it is, and that is a physical illness, like every other physical illness, then we as a society will not begin to address all of the other problems that we hear our colleagues come to the floor this evening to talk about.

We will fail to address the criminal justice problems. We will fail to find a way to deal with the incarceration problems. We will fail to find a way to deal with the drug smuggling problems. We will fail to find a way to deal with the violence problems if we don't first find a way to address the fundamental problem of treating people's physical illness which drives them to use drugs and alcohol which forces them into these situations which create the underpinnings of violence that create these problems in the first place.

Now many people say, Well, when people use drugs, that is their choice. It is a moral failing on the person's part if they get addicted. We know better now. We have done scans of the brain and we have done research and we have shown that a brain is an organ of the body, like every other organ of the body. And in fact just like somebody may have diabetes and if they get low sugar and they eat candy bars in order to get that sugar up, for many people who have depression, they use drugs to get their serotonin levels up, to get their neuroepinephrine up, to get their chemicals up in their brain

that are unusually low because of the way their brain is constructed. So they use drugs because they are looking for a way to get themselves back up, and that is the way that they try to compensate for their depression.

Many people have bipolar disorder, like myself. Initially, I used drugs in order to make myself whole again. I got addicted. I am fortunate because I got treatment. Now I am able to get medication and I am able to live a life that is free from addiction because of that treatment. As a result, today I am able to live a free life. But for many people in this country, they don't have that freedom because they don't have that opportunity to get treatment. Why? Because their insurance plans in this country, unlike Members of Congress, do not cover addiction treatment. Their insurance plans do not treat the brain like an organ in the body. As a result, they are denied treatment for their addiction; and as a result, many of them do not survive.

My friends, that is why my friend Congressman RAMSTAD and myself have been working so hard to see that we pass the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Parity Act in the United States Congress that would do away with the discrimination against this disease called addiction because we feel so strongly that people with addictions, illnesses that are mental illnesses, are no different than illnesses like any other illness of the body. They are just physical illnesses in the brain as opposed to physical illnesses in some other part of the body. And they are no different than any other part of the body. It is just that they are above the shoulders. But insurance companies don't treat these illnesses the same for insurance purposes, and that is what we want to see end. We want to see the discrimination against mental illnesses end, and this is about ending that discrimination.

We have stories this evening that we want to share telling about what we have learned in our tour around the country about how this issue is affecting millions of Americans.

At this time, I yield to JIM RAMSTAD who has been a champion of this issue during his many years in Congress and whose leadership on this issue has been second to none and whom I am proud to have worked with in this Congress on this issue. JIM, it has been a pleasure to work with you.

Mr. RAMSTAD. I thank my friend and colleague from Rhode Island for yielding, and I thank him for his outstanding leadership as co-Chair with me of the Addiction Treatment and Recovery Caucus, for his outstanding leadership on the parity legislation, and every other piece of legislation dealing with mental illness and addiction.

I also want to thank my friend and colleague from Rhode Island for the inspiration he has been to literally hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of Americans because of his own honesty,

candor, because of the example he has been. By going public with his own story, he has impacted the lives of countless Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend from Rhode Island knows, and many of my friends here know, on July 31, 1981, I woke up in a jail cell in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, under arrest from my last alcoholic blackout as a result of my last alcoholic episode. I had abused alcohol for 12 long and painful years, and I was under arrest when I woke up that morning for disorderly conduct, resisting arrest, and failure to vacate the premises.

I am alive and sober today only because of access to treatment that I had, like other Members of Congress. Like my friend from Rhode Island, we had access to treatment as well as the grace of God and the support of many other recovering people, over the last 26 years in my case.

□ 1530

I'm living proof, as is my friend from Rhode Island, that treatment works and recovery is real. But too many people don't have that access to treatment. It's a national disgrace that 270,000 Americans were denied access to treatment last year for their addiction, people who had admitted their powerlessness over chemicals, and the treatment doors were slammed shut because the insurance companies said, No, we're not going to cover you in treatment, despite the fact that the policy said treatment shall be provided.

It's a national tragedy, Madam Speaker, that 150,000 of our fellow Americans died last year as a direct result of chemical addiction. Thirty thousand Americans committed suicide from their depression last year alone.

And it's a national crisis that untreated addiction and mental illness cost our country, our economy, \$550 billion last year alone.

And think of the costs that can't be measured in dollars and cents. Think of the human suffering, the broken families, the shattered dreams, the ruined careers, the destroyed lives. The statistics are so staggering that sometimes we forget there's a tragic human story behind every figure, as Representative KENNEDY and I heard in those 14 field hearings we conducted throughout the Nation.

Madam Speaker, let me now share a couple of those stories.

In my home State of Minnesota, the second hearing we held, Anna Westin, was a young woman who suffered from anorexia for several years, and her mother, Kitty, talked about how their insurance company, the family's insurance company, refused to cover the inpatient treatment that Anna Westin desperately needed. Anna became distraught at being a financial burden on her parents and committed suicide, took her own life.

I want to thank Anna's mother, Kitty Westin. She has created the Anna Westin Foundation to help other

young people struggling with eating disorders. And Kitty Westin has been a tireless advocate for expanding access to treatment. But her daughter didn't need to die had the insurance company done the right thing, the cost-effective thing, and covered that inpatient treatment that Anna Westin needed so badly.

We also heard horror story after horror story as a result of health plans discriminating against people with chemical addiction and mental illness.

We heard from Steve Winter, a close personal friend of ours because of these hearings. He traveled in his wheelchair to at least half of those field hearings. Steve tells the most compelling story I've ever heard. When he was a teenager, he woke up one morning and his back was stinging. He felt a stinging sensation. He stumbled downstairs to breakfast and he realized that blood was streaming from his back. He put his hand back there to his back, lower back, and had a handful of blood. Then his mother came into the kitchen, and her voice said, your sister is in heaven, and now you and I are going to join her. His mother was pointing a gun at him. Fortunately, Steve was able to talk his mother into putting the gun down after she had killed his sister and critically injured him, causing him to be a paraplegic for the rest of his life. But as Steve said, My mother didn't shoot my sister and me; her mental illness did. It was the family's insurance company who is to blame for stopping the coverage of his mother's drugs for schizophrenia. That's what caused Steve to lose the use of his legs for the rest of his life and his sister to be shot to death.

Clearly, Madam Speaker, there are very few families in America who haven't been touched in some way by mental illness or addiction. And I know my colleague's going to share some of those stories, but let me just say that it's time to end the discrimination against people suffering the ravages of mental illness and chemical addiction. It's time to end the higher copayments, higher deductibles, the out-of-pocket costs and limited treatment stays. It's time to end those discriminatory barriers that don't exist for other physical diseases. It's time to treat mental illness and chemical addiction under the same rules as physical illnesses. After all, it was 1946 when the American Medical Association categorized addiction as a disease. Anybody from the Flat Earth Society who still thinks it's a moral failing, I suggest they consult the American Medical Association, our Nation's doctors, who, as long ago as 1956, realized addiction is a disease.

As my colleague from Rhode Island said, the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act will give Americans suffering from addiction greater access to treatment by prohibiting health insurers from placing discriminatory restrictions on treatment. In other words, it will end the discrimination against people in health plans

who need treatment for mental illness or chemical addiction, plain and simple.

Madam Speaker, expanding access to treatment is not only the right thing to do, it's also the cost-effective thing to do. We've got all the empirical data in the world, all the actuarial studies in the world to prove that equity for mental health and addiction treatment will save billions of dollars nationally while not raising premiums more than 2/10 of 1 percent, and that's according to an exhaustive study by the Congressional Budget Office.

In other words, Madam Speaker, for less than the price of a cheap cup of coffee per month, one cheap cup of coffee per month, 16 million people in health plans could receive treatment for their chemical addiction and millions more for mental illness.

It's also well documented that every dollar spent on treatment saves up to \$12 in health care and criminal justice costs alone. People like Mr. KENNEDY and I, who have been treated, our health care costs are 100 percent less, 100 percent less than people with an addiction or mental illness whose disease has not been treated; 100 percent less in terms of health care costs alone.

This landmark legislation that Representative KENNEDY and I have been working on for 10 years has 273 House sponsors, 273 of you here in the House, cosponsors. It was passed with strong bipartisan majorities in two subcommittees, three full committees in the House.

Let me say, Madam Speaker, the bottom line now, we must not go home this year without enacting mental health parity into law. Let me repeat that. We must not go home this year, Congress must not leave without enacting mental health parity into law. Tens of millions of Americans suffering the ravages of mental illness, chemical addiction, can't afford to wait any longer.

Madam Speaker, before I yield back to my friend from Rhode Island, let me just thank him, again, for his incredible leadership, for his outstanding work, for his passion for people in need, people suffering from mental illness and chemical addiction, and for the example he is to millions of Americans.

I want to conclude, Madam Speaker, by saying that ending discrimination against people suffering from addiction or mental illness is not just another public policy issue. It's a matter of life or death. It's a life-or-death issue for millions of Americans suffering the ravages of mental illness and chemical addiction.

Let me conclude by repeating as strongly as I can, it's time to end the discrimination against people who need treatment for mental illness and/or chemical addiction. It's time to prohibit health insurers from placing discriminatory barriers on treatment. It's time to provide greater access to treatment. It's time to pass the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction

Equity Act, because, Madam Speaker, the American people, literally, can't afford to wait any longer for Congress to act. The American people should not have to wait any longer for Congress to deal with America's number one public health problem.

Let's keep the ball moving forward. And next week, hopefully, we'll have the best Christmas and Hanukkah present we could ever deliver to the American people; that is, treatment equity for those suffering from mental illness and chemical addiction.

Again, I thank my friend from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I ask him and say to everybody a rhetorical question. If you could imagine in this country insurance companies saying to you, "Cancer is going to cost you a higher deductible or copay. We're going to charge you more for that because we choose to," I can only imagine the outcry in this country. They wouldn't allow it for a second if they charged more for treatment for one disease than another in any other part of the body, but they allow it for mental illness because there's a stigma in society. Let's just face it. People are afraid of mental illness because they think it reflects something about them, their moral character, their ability to be strong and so forth. The fact of the matter is mental health is about being strong.

One of the great opportunities that I had as an early Member of Congress was to go down to Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and rededicate the Special Warfare School named in honor of my late uncle, President John Kennedy. President Kennedy was the first to award the wearing of the green beret in Special Forces. And I was surprised to learn that the Special Forces have for them psychiatrists on staff 24 hours, 7 days a week for each of the units of our Special Forces.

And you'd think to yourself, why in the world would the strongest, most elite, most resilient of all of our military men and women, why would they ever need to see a psychiatrist? And the commanders told me it's not because of any weakness that we want them to have a mental health professional; it's, rather, we want them to be the best that they can be. And we know, we've sunk hundreds of thousands of dollars into the training of these elite Special Forces. We've trained them to jump out of the sky. We've trained them to dive under the water and carry all kinds of things. We've trained them to do the most extraordinary tasks, and we've trained them to shoot at incredible ranges and to do incredible tasks. And we know that for them to be able to do those tasks at the maximum proficiency, they have to have a clear mind. They have to be unburdened by any stress in their life for them to have the maximum use of all their faculties and doing the job that this government

asks them to do when they're tasked to go and defend the United States of America.

And I was astounded. I said to myself, Well, if we want the best for all of our Special Forces and are tasking mental health professionals so that we get the best from our Special Forces, why aren't we tasking this for the rest of our military? And, in fact, as we're finding out now, the military is slowly learning that, in fact, we should be doing that for the rest of our military. It actually makes sense, in order to save lives amongst our own military members, to train them in advance to them going to war, in advance of them going to defend our country, to prepare themselves not only physically, but to prepare them mentally for the challenges that lay ahead. Why? Why? Because, when they get back from that combat theater, we've all read about posttraumatic stress disorder. I prefer to call that combat stress illness because I don't see it as a disorder. Frankly, I see it as a normal reaction to abnormal situations. That's what war is. Soldiers are responding to stress that is absolutely abnormal. People killing people in the streets, bombs going off is abnormal. Soldiers responding to that is normal. So the stress that is known as posttraumatic stress is absolutely a normal response to war. It should be called combat stress illness. That means they can get over it with the proper treatment, and, frankly, we ought to be doing more to treat our soldiers and their families. But, frankly, we, as a country, have seen such a stigma towards mental health that we're losing our soldiers now to suicide at a record rate.

□ 1545

We have got 120 soldiers killing themselves every week back here in the United States after they've survived going over to Iraq. I only wish we added all those soldiers' names to the list of casualties in this the Iraq war, because if we added them to the names of those killed in action, this President's body count for the war in Iraq would be a lot higher than it is right now.

And the fact of the matter is we are missing the opportunity right now to intervene and take care of many of those soldiers because of our stubborn attitude towards mental health; and if we don't get it right with our soldiers and our veterans, we're not going to get it right for the rest of the American public.

Our American public is sympathetic to our soldiers because they've stood the line and defended our country, and if we can't understand why they don't need it, then how are we going to understand why a child in the inner city who is going to school in southwest Washington, who's seeing guns and bullets fly through their neighborhood and seeing police cars at night all around their neighborhood, because of gunshots echoing in the night, how are we

going to understand where that child isn't going to have post-traumatic stress? If a soldier's going to suffer from post-traumatic stress because of guns, bullets and bombs, how are we not going to expect a child growing up in our inner cities around our country not to have stress and not have the impact of that?

We need mental health for our soldiers. We need it for our children in this country who are growing up in traumatic situations.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Absolutely.

Mr. RAMSTAD. I again appreciate the gentleman's comments.

One of those troops lived not far from me in a neighboring community in Minnesota. Lance Corporal Jonathan Schultze, a brave, proud marine who had returned from combat in Iraq, went to the VA suffering from PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder, as well as alcoholism. He was told that there were no beds available at the VA, and he would be number 26 on the waiting list, that he will get a call in weeks, probably several months.

Well, 4 days later, Marine Lcpl Jonathan Schultze was found in his apartment hanging, hanging from an electrical cord. Just one victim, one brave marine who didn't have to die after sacrificing so much for his country in Iraq, one brave veteran who didn't receive the mental health treatment he needed and deserved.

And I thank my friend from Rhode Island and others who supported the Veterans Health Care Act. Hopefully, that legislation that we passed and was signed by the President earlier this year will help address that problem.

I also appreciate the gentleman from Rhode Island pointing out that the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Treatment Equity Act only addresses one aspect of the problem here, people who are being discriminated against in health plans. We also need to make sure our troops are getting the adequate mental health care that they need and deserve; our veterans, across the board, from all wars, are getting the treatment that they need and deserve; our Medicare seniors, you look at the rates as people are aging with our aging population, so is the incidence among people over 65, the incidence of alcoholism and drug addiction. We need to address the Medicare population as well.

The Medicaid population, there are roughly 26 million addicts and alcoholics in this country according to SAMHSA, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration. About 16 million of the 26 million alcoholics and addicts are in health plans, which means that at least 10 million are either in Medicaid or have no insurance whatsoever. We've got to address that population as well.

And, finally, as the gentleman from Rhode Island knows well, 82 percent of the people in prisons and jails in the

United States are there directly or indirectly because of mental illness and/or addiction, and we're not treating, in our prisons and jails, we're not treating these problems, the underlying cause. And 99 percent of prisoners are going to get out some day, about one percent being capital offenders who presumably will be executed or will be staying there for the rest of their life without parole.

Mr. KENNEDY. And in fact, within 3 years in the State prisons, those prisoners have a recidivism rate of 70 percent. So those State prisoners will be back in the criminal justice system. Seventy percent of them will be revolving back within the criminal justice within 3 years, the reason being we don't have alternatives. We don't deal with the basic problem.

We need to have drug courts and drug treatment; and if we do that, we establish a way for these prisoners who are spending 35 grand, 40 grand a year to keep these people housed in prison and, yet, we're not. We're releasing them to what? They don't have the skills. They don't have the treatment. Whether they do, when they get out, they're going to go out and use again. If they have to use, they have to break in and enter. They're committing more crimes.

It doesn't solve the problem. It may make lawmakers feel good to beat their chest and say, oh, I sent that criminal to jail, but it is not making our constituents any safer, and it's not solving the problem. And the war on drugs is a joke if it doesn't address the demand side of the war on drugs.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Ironically, when President Nixon declared the war on drugs, he directed 70 percent of the funding to treatment, prevention and education, 30 percent to the supply side. In other words, 70 percent to demand side, to reduce the demand for drugs, and 30 percent for law enforcement, proper adjudication and interdiction efforts. Well, today those funding priorities have been reversed, and we simply aren't spending our resources wisely. We are not doing enough on the demand side of the equation.

That's why over the last decade and a half the treatment beds in America have disappeared. They're gone. Insurance companies aren't reimbursing. That's why, even more alarming, 60 percent of the adolescent treatment beds have disappeared over the last decade. We need to reverse those priorities.

I remember visiting with President Clinton and several other Members of Congress and Mexican President, President Salinas, former President Salinas, and he said, until you Americans curb your insatiable demand for drugs, we're never going to be able to address the supply-side problem, the flow of drugs from Central and South America through Mexico into the United States.

So the gentleman from Rhode Island is absolutely correct: we need to address the demand side. We need to spend more of our resources on treatment, education, and prevention.

Mr. KENNEDY. And, frankly, what the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Parity Act says is that we need to offer insurance because really what private insurance companies are doing is putting this on the public taxpayer because, for example, we heard a story out in Los Angeles about a single mom who was trying to get treatment for her son with a methamphetamine addiction, and the insurance company told her that the in-patient treatment that her doctor told her her son needed was not medically necessary so she couldn't get it for her son. What happened to her son? Her son broke into a house to burglarize it to get the money for the drugs. He got caught up in the criminal justice system. Wouldn't you know, 2 years in jail, at the taxpayers' expense. Imagine what that could have bought in terms of treatment, all of which should have been covered by her insurance policy, which she paid for.

Now, the fact is, when you buy insurance, you should think health insurance, your body. I mean, where does it say health care only starts from your neck down? I don't know. I just can't understand where, when they say you're buying health insurance but your health only starts from your neck down. This is absolutely incredible in the year 2007 that we've got such patent discrimination in our country's laws, and we're still abiding by them, and that it is taking Congress this long to even consider legislation to end this patent discrimination.

So we need the people in this country to call their Representatives, to call their Senators and tell them that we need passage of the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Parity bill, and let me just read another story about what happened about this medical necessity.

We had a woman whose daughter Katie was trying to get help for her heroin addiction. She had insurance. Her insurance company said that they couldn't treat her with in-patient treatment until she had OD'd, overdosed, at least once. So imagine this: they said, we can provide her with outpatient treatment, but of course, the outpatient treatment that they provided her was a great deal of distance from where she lived, so it made it very difficult for them to get to. I'm sure that was no coincidence by the insurance plan to make it difficult for them to get to.

What happened? Well, sure enough, Katie OD'd, but unfortunately, you can never tell whether you're going to survive an OD. Katie never survived her first OD to prove that she was an addict so that she could qualify for medical necessity by her insurance plan so that she could get health care insurance for her drug addiction. That is how crazy our health insurance system is when it comes to mental health. If

she had cancer and malignancy or a tumor in her, she would have been given that care, would have been given that care. But because this is a mental illness, she's been denied that care.

And we are looking to pass this legislation because we believe it's fundamentally wrong that this is not covered, and it should not be denied care. We know, once again, that the brain is part of the body. We can measure the metabolic changes in the brain now due to modern technology. If people and insurance companies are questioning the science based on determining any of this, all they need to do is go to the National Institutes of Health, National Institutes on Drug Addiction, National Institutes on Alcoholism, or National Institute of Mental Health. They can get all the information they want.

There is no sound basis for discrimination. It's patently wrong. It's based in fear and it's based in essential misinformation. And so we are constantly trying to pass this in spite of the efforts by insurance companies to fight us, and we need the American public to join us in this battle. Otherwise, we'll continue to see these tragedies reoccur over and over and over again in this country.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. I'd just like to conclude my portion, Mr. Speaker, by quoting from one of our key advisers on this legislation, somebody who's a true expert, Navy Captain Medical Dr. Ron Smith, who is former chairman of the Department of Psychiatry at the Bethesda Naval Medical Center and who's worked in chemical dependency in the field of treatment for dozens of years.

And Dr. Smith, when he testified at a hearing several years ago, said every time you treat a person for addiction or mental illness, you're really helping seven people: their siblings, spouse, significant others, children, grandparents, uncles, aunts and others close to the addicted or mentally ill person. Why? Because these are family diseases that affect the entire family. And Dr. Smith went on to say at that hearing that the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Treatment Equity Act has the potential to favorably impact more American people than any other law passed by Congress since Social Security and Medicare; that this bill, to provide treatment, to provide equity in treatment for mental health and addiction has the potential to help more American people than any law passed by Congress since Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, we can't afford not to pass this bill next week, the final week of this year of Congress. This is a historic opportunity for the Congress; and I know, I know in my heart that the President will sign the bill if it gets to his desk.

□ 1600

Again, I urge all Americans who have an interest in this life-or-death issue to

e-mail, call your Congress Member, your Senators in the next several days, urge them to pass the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Parity Act. It is absolutely essential that we get it done now.

I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you.

I wanted just to conclude with a couple of stories that I think are uplifting, and they show when people are successful in getting treatment that their lives really do turn around.

Marley Prunty-Lara spoke to us in one of our hearings. She was diagnosed with bipolar disorder. She was first diagnosed when she was 15 years old. And she and her mom were searching for a psychiatrist in her home State of South Dakota, and they were told that she would have to wait 4 to 5 months for an initial appointment. As Marley was stating in her testimony, she did not have that long to live.

Thankfully, she found care 350 miles away, in another State, and was hospitalized for 2 months. However, the residential treatment facility was not covered by her mother's insurance, forcing her parents to take out a second mortgage on their home in order for them to receive the care that their daughter needed for her to survive.

Marley stated that if she had suffered a spinal cord injury requiring long-term hospitalization, the insurance company would have paid for all of her care without any questions asked, but because her hospitalization involved a mental illness, it was deemed unworthy of insurance. Finally, Marley said, "I understand the power of successful treatment because I am living it today. I have passionately lived with the prison of mental illness and I have also experienced the incalculable emancipation that accompanies wellness."

How can Congress continue to deny the opportunity to be well and live a full life to tens of millions of Americans every year?

We met with Amy Smith from Denver, Colorado, who also talked about her unmet mental health needs, how it cost her 40 years of her life, shuffling the roads in Denver, Colorado; muttering to herself; people dismissing her on the sidewalk, not talking to her; panhandling, using drugs; in and out of prison; in and out of detox; always being marginalized from society until one day she finally got the help she needed.

Her life is 180 degrees different today. She has a job. She has a house. She's paying taxes. But she said to us, Members of Congress, I lost those 40 years of my life. You can't give those years back to me. I wish I had gotten the treatment earlier in my life, but I didn't. I only hope that more Americans get the help they need earlier in their lives rather than waste their lives the way I did. But I didn't get that help.

We need to make sure that people live out their dreams. Amy Smith said

that she had had the dream of getting married and having children. She said, I'm too old for that now. I can't have children now. I'm too old for that. She said, Maybe some day I might still get married, maybe I will adopt. But she said, I had all kinds of dreams of having a really successful career and really making the most of my life. She said, I feel like I've squandered so much of my abilities and talents.

And it was so clear to us that she had so much to offer, and those skills and talents were not realized because of her mental illness. And the fact is we have millions of Americans who have so much to offer in our society, and yet they and their potential is being squandered. Squandered why? Because we as a society failed to open up the door of opportunity to them simply because we reject their illness from being treated like every other illness.

And I think that's un-American. That's not what this country is all about. That's not what we as a nation are all about. And that's why we need to pass the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Parity Act.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, why don't we just continue on talking about health care over the next hour. It's a relevant subject, and many of us are concerned about health care in this country. Many of our constituents are concerned about health care.

Mr. Speaker, I was a physician in my former life before coming to Congress almost 5 years ago. Perhaps it's time that we approach this as maybe a checkup on American health care. And like any good physician, as when I approached someone with a medical condition, maybe make a little problem list and try to run through that and see if we can't break things down and come to some problems that are more manageable or come to some solutions that may, in fact, be possible.

The first problem that I want to talk about are problems that affect really the law of supply and demand, the problems that affect the physician workforce in this country. The second problem that I would like to focus on is the one we hear a lot about on the floor of this House, the problem with people who lack coverage for their medical expenses, the people who lack health insurance. The number varies depending upon the source that you check, but by anyone's estimation, the number is too large, and Congress does have an obligation to try to ameliorate that if it can. And then the final problem is how much more government involvement do we want in our health care. And that government involvement, by its involvement, will that lead to the type

of solutions that we'd like to see in America?

So starting with problem number one, it, again, addresses some of the physician workforce issues that we face in this country. And, again, it's one of those fundamental supply and demand questions, and if we don't have the correct supply of physicians, it is going to affect the overall cost, price and quality of the health care that we receive.

Probably now almost 2 years ago, right before he left as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan came and talked to a group of us one morning, and the inevitable question comes up about Medicare: Mr. Chairman, how do you see us as ever being able to fund the obligations that Congress has taken on in the Medicare system with the baby boomers now retiring, and starting January 1, 78 million of us will be coming through over the next 40 years?

And the Chairman thought about it for a moment, and he said, It's going to be difficult, but I think when the time comes, Congress will make the correct decisions and the Medicare system will be preserved and it will endure.

Then he stopped for a moment, a thoughtful pause, as the Chairman always has wont to do, and he said, What concerns me more is will there be anyone there to deliver the services when you require them?

And that was a very insightful comment and one that has stayed with me over the past 2 years.

Now, my State medical association, the Texas Medical Association, every month they put out a periodical or journal that talks about some of the issues affecting medicine in the State. And this is the cover from the March issue of 2007, and the title of the article is "Running Out of Doctors." The Texas Medical Association is concerned about the number of physicians that are in the State that are being educated in the State and that are staying in the State to enter their practice lives. And it is, indeed, a problem for the State of Texas, but it's a greater problem. It's a ubiquitous problem across the country.

Now, some of the things that we do here actually have a direct and consequential bearing on the number of physicians. And here we are bearing down very quickly on the very last of this year. We passed a bill today called a continuing resolution, and that continuing resolution was passed because tomorrow all of the funding for all of the Federal agencies and all the Federal programs, with the exception of the Department of Defense, all of that funding was going to expire because we have not passed 10 of our 11 appropriations bills. So today we passed, really, a deceptively short bill that actually funds the government for those 10 appropriations bills for another week. So perhaps not a great lift, but when you consider that this Congress spends about \$3 trillion a year, you can imagine what 1 week's pay amounts to.

As we did that, there, of course, is an acknowledgement that we may indeed have to pass another continuing resolution on into next week if we can't indeed pass our spending bills. And that continuing resolution, because of the fact that Congress is going to wind down one way or the other toward the end of next week and then not be in for the remainder of the year, we are indeed going to have to ensure that the funding for those Federal programs continues.

But, Mr. Speaker, there's one aspect of that continuation that you really can't punt, you really can't just push it down the road and put it in the "too hard" box and we'll deal with that in January or February, and that one aspect is how Medicare compensates the physicians that see our Medicare patients. They are physicians that we've asked to see our Medicare patients. We require them in some instances to see our Medicare patients. And the fact is that Congress for the last several years has had a program in place that actually reduces year over year what we return to physicians in terms of payment for delivering those services.

Stop and think about it. A physician's office is a small business. Most people don't think of it that way, but it is a service industry business. It is a small business. And any other business that faced year-over-year cuts in projected revenue or cuts in what the reimbursement rates were going to be would have a difficult time surviving, because guess what? The energy costs for a physician's office are no different than the energy costs for the hospitals or for the bank across the street. They've gone up every year just as they have for our homes and our businesses across our communities.

What about the cost of paying the people who work there in the physician's office? That has gone up year over year. What about the cost of insuring those employees that work in the physician's office? Well, that has gone up year over year. But it's kind of ironic that the same time the cost of providing health insurance for the employees in that physician's office goes up every year, the actual return on investment goes down. The reimbursement rate from those insurance companies goes down. And one of the reasons for that is, again, how we compensate physicians in the Medicare system.

There is a very technically complicated formula that calculates physician reimbursement rates, and last night I went through that in some detail. I have heard from some of my colleagues that perhaps that's a little too complex and maybe something that doesn't project well on television and doesn't project well here on the floor of the House, but let me give you just a flavor of what's involved with our calculating the reimbursement rates for America's physicians who choose to participate in the Medicare system because we have asked them to who take care of, arguably, some of our most

complex and some of our most fragile patients.

□ 1615

And the reason this is so important, if we don't do something before midnight, December 31 of this year, there is a 10.1 percent payment reduction to America's physicians who participate in the Medicare system. Not a really great way to go about rewarding them for doing the work that we've asked them to do.

And the truth is, every year there has been a projected reduction in reimbursement rates for America's physicians who participate in the Medicare system. Every year for the 5 years that I have been here, Congress has come riding in at the last minute and stopped those reductions in reimbursement rates. But the fact is, Congress has to act before December 31 or those rates that were posted by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services November 1, which this year is a 10.1 percent across-the-board reduction in physician reimbursement rates, if Congress does not do something affirmatively before midnight December 31, those cuts go into effect, and physicians wake up on January 31 earning 10 percent less for doing the same amount of work that they did the week before. Again, no other business would be asked to absorb this type of activity.

You can just imagine how tough it is to plan for the future. Here you think about a physician's office and they've got the rent, they've got the employee cost, they've got, or course, liability insurance, and various and other sundry things, one of the toughest things for a small physicians' office, and I would talk to you in terms of a group of between two and five individuals, which compromises a vast number of the physicians' offices in the country, one of the biggest expenses they have is the cost of capital when they want to do what? Expand.

And what does expansion mean? Hire another doctor to come in and help them do the workload because, again, 78 million people are entering the retirement age where they will be eligible for Medicare, and that starts January 1 of this year. What a coincidence. How ironic. January 1 of this year we start into the baby boom surge, and at the same time, oh, by the way, Doctor, we're going to be reducing your reimbursement rates by 10 percent.

That cost of capital to bring in a new physician is one of the biggest hurdles that a small physicians' office has to overcome. Granted, there may be large pieces of equipment that are purchased from time to time, and those also incur a cost of capital, but planning for the future, planning your own future workforce within your office is one of those things that keeps managing partners up at night in those types of practices. And it becomes even more complex and certainly more difficult to predict the future on what future earnings and what future requirements are going to

be when every year Congress comes in and says, oh, by the way, at the end of the year we are going to be enacting a physician reimbursement reduction which will significantly affect your ability to pay your bills and perhaps have something at the end of the month to take home to your family.

Well, what is the formula? And let me just back up for a moment. Let's talk about the Medicare system in the broad perspective for just a moment. Because the Medicare system, every time you hear somebody talk about Medicare, they say it's an integrated system that works seamlessly and flawlessly. But the reality is that Medicare, in many ways, is stove-piped or siloed. You have part A, part B, part C and part D, which was just enacted a few years ago. Part A pays the hospitalization expense. Part B pays the physician expense. Part C is the Medicare HMO. And part D is the prescription drug benefit that was enacted back in 2003.

If you look at the other funding silos, A, C and D, each year those undergo sort of a cost-of-living adjustment for hospitals that's called a "market basket update." So the cost of inputs is calculated by the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services. They probably have a complicated formula for that, or at least I would imagine that they do. They calculate what the cost of inputs is and they come back to the hospital and say, well, next year we're going to pay you this much more than we paid you last year. The same is true for the Medicare HMOs; the same is true for the Medicare prescription drug account.

Physicians, part B, is constructed entirely differently. And I have to confess, I don't quite understand why it's constructed differently; but when Medicare was first enacted over 40 years ago, this seemed to be a sound way to approach the problem. Part A, hospitalization, funded out of a payroll deduction, just the same as Social Security tax every month. There is that 1.5 percent Medicare charge, your employer kicks in a similar amount, so about 3 percent of your gross pay is deducted to cover Medicare expenses for the future.

Part B is funded from two sources, one is general revenue, and the other source is premiums that are paid by people who are Medicare recipients. By law, the Medicare recipient's premiums must account for 25 percent of the total expenditures in part B; the remaining 75 percent is made up in the general revenue.

Part C and part D, again, have different funding streams. Part D, when we created the prescription drug a few years ago, has dedicated funding to that. You may recall there was some argument about what the total cost of that would be. Thankfully, it has come in under cost, and that's been a great boom and a great savings; but nevertheless, there is a dedicated stream of money for the Medicare prescription

drugs. Part C, the Medicare HMOs, also has some dedicated funding, plus some cost-of-living adjustments that occur there as well.

So physicians are clearly in sort of a class by themselves when it comes to Medicare reimbursement. So, how does the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, how does it calculate what the payment rate for physicians is going to be? It's calculated under a formula called the sustainable growth rate formula, referred to as the SGR. And you will probably hear people talk about the SGR a lot next week because, again, if we don't do something about the SGR, it is going to automatically proceed with a 10.1 percent reimbursement reduction for the Nation's physicians who choose to see Medicare patients.

Now, for the people who are very astute, there is a typographical error on this page, and I cannot take ownership of the typographical error; this was actually a pdf file simply taken from a CRS report to Congress about physicians' payment. But here's how we calculate physicians' payments: the relative value unit of work times essentially what is a geographic factor, or fudge factor for the geographic location of the practice, a relative value unit for the practice expenses, and then, again, the geographic adjustment for practice expenses in that area factors in things like the cost of labor force and what have you in different areas of the country.

And then a relative value cost for providing liability insurance. And as you might imagine, there is also some geographic discrepancies there across the country, so that is factored in, times CF, which actually down here is written as CV, but that's the conversion factor. And we'll get to the conversion factor in just a moment.

But I think you can see a pretty complex formula. And perhaps that's why I was criticized for going through that last night. And I will abbreviate the discussion of the formula, but I just want to give you a sense of how complex this is and why, certainly, the average person doesn't understand it, the average physician doesn't understand it, and I will submit to you that most average Members of Congress don't understand how this formula is calculated either.

Here is a calculation again of the update adjustment factor, perhaps a little bit different way of looking at some of the same sort of data. But the thing that I want to point out on this, because it is extremely important to understand this, the update adjustment factor here is equal to the prior year adjustment component, what we did last year, plus a cumulative adjustment component. Why is that important? Well, every year that we sweep in at the last minute and we say we're going to fix this reduction in reimbursement for physicians and we're going to make that go away, or maybe even provide a little bit of a positive

update, every year that we do that, because of the cumulative nature of this formula, we make the overall expense of eventually repealing the formula, we make that expense increase. And every year the amount of increase actually grows, it snowballs, if you will.

To give you an example, when I first came to Congress in 2003, the year before, in my practice, we had sustained a 5.4 percent reduction in Medicare reimbursement rates. A great hue and cry from across the country and Congress recognized that and said, we're going to do something this year to prevent that from happening. And that something did, indeed, occur in an omnibus bill right as I got to Congress in January of that year.

The cost of repealing the sustainable growth rate formula at that time was calculated by the Congressional Budget Office to be \$118 billion, give or take a billion here or there; \$118 billion, a significant amount of money, but that actually is a 10-year figure. So it's about 11 to \$12 billion a year that we would have to come up with in Congress to offset the cost of repealing that formula. Big sum of money to be sure.

But every year now, over the last 5 years, we've done something at the last minute, and that something has increased the cost of the ultimate repeal of the sustainable growth rate formula, such that now it is calculated by the Congressional Budget Office this year as being \$268 billion over 10 years' time. If, indeed, we get our work done and prevent that cut from going into place at the end of this month, the cost, again, that cumulative adjustment factor will come into play, and that cost will be bigger in 2008 than it was in 2007. And it will be bigger by a larger amount than it was in 2007, depending upon the amount of rescue that Congress chooses to bring to the table.

And then again, I just can't help myself, one last slide, talking about the complicated nature of this. And again, I show you this not to invoke sympathy from someone who has spent some time studying this, but I show you this because I want to give you a sense of how complicated the problem is. Again, I will submit to you that many Members of Congress just simply do not, cannot, will not understand this. And as a consequence, it kind of gets put in that "too hard box" over here and we'll think about that later. That's why there is always the temptation to try to kick it down the road.

The fact is, we have to do something by December 31. If we don't, that 10.1 percent reduction comes into play. You might say, well, okay, that's for Medicare patients, but doctors see more than just Medicare patients in their office, so they will be able to deal with that in some way, won't they? Just raise the rates on someone else. Here's the deal: almost all of the major insurance companies in this country peg their reimbursement to what Medicare reimburses. So the contracts may be a

little more generous than Medicare, they may reimburse at 110 percent of Medicare, 115 percent of Medicare, 120 percent of Medicare; but they peg to what the Medicare reimbursement rate is. So if we come in with a 10.1 percent reduction in physician services reimburses, guess what happens to private insurance at the same time? That same reduction goes into play.

So I called my old medical practice yesterday and I just asked them, what do you think about this? And of course they were more or less unaware that this was happening, and that's really not unusual. Most physicians' offices don't pay a lot of attention to what we're doing up here in Congress because they're busy, they're taking care of sick people. And that's what we want them to do. We don't want them necessarily watching every move we make here in Congress.

But when I related that, no, we actually need to do something or there will be a 10 percent reduction at the end of this year, then I got their attention and then they were very interested. And I said, well, give me an idea of what this will do to your commercial insurance. And very quickly the response came that almost all of our contracts that we have with commercial insurance actually pegged to Medicare. So it will have more than just a ripple effect. It will be almost like a tidal wave effect through the rest of the reimbursement rates for the other plans and insurance companies that this office, for which they receive reimbursement for taking care of those patients.

Now, what happens if we don't do it by January 1? The cuts go into effect. But maybe we go ahead and do it and take care of it in January or February, we kick the can down the road a little bit and then we come back later and do it. Actually, this happened in 2005. We had the fix in a big bill that was being passed that year. It was called the Deficit Reduction Act. And we kind of ran out the clock at the end of the year and on a technicality the bill had to come back to Congress, but we weren't in session anymore, so it had to wait until January. And the effect was that those cuts did go into effect January 1 of that year. And I know that because my fax went crazy. There was no one in the office that day to answer the phone, but the fax machine went crazy from physicians across the country sending me notices, Congressman, I want you to see the letter I sent out to my patients this week. I will no longer be able to provide Medicare services because of the cumulative effect of these reductions on my practice. It had a very immediate and detrimental effect on practicing physicians across the country.

The same would be true this year. In fact, it would be worse because that year the reduction was 5 percent; this year it is 10 percent. And I would just imagine that it would at least double, if not more, the anxiety that's felt within our physician community across the country.

Moreover, the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services said, we will come back and make whole those practices that continue to see Medicare patients without interruption, and we will go back and reimburse them the difference when Congress finally passes a law. And that's all well and good, but there's very little way to control if those private companies come back and make the adjustments retroactively the same as Medicare did.

Again, very, very difficult to know that because we're talking about very small amounts of money. It's very difficult for a practice to actually track that through the overall cycle of a patient's care, but the result is, cumulatively across the country, the numbers could have been quite, quite large.

And it was never the intent of Congress to provide a benefit for commercial insurance by reducing the Medicare rate. It's just an unfortunate consequence of having what are essentially Federal price controls on Federal reimbursement rates.

□ 1630

Well, again, I promised not to spend too much time on the formula, but I think it is important. I think it is important for Members to understand. I have had several bills over the years trying to deal with this. One thing that I have introduced just this week is a resolution in the House of Representatives. And I will admit this resolution does not have the force of law. It actually doesn't spend any money. It almost is like sending a get well card to the doctors who take care of our Medicare patients. But the resolution is multiple whereases detailing the problems that I have just been through followed by a single, Resolved: That it is the sense of the United States House of Representatives to immediately address this issue and halt any scheduled cuts to Medicare physician payments and immediately begin working on a long-term solution and implement it within 2 years that pays physicians in a fair and stable way, that ensures Medicare patients have access to the doctor of their choice.

Mr. Speaker, I know I have to confine my remarks and I only speak to the Chair, and I will do that, but if I could speak to my colleagues, the Members on both sides of the aisle, I would ask them to take a very serious look at House Resolution 863. Again, it spends no money. It does not have the force of law. But I think if a significant number of Members were to participate in signing on to this particular resolution, it would be a powerful message to send to House leadership on both sides of the aisle that we want this problem fixed before we go home at the end of the year. This is one of those things on our to-do list that we must address, that we must take care of.

Now, one of the other things that I do want to spend just a minute talking about, and in some of the physician workforce bills that I have introduced

in Congress, I have provided some additional help for doctors who will voluntarily participate in improvements in their office's investment in health information technology. In fact, the last bill that I introduced dealing with the sustainable growth rate problem had it in two components for a voluntary positive update for physicians who, again, participate on a voluntary basis in upgrades in health information technology and for physicians who voluntarily participate in quality reporting measures.

Let me just tell you something. Mr. Speaker, it is just human nature, anyone who works for a living always likes to be kind of pulled into the process and asked to help work on a problem. Most people don't like to be told what to do. Most people inherently reject orders that come from the top down. A lot of times, it is better to build things from the bottom up. Now, I have to tell you, when I was a practicing physician, I wasn't a big advocate of electronic medical records. I dabbled in it a little bit. I had a run or two with electronic prescribing. These things were complicated. They were expensive. They added time to my day that wasn't reimbursed. But the reality is I have come to accept the concept more since I have been in Congress.

Let me just share with you what one of my revelations was. Many of us who serve in this body will never forget the week that Hurricane Katrina roared into the gulf coast and struck the gulf coast areas of Mississippi, Louisiana and Alabama. It was the result of the effects of that hurricane and the subsequent flooding in the City of New Orleans and subsequent trips to that area, once just as an individual to see if I could be helpful, and once as part of a field hearing with my Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations as part of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

This is a picture that was taken on that second trip, January of 2006. So we are now 5 months after the hurricane hit, 5 months after the dewatering of the City of New Orleans, if "dewatering" is actually a verb. Here is a picture of the basement of Charity Hospital. Charity Hospital, one of the venerable old institutions in our country that has been long associated with teaching doctors, teaching new doctors, here is the records room at Charity Hospital. You can't really see it from this picture, but there is still water on the floor, water about up to the level of the top of our shoes. Do you see these records? And there is just oceans and oceans of records. This is one stack. There are stacks that go on, 50 behind and 50 in front. There are a lot of records in the basement of Charity Hospital because they take care of a lot of patients, and they have for a lot of years.

Look at these records. It almost looks like they have some smoke or soot damage on them, but, in fact, that is black mold that is growing on them

on the manila folders and growing on the paper in the charts, and as a consequence, you could not possibly send anyone in here to retrieve a chart. It would be too hazardous. In all likelihood, the ink is washed off the paper anyway during the couple of weeks that these things were submerged.

These records are, for all intents and purposes, lost to the ages. There is no way of knowing what is included in those medical records. There may have been a treatment for leukemia here. There may have been a kidney transplant down here. We don't know. This may have been someone on a waiting list for a transplant. No way of knowing. Those records are lost forever.

Here is the deal. Those individuals who were brought to the Dallas-Fort Worth area who were displaced after Hurricane Katrina and arrived at Reunion Arena in sort of a little triage area set up by doctors from the Dallas County Medical Society, there was a small trailer outside, and one of the chain drugstores said, Well, for those people who had prescriptions at our drugstore, we can at least help you reconstruct what medicines they were on. It was enormously helpful to have that information so those patients who had their prescriptions at that particular pharmacy, they could go online into their master list and at least reconstruct the medication list. And a lot of times, if you have the medication list, you have a pretty good idea of the problems that were under treatment. Certainly, you would have a better idea than if you were waiting for the City of New Orleans to be evacuated of water and then get down to the basement of Charity Hospital, run the health risk of pulling out one of these records and breathing in the spores of the black mold.

So I have become a believer. You have to have some way of, especially in times of great national upheaval, you have to have some way of getting that data that has been accumulated on patients over the years. You have to have ways of getting it into the hands of the caregivers. I don't know that we have the perfect system yet. I don't know if the Federal Government is capable of developing the perfect system, or perhaps that may be something that comes to us from private industry, but I do know this. The time for electronic medical records is nigh at hand, and as difficult as it is for doctors my age who did not grow up with this technology, it is time that we are going to have to come into the 21st century and acknowledge this type of technology is a benefit and delivers value to the interaction that occurs between the doctor and the patient.

But how much better is it to bring those physicians along who are in practice and allow them to participate in the solution, allow them to participate in the construction of these platforms? Contrast that with the typical congressional activity, which would be a top-down approach. In fact, just last week

we had the unveiling of an e-prescribing bill with a lot of fanfare over on the Senate side. And it was vaunted as a "carrot and a stick" approach, that, Doctor, we will give you a little something if you participate, but we are going to have a little something to say to you if you don't participate. So the carrot was we are going to increase your reimbursement rate by 1 percent if you participate in an e-prescribing program. And what is the stick? A 10 percent reduction if you are not participating in an e-prescribing program in 5 years' time. So that was seen as a way to rapidly get physicians' attention. Yes, we will offer them perhaps a little bit up front and we will have a significant penalty if they don't participate.

Well, what does it really mean when you say we will offer a 1 percent increase? Well, I will just tell you that for those Medicare patients that I saw as an office patient, the office reimbursement visit typically wasn't as generous as \$50, but for the sake of argument, to make the math easy, let's say it was a \$50 reimbursement for a moderately complex Medicare patient return visit, which would be the bulk of the patient load that a physician would see during the day. And the average physician can probably see four of those moderately complex return visit appointments in an hour's time, sometimes a little bit more, sometimes a little bit less if those visits turn out to be more and more complex. That 1 percent increase that the doctor will receive amounts to about a \$2 an hour, 50 cents per patient, four patients an hour. So that is a \$2 an hour increase that we are willing to provide the physician who is willing to participate.

Now, what happens if in 4 or 5 years' time they are not participating, they are not partaking? I have to tell you, you look at the cost of installing an e-prescribing program in your office, putting a handheld device of some kind in the hands of perhaps every doctor and perhaps every nurse that is working in that office. This program that was unveiled last week would allow a \$2,000 credit or grant to the physician to buy the equipment, but the reality is the equipment costs many times that. But we are going to give an extra \$2 an hour to that doctor for participating in this program. But if they don't do it within 4 or 5 years, the stick is going to be a 10 percent reduction, which doing the same math, you are going to come up with about a \$20 an hour reduction in reimbursement.

Now, wait a minute, this is the same doctor you said we were going to cut 10 percent at the end of this year, and at the end of next year and the year after that. How many doctors do we expect to see, going back to my first slide, "Running Out of Doctors," how many doctors do we expect are going to be participating in the Medicare system if we keep treating them like that? Well, they would be foolish to stay. You would have to wonder about their mental stability if they did indeed stay.

So we need to have a better approach. It was talked about as a "carrot and stick" approach. To me, it almost seemed like spinach and a whooping. You know, it is not going to be that attractive on the front end, but it sure is going to be bad on the back end. So I can't see that physicians will rush out and embrace this. And I really would caution the Members of Congress who are working on this end-of-the-year Medicare fix, whatever it is, to really be careful, to really be cautious about including this type of language in whatever type of Medicare fix that we come up with at the end of the year.

Is the theory good? Yes, it is. E-prescribing is something that certainly younger physicians in medical school and residency, they are going to be exposed to on an ongoing basis. And they are going to look for practices that have this to offer, or they are going to come to work in practices where it is not offered and wonder why it is not there and ask their older partners to please provide them an e-prescribing platform because it is the right thing to do. It reduces errors. It reduces some of the complications of prescriptions that are filled poorly, of doctors' handwriting can't be read, the pharmacist has to call the doctor back and say, did you mean Zanax or Zantac? And these types of problems can be avoided with e-prescribing.

It is not a panacea. There will be different types of errors that come to light as more and more people use e-prescribing, but it clearly is the way of the future. But do it correctly. Remember, there is not a single dollar that is spent in the health care system unless it is ordered by a physician. So our physicians are the gateway through which all of the medical reimbursement, all the medical pricing, all the medical cost flows through the physicians. So let's make sure that they are on our side with this. Let's not alienate them the first shot out of the box as we go forward with these types of programs.

Let me just give you an example, too. And I talked a little bit about I am not sure if the Federal Government is exactly the correct entity to have involved with creating this new electronic environment that we want medical practices, in which we want them to exist. Perhaps it would be, perhaps there will be improvements from the private sector that we ought to investigate. Perhaps we need to remove some of the regulatory burden. I won't go into great detail, but they are called the Star clause. Maybe we ought to remove some of the regulatory burden. Maybe we need to have some medical justice, some medical liability reform so companies aren't afraid of this. But the fact of the matter remains, I am not sure the Federal Government is the correct avenue to proceed with this.

When I came here 5 years ago, I was told that the Federal Government controls 50 cents of every dollar that is spent in health care and we are going

to develop a platform. We are going to develop what electronic medical records should look like, and private industry will follow our lead. Five years later, where is it? I don't know.

But I do know this. Do you remember a year ago all the trouble we had out at Walter Reed Hospital and all the negative headlines that were coming out in the Washington Post? And yes, there were some real physical problems in a place out there called building 18. But here is the real problem. Master Sergeant Blaine, who was kind enough to give me a tour through that area at the end of showing me the peeling paint in the building under question which was no longer at that point occupied by our soldiers out there on medical hold, he said, Here is the real problem. I have guys who have been in the service for sometimes 20 years. They are trying to decide whether or not they are kept in the service, whether they can be returned to their unit, or whether they need to be discharged because of whatever their medical condition is, and if they are discharged, what is the disability, what is the correct disability designation to give them? And how can we put that information in the hands of the VA system so that patient's transition to retirement status is made easier?

The problem is, the master sergeant told me, that someone who has been in the service for a number of years is going to have a great big, thick medical record. And the problem is, that even the part of the Department of Defense records that are electronic don't talk to the electronic medical records that are kept by the VA system.

□ 1645

So the result is they have got to go through a paper interface to go from one platform to the other, and there is this great stack of papers that the soldier will collect themselves, go through with a yellow marker, yellow highlighter, and mark and identify those things that will perhaps make their case for themselves, as to whether or not they should go back to their unit, be discharged on a disability, transition to the VA system. All of that data has to be done by hand by the soldier, and it may take many man-hours to accumulate that data.

The real problem, the master sergeant said, was after collecting this voluminous data that may look like the Washington, D.C. phonebook, when it's all said and done, that goes and sits on someone's desk for two weeks' time, and then it's lost and the soldier has to start all over again. So their time in medical hold is increased, their frustration level is certainly increased, and, yeah, the peeling paint and crickets were a problem, because the building was a crummy building.

But the real problem was the difficulty that the soldiers were experiencing because one electronic medical records system within the Federal Government didn't talk to the other med-

ical record system within the Federal Government. Just an indication of, to me, perhaps government doesn't have the entire solution here.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of other things that I just want to touch on, and I know time is growing short. The medical liability condition in this country is something that really adds to the frustration list. When you talk to doctors about what are some of the things that really bug you, what would be some of the things that shorten perhaps your number of years in practice, your number of years in service, certainly the medical liability issue will come front and center.

Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers were very wise, and they talked of States as being great laboratories where different ideas can be tried and tested; and I am happy to say within the arena of medical liability, my home State of Texas made some changes a little over 4 years ago that have resulted in a significant, a dramatic improvement in the medical-justice environment in the State of Texas.

Consider this: my last year of active practice was 2002. We had gone from 17 medical liability insurers in the State down to two. I am here to tell you, you don't get much competitive advantage when you only have two medical liability insurers. But the claims are going up, the amounts of dollars awarded in claims is going up, and you only have two insurers. Guess what is happening? Premiums for doctors, doctors who historically had not had much in the way of any activity, still, those doctors were being asked to fork over increasing amounts of premiums, and we are talking about significant increases year over year, such that my premium might go up from \$18,000 one year, \$25,000 the next year. My last year in practice, it was likely to be \$28,000. You multiply that by five doctors in a practice, and that is a pretty hefty check to have to write at the beginning of every year. In an OB/GYN practice, as I was in, that's a lot of babies that you have got to deliver just to pay the freight, to pay the tab on medical liability.

The State of Texas recognized that they were in crisis. The State legislature in 2003, at the end of their legislative session, passed a medical liability reform bill, and it was patterned after what was called the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975, passed out in California. It essentially was a cap on non-economic damages, patterned after the California law from 1975; but it was a little bit different, a little bit different in that there was a cap on non-economic damages as applied to the physician, a cap on non-economic damages as applied to the hospital, and a cap on non-economic damages as applied to a second hospital, or nursing home, if one was involved.

So the cap was trifurcated, each maximum being fixed at \$250,000, but an aggregate of \$750,000 for non-economic

damages. Punitive damages and actual damages were not affected by the law and the subsequent constitutional amendment that was passed in Texas that allowed this law to go into effect. Indeed, it went into effect on September 12, 2003; and since that time, Texas Medical Liability Trust, my old insurer of record, doctors who were insured with Texas Medical Liability Trust, between dividends and reductions in premiums, have seen a return of about 22 percent, a reduction of 22 percent of their premiums that they paid with Texas Medical Liability Trust. Remember, this was an environment that was going up by 10 or 15 percent or more a year. So a significant reduction for the physician.

The other unintended beneficiary was the small, not-for-profit hospital that typically was self-insured and had to put vast sums of money in reserve against the unknown aspect of what they might be hit with in a medical liability suit where the non-economic damages were not capped. These small not-for-profit hospitals were able to move some of that money that they were holding against a loss in a legal action and put that into the very things you want your small, not-for-profit community hospital to be doing, like capital improvements, paying nurses, hiring more nurses; perhaps doing some of the very things that would result in better care that would reduce the number of medical-legal claims. So this was a good thing across the spectrum for physicians, for hospitals, for patients in the State of Texas.

Now, we have tried several times to do that similar sort of law here on the floor of the House. We have never managed to quite get it done. But House bill 3509 is a bill that is patterned after the Texas law. Again, Mr. Speaker, I know I need to speak directly to you and not to other Members of the House of Representatives, but if I could speak to them directly, I would ask them to have their staffs seriously look at H.R. 3509 and see if there wouldn't be some way for them to cosponsor it. Because, again, I think the weight of significant cosponsors, taking it to the House leadership both on my side and the Democratic side of the aisle, might help tip the balance that we really want something done on this issue. We will still have a tall order in the Senate, which has always been the stumbling block, but the time has come to do some type of sensible medical liability reform, medical justice reform.

Well, I have spent a lot of time talking about physician workforce. Let me touch on the other two problems that I alluded to as I began this. Certainly, the second problem we always hear a lot about is the uninsured, and we can argue about what the number is, and the census number will come up with different numbers and different people will have different figures. But by anyone's estimation, it is higher than it should be in this country.

If you look at kind of the breakdown of the uninsured, one of the big problems I think we make is we always approach that as some sort of amorphous demographic, where everyone is identical throughout the spectrum of the patients who are uninsured in this country, and the reality is there are vastly different groups contained within that number.

Now, a bill that I introduced just a couple of weeks ago that, again, Mr. Speaker, I will address to you, but if I was able to talk to other Members of the House of Representatives, I would suggest they have their staff look at H.R. 4190. Now this is a simple little bill that actually takes Members of Congress and takes them out of the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan, in other words, makes Members of Congress uninsured. How else are we going to be able to really understand and really deal with the problems of the uninsured when we have very good health insurance?

So if every Member of Congress suddenly found themselves without health insurance and placed into that demographic, however large it is, perhaps we could think of some more creative solutions, whether it be a change in the Tax Code, perhaps a tax credit, whether it be some additional help, whatever. Members of Congress would have a renewed vigor with approaching the problems and providing solutions and options for patients who find themselves uninsured.

Perhaps it is a health savings account, perhaps an individually owned insurance policy. And, oh, by the way, the tax treatment for that for those provided by an employer and those provided by an individual, the tax treatment is vastly different. Maybe we could come up with some creative ways of looking at that if we ourselves were not kept in this cocoon and anesthetized by the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program.

Suffice to say, Mr. Speaker, I have not had a lot of people showing up outside my office to sign on as cosponsors, but it is an intriguing idea, and I do ask Members, I will not ask them to necessarily sign up as cosponsors, but realistically, Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to my colleagues about this, I would ask them to give some thought to how they would approach the problem if they themselves or their families were actually members of the group in this country that did not have health insurance.

You break the number down, and the individual demographics, suddenly you start looking at numbers of people where perhaps there are some choices and options. There are some things we could do. Some people tell me that as many as 10 percent of that uninsured demographic are people in universities or just recently graduated university students who, for whatever reasons, don't have health coverage.

Well, there is a group of individuals that is fairly easy to insure because

they tend to be healthy. Yes, they can have some bad things and they tend to be very expensive when they occur, but almost the ideal population to think about some type of catastrophic coverage, again along the lines of the HSAs that we expanded a few years ago.

Perhaps if we equaled out the tax treatment a little bit, because a lot of these individuals are entering the workforce for the first time, they are finding what it is like to pay taxes for the first time, maybe we could get their attention with a little bit more favorable tax treatment. Certainly that is one option we could look at.

A number of people in this country actually make enough money to purchase health insurance, but choose not to. Perhaps there would be ways of pricing health insurance so the costs were not so daunting, that the cost was not such a barrier to entry for those individuals; and there are a variety of ways of perhaps approaching that. Congress just simply again perhaps needs to remove some regulations, needs to provide a little bit more level playing field between some of the States and allow this to occur.

There is no question that there is a lot of people in this country who are here without the benefit of having a valid Social Security number. That is a large number of our uninsured. Perhaps there are ways that we need to be thinking about how to address and how to approach that population, because clearly it is a difficult issue that we can't just keep putting in the too-hard box and we are going to think about it later. If we don't address that issue, we will never solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker, let's not forget, we had a hearing on the Federally Qualified Health Centers in my committee on Energy and Commerce earlier this month. Fifteen million people actually get their health care through a Federally Qualified Health Center. Well, they have a medical home. For all intents and purposes, although they may lack an actual insurance policy on paper, they have access to medical care, they have access to a medical home through a Federally Qualified Health Center. So let's stop counting those as members of the uninsured, because they all obviously do have access to care.

One final point that I do need to make, Mr. Speaker, and, again, I realize that time is short and it has been a long week: Do we increase the participation of the Federal Government in health care? Is that the answer for us in dealing with a lot of the problems that we face today?

Well, I would ask us to look at a couple of things. You look at what is still on our to-do list as Congress wraps up this year, and what are some of the big things you see? First off, we haven't funded the money for veterans services and veterans health care. That is still up there on the to-do list.

I have talked about it already, but we have not dealt with the looming re-

duction in physician reimbursement rates that is out there and fixing to happen to doctors across the country in just a few short weeks' time.

We haven't dealt with whatever our final resolution is going to be on continuing the State Children's Health Insurance Program, a program administered by States, but they receive a significant amount of money from the Federal Government. And we have as yet not been able to come to a conclusion as to what we are going to do about funding the future for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Take a step back and look at that. We haven't funded veterans, we haven't figured out what we are going to do for our Medicare patients, because the doctors may leave because we decided not to pay them, and, oh, by the way, we still haven't done anything to cover our kids.

Do we want to be giving the Federal Government an increased reach and grasp of our health care in this country? Are we doing such a good job here that you want to reward us with more?

You see Members of Congress write op-eds in the Washington Post where they talk about expanding Medicare to people that are age 55. But, by the way, good luck on finding a doctor, because we are not paying them anymore and they are dropping out of the system.

So we have people in this Congress who want to sort of drag and drop people into Federal programs, take people off of private health insurance in the State Children's Health Insurance Program. One of the big issues there, we want to expand the program so big that it pulls kids off of private insurance, because, you know what, it is too hard to go down and find those really poor kids that we are supposed to be covering. That is a lot of work. They move around a lot. They may not really live with their parents any more. It is just a lot of hard work to find them. It would be a lot easier to go get some middle-class kids and pull them in to have a number of 10 million and say, look, aren't we great, what we did with the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

I don't know. I don't know. You talk to pediatricians who work in private practice in this country. You ask them how they are reimbursed in the State Children's Health Insurance Program versus private commercial insurance. And guess what? Private commercial insurance, for all its faults, is still a better reimbursement rate than the State Children's Health Insurance Program by about a two to one margin. So are we going to be helping our pediatricians by pushing more kids on to the state-run program and pulling them off of those private programs? I don't think so.

Right now the Federal Government has control of about 50 cents out of every health care dollar that is spent in this country. The remainder of that is not all private insurance. The lion's share of it is. Certainly some people

still write a check for their health care, just like they did when my dad was in practice back in the 1950s. Some doctors give of their time willingly. They give charitable care. We never account for that in any of the demographic studies that we do. But half of the health care in this country, the dollars spent on health care in this country, 50 cents out of every health care dollar originates right here in the House of Representatives.

Are we doing a good job with what we already have? Might we not be asked to improve what we are doing in those programs before we are asking you to let us take over even more of how we deliver health care in this country? It is certainly food for thought as we wrap up this year in the United States Congress.

I would emphasize one more time, Mr. Speaker, and again I will address my remarks to you, if I could talk directly to Members who are involved in leadership on both sides of this House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that they seriously look at fixing the problem with physician reimbursement rates that we are coming up on now like a freight train and it is going to have a significant negative impact on the care rendered to our seniors in the Medicare program.

□ 1700

But we have got to pay attention to what we are doing for our veterans. We have got to pay attention with the State Children's Health Insurance Program. Again, lots of areas for improvement, I think, before we talk about expanding the reach and grasp of the Federal Government.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the earlier order of the House granting the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) 5-minute Special Order speech is vacated.

There was no objection.

THE LIBERTY ALLIANCE: CHAMPIONING LIBERTY AND DIGNITY IN OUR HUMAN COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, in the immediate aftermath of World War II, at the commencement of our Cold War against the Soviet Union and international communism, in his blunt, son of the middle border manner, President Harry Truman enunciated the eponymous doctrine he would apply to this challenge during his March 12, 1947, address to a joint session of Congress.

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted

subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures. I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes.

"One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and of religion, and freedom from political oppression. The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly opposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

"The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife. They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died. We must keep that hope alive.

"The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own nation."

Regarding the Soviet Union, in the face of experts' arguments, Stalin's imperialist dictatorship should be psychologically understood and indulged to purchase an illusory peace, Truman morally comprehended this evil empire's threat to the United States and the Free World. Through the United Nations, multilateral and bilateral treaties, his strategy to contain and defeat inhuman communism called for the United States to champion the cause of human liberty and dignity.

We heeded his call, and, through American leadership and sacrifice, the Soviets' evil empire imploded and Eastern Europeans and the Russian people experienced a new birth of freedom. This victory of humanity over tyranny must not lull us into the conceited liberty is now without enemies or invincible in their face. For we must always remember our Founders' caution: "We will give you a republic, if you can keep it." Today, as we confront a barbarous terrorist enemy and the rise of another Communist superstate, China, it is wise to reexamine President Truman's sound strategy, revise it as appropriate to our circumstances, and defeat the enemies of our free Republic and the free world.

A revision I propose is this: We can no longer rely on any part on the United Nations for the preservation of American or human freedom. For global altruists afflicted with cognitive dissonance, in a likely futile effort, let us remind them of the U.N.'s recent, execrable acts against the human liberty and dignity it was founded to defend.

The U.N. humanitarian aid program, Oil-for-Food, provided little bread for Iraqis but large bribes for Hussein, his

regime, U.N. cronies, and likely terrorists. Estimates are Saddam's dictatorship siphoned \$10 billion from the program through oil smuggling and systematic thievery, and illegal payments and kickbacks from international contractors, all beneath the nonjudgmental gaze of U.N. bureaucrats who were nevertheless judged culpable for gross incompetence, mismanagement and potential complicity with Saddam in perpetrating the biggest corruption scandal in human history.

Secondly, widespread instances and allegations of the sexual exploitation of Congolese women, girls, and boys were leveled against the U.N. personnel sent to protect them. The particulars of this barbaric sexual abuse are unfit for this forum.

Thirdly, the U.N.'s waste, fraud, and malfeasance has turned tawdry graft into a global art, an epic debacle of avarice less worthy of journalist than a satirist. As one U.N. peacekeeping staffer informed the Inter Press Service News Agency: "Corruption and kickbacks were taken for granted in most overseas operations." Though not in a New York Federal Court where, on June 7, the former top U.N. procurement official, Sanjaya Bahel, was convicted of steering \$100 million worth of U.N. peacekeeping contracts to the family of a personal friend. U.N. officials refuse to explain how Bahel was twice exonerated by its internal investigations, while a New York jury convicted him of fraud and corruption in half a day.

These are not the acts of the U.N. envisioned by President Franklin Roosevelt in his March 1, 1945, address before the Congress on the Yalta Conference.

"A common ground for peace ought to spell the end of the system of unilateral action, the exclusive alliances, the spheres of influence, the balances of power, and all other expedients that have been tried for centuries and have always failed. We propose to substitute for all these a universal organization in which all peace-loving organizations will finally have a chance to join."

Weighed against Roosevelt's words, the U.N. is deemed wanting, and the reason is revealed. A universal organization will include peace-loving nations and tyrannical regimes.

Consequently, all of the exclusive alliances, spheres of influence, balances of power, and all other expedients which occurred and failed for centuries outside of a universal organization have now occurred and failed this century inside the United Nations.

Unlike Roosevelt, Truman viewed the U.N. as a future hope, not an immediate panacea. Though personally honest, Truman was versed in Boss Tom Pendergast's political machine, and so understood the U.N.'s membership's math boded ill for free people. Today, according to Freedom House, of the 192 U.N. member states, 89 are fully free and 103 are not. Thus, a solid majority of 54 percent of member states know

liberty directly threatens their survival, which requires the suppression of their own peoples and, through their U.N. membership, the entire human community.

While it is said that words cannot hurt, the majority-ruled General Assembly's resolutions and speeches can and do hurt free peoples. As reporter Claudia Rosett poignantly observes:

“What may appear to an American audience as irrelevant and even tedious theater is anything but harmless. The speeches on that U.N. stage are not, as a rule, meant for Americans, nor even for the multilateral audience in the chamber. Especially amongst repressive regimes, they are beamed to home countries and regional neighbors as evidence of the dignity and respect enjoyed by these governments at the world's leading conclave of nations. They feature as one more blow to the courageous Burmese monks, the hungry North Koreans, the desperate opposition in Zimbabwe, and the democrats who risk prison when they raise their voices in places such as Syria and Iran.”

This holds true at the U.N. Security Council and its Human Rights Councils, from which a few bitter vignettes painted an abhorrent portrait.

The U.N.'s Permanent Security Council includes a nuclear armed communist China and an increasingly authoritarian Russia. Their unsettling synergy of interests and actions on this body ominously echoes the heights of their Cold War cooperation.

Consider: Despite over a decade of U.S. protestations, communist China and Putin's Russia are the top exporters of nuclear technology, chemical weapons, precursors and guided missiles to Iran. In 2004, the U.S.-China Security and Review Commission declared, “Chinese entities continue to assist Iran with dual-use missile-related items, raw materials, and chemical weapons-related technology”; and further noted that these transfers took place after the communist Chinese Government's 2003 pledge to withhold missile technology from the Iranian regime.

Looking at the U.N. Human Rights Council, some members are more suited to a rogue's gallery than a roster of righteous nations. Soon, the U.N. will enthrone as arbiters of human rights regimes like communist China, communist Cuba, Putin's Russia, and Saudi Arabia. Only the U.N. would put oppressed people's hopes in such blood-stained hands.

Our association with this insanity exacts a steep price. Since 1945, the United States has been the U.N.'s largest annual contributor. In 2006, American taxpayers forked over \$423.5 million in dues, or 22 percent of the U.N.'s regular budget, and over \$5.3 billion in total funds to the United Nations. Nevertheless, the U.S. and all other free nations remain the targets of the U.N.'s member regimes' internal intrigues and corrupt practices.

Two statistics define this function. Only 46 percent of the U.N.'s members are free nations. All of the top 10 financial contributors to the U.N. are free nations.

In a crystalline instant are the U.N.'s symptoms manifest, its disease diagnosed, and its prognosis shameful: The U.N. is a global Tammany Hall lethal to the liberty and dignity of our human family.

In our time, we face challenges equivalent to those posed to President Truman. Once more, the United States and the entire free world face a global, generational war for freedom against vicious enemies bent upon our destruction. To win, our devotion to liberty must transcend their obsession with death. This cannot be accomplished by fecklessly continuing to rely upon a debauched U.N. for our collective security.

Recall Truman: “It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.”

So, it remains in our global age, wherein a world convinced by an Internet cannot endure half slave and half free. Our survival at stake, all free nations must prudently diminish their participation in a debased U.N., and unite in the cause of human dignity and liberty. Encircled at the U.N., we have no more time to entreat with wolves in our midst. Best we hold them at bay in their lair, and forge a course for the world's new birth of freedom.

Our new course is a Liberty Alliance. Similar to the Community of Democracies, which could be transformed into this more focused and potent international organization for freedom, the Liberty Alliance must be founded upon the self-evident truth, all human beings are endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and, it must be steeped in the wisdom that extending liberty to the the enslaved will ensure liberty for ourselves.

The Liberty Alliance must be composed of free nations dedicated to expanding human liberty to peoples yet free. Member nations must meet a mutually agreed-upon criteria of human and civil rights. Observer nations must be domestically expanding their people's liberty and, upon attaining the agreed-upon criteria for membership, shall be admitted into the Alliance. Importantly, member nations which diminish their people's liberty beyond the agreed-upon criteria, must be demoted to observer status and, when necessary, expelled from the Alliance.

The governing structure of the Liberty Alliance shall be determined by its member nations, with the objective being the maximization of transparency, equity, and democracy in accordance with the effective expansion of human liberty and dignity. In accordance with Truman's doctrine, the Alliance “must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their

own way.” Ergo, the Alliance's emphasis must be upon liberty, wherein human beings individually and communally shape the nature, form, and functions of their representative institutions, not upon abstract notions of uniformity, like western democracy or democratic capitalism, presumptuous and too often destabilizing impositions upon peoples trying to seize their freedom and shape their destinies as they deem fit.

Heeding Truman's assessment, “The seeds of totalitarian strife are nurtured by misery and want, poverty and strife, and reach their growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died.” In order to foster liberty, the Alliance must advance human liberty and dignity through diplomatic, political, economic, and cultural initiatives aimed at empowering and emancipating the individual, their communities, and their emerging democratic governments from dictatorial rule. The Alliance must not have a military component. But member and observer nations will retain their powers to continue or commence security agreements with other free countries through bilateral and multilateral treaties. Never must any member or observer nation's rights be infringed upon by the Alliance.

Now, two sanguine hopes. The U.S. must lead the establishment of the Liberty Alliance; and, secondly, the Liberty Alliance's headquarters shall be sited on the free soil once scarred colonialism, communism, fascism, world wars, and the Holocaust. I speak of Eastern Europe, where, cradled in the intrepid human spirit, liberty's lamp triumphantly pierced these benighted recesses of evil.

In heralding the Liberty Alliance, we do not invite the free world to exit the U.N. Especially by participating in a democracy caucus, the United States and all free nations should remain in the U.N. to advance or defend liberty by keeping her enemies close. But we must not be so mad as to continue paying through the nose to be kicked in our assets.

So, a simple proposal. No free nation will pay more to the U.N. than does it lowest paying tyrants, like North Korea and Burma, who contribute only \$170,660, or 1/100 percent of the U.N.'s regular budget. Free nations' monies and personnel spared from the U.N. shall be dedicated to the Liberty Alliance or returned to taxpayers.

□ 1715

Doubtless, discombobulated global sophisticates will decry the Liberty Alliance as undesirable and/or impossible. They are overwrought and best ignored. For as we know: “The day is short; the task is great.” But we will not withdraw from it. The United States and all free peoples are cemented and steeled by the harmonic bonds of liberty, comity, and duty. Like Harry Truman and the greatest generations of both our nations, to date, we will not bend, we will not

break in our reasoned faith in a future graced by free nations. "We (will) keep that hope alive."

Toiling our way up to that day, may God grant all free peoples the strength to be as He in Marie Syrkin's verse, "The Strongest":

"I'll be the strongest amid you, not lightning, stream or mountain blue, but dew that falling to the Earth gives birth.

"I'll be the strongest in my hour, and lofty tree and quiet flower will both drink gratefully from me.

"I'll be the strongest in the land. I'll be the word that heals, the hand that unseen and still, as from above, gives love."

Mr. Speaker, may it be. And may God continue to grace, guard, guide and bless the people of the United States and our entire human family.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 11:30 a.m. on account of family reasons.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons for a family event.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons due to family matters.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LARSON of Connecticut) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SNYDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CLARKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAMSTAD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, December 20.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, December 20.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2271. An act to authorize State and local governments to divest assets in companies that conduct business operations in Sudan, to prohibit United States Government contracts with such companies, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Financial Services; in addition, to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and to the Committee on Education and Labor for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4343. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify age standards for pilots engaged in commercial aviation operations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 17, 2007, at 10:30 a.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:

ROBERT E. LATTA, Ohio, Fifth.

ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia, First.

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, Elliot 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, Robert E. Latta, 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 McNeerney, 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 (AL), Mike Rogers (MI), 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, Robert J. Wittman, 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:

4636. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clethodim; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0890; FRL-8340-7] received December 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4637. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7987] received December 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4638. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Filing Requirements for Suspicious Activity Reports (RIN: 3133-AD23) received November 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4639. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Regulatory Flexibility Program — received October 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4640. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF DIRECTORS [RELEASE NO. 34-56914; IC-28075; FILE NO. S7-17-07] (RIN: 3235-A-95) received December 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4641. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rhode Island: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R01-RCRA-2007-0999; FRL-8504-4] received December 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4642. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure To Attain; California — Imperial Valley Non-attainment Area; PM-10 [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-CA-0017; FRL-8504-2] received December 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4643. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois; Source-Specific Revision for Cromwell-Phoenix, Incorporated [EPA-R05-OAR-2004-IL-0002; FRL-8503-5] received December 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4644. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Approved End-Users and Respective Eligible Items for the People's Republic of China (PRC) Under Authorization Validated End-User (VEU) [Docket No. 070817469-7596-01] (RIN: 0694-AB11) received October 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4645. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Arms Traffic in Arms Regulations: UN Embargoed Countries — received December 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4646. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Voluntary Disclosures — December 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4647. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Regarding Dual and Third Country Nationals — December 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4648. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-215, "Department of Small and Local Business Development Subcontracting Clarification, Benefit Expansion, and Grant-making Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 2007, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4649. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-214, "Lower Income Homeownership Cooperative Housing Association Re-Clarification Temporary Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4650. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-213, "School Proximity Traffic Calming Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4651. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-194, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 347, S.O. 06-5596, Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4652. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-212, "Child Abuse and Neglect Investigation Record Access Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4653. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-195, "Omnibus Sports Consolidation Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4654. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-211, "Hattie Holmes Senior Wellness Center Designation Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4655. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-193, "District of Columbia Regional Airports Authority Clarification Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4656. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-192, "Neighborhood Investment Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4657. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-210, "Health Services Planning Program Re-establishment Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4658. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-191, "Retail Service Station Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4659. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-208, "Mortgage Disclosure Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4660. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-178, "Advisory Neighborhood Commission Clarification Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4661. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-207, "Southwest Water and Sewer Improvement Special Assessment Authorization Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4662. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-206, "Heurich House Foundation Real Property Tax Exemption and Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4663. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-205, "Home Equity Protection Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4664. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-198, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square N-515, S.O. 07-6534, Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4665. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-197, "Closing of a Portion of a Public Alley in Square 234, S.O. 07-7717, Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4666. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-126, "School Modernization Use of Funds Requirements Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4667. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Technical Amendments to Office of Government Ethics Freedom of Information Act Regulation: Designation under E.O. 13392 and Updates to Contact Number and Addition of E-Mail Address (RIN: 3209-AA37) received December 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4668. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Use of Campaign Funds for Donation to Non-Federal Candidates and Any Other Lawful Purpose Other Than Personal Use [Notice 2007-18] received

December 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

4669. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28378; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-0890-AD; Amendment 39-15222; AD 2007-21-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4670. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company (GE) CF6-80C2A5F Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-28172; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-23-AD; Amendment 39-15224; AD 2007-21-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4671. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models 58P and 58TC Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21175; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-24-AD; Amendment 39-15200; AD 2007-21-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4672. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Alpha Aviation Design Limited (Type Certificate No. A48EU previously held by APEX Aircraft and AVIONS PIERRE ROBIN) Model R2160 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-26491 Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-076-AD; Amendment 39-15218; AD 2007-20-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4673. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27595; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-248-AD; Amendment 39-15216; AD 2007-20-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4674. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation (Type Certificate No. A00010WI previously held by Raytheon Aircraft Company) Model 390 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28068; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-043-AD; Amendment 39-15217; AD 2007-20-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4675. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Airplanes and Model A310 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27010; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-259-AD; Amendment 39-15214; AD 2007-20-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4676. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-111 and A318-112 Airplanes and Model A319, A320, and A321 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27015; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-169-AD;

Amendment 39-15215; AD 2007-20-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4677. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Water Quality Standards for Puerto Rico [EPA-HQ-OW-2007-0259-FRL-8504-9] received December 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 873. Resolution Waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 110-493). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 4524. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain cathode ray tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 4525. A bill to codify the definition of terms used in subheading 1604.14 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4526. A bill to extend temporarily the duty on Dimethyl Carbonate, CAS Number 616-38-6; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4527. A bill to extend temporarily the duty on Ethyl Pyruvate, CAS Number 617-35-6; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4528. A bill to extend temporarily the duty on 5-Chloro-1-indanone, CAS Number 42348-86-7; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4529. A bill to extend temporarily the duty on Phenylmethyl hydrazinecarboxylate, CAS Number 5331-43-1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4530. A bill to extend temporarily the duty on 5-methyl-5-(4-phenoxyphenyl)-3-(phenylamino)-2,4-oxazolidine dione (a.k.a. famoxadone) and 2-cyano-N-[(ethylamino)carbonyl]-2-(methoxyimino)acetamide and its related application adjuvants, CAS Numbers 131807-57-3 and 57966-95-7; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4531. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on S-methyl 7-chloro-2,5-dihydro-2-[[methoxy-carbonyl] 4(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]amino]-carbonyl] indeno[1,2-e][1,3,4]oxadiazine-4a-(3)-carboxylate (a.k.a. DPX-KN128, Indoxacarb), CAS Number 144171-61-9; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4532. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures of indoxacarb (CAS#173584-44-6) chemical name=(S)-methyl 7-chloro-2,5-

dihydro-2-[[methoxy-carbonyl]-[4(trifluoromethoxy) phenyl]amino)carbonyl]indeno[1,2-e] [1,3,4]oxadiazine-4A- (H)-carboxylate and inert ingredients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4533. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 5-bromo-3-sec-butyl-6-methyluracil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4534. A bill to extend temporarily the duty on Methyl-4-trifluoro methoxyphenyl-N-(chlorocarbonyl) carbamate, CAS Number 173903-15-6; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4535. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-amino-5-chloro-N,3-dimethylbenzamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4536. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-bromo-1-(3-chloro-2-pyridinyl)-1H-pyrazole-5-carboxylic acid (CAS No. 500011-86-9); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4537. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on dimethyl 2,3,4,6-tetrachloro-1, 4-Benzenedicarboxylate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4538. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on [3-4,5-dihydro-isoxazol-3-yl]-4-methylsulfonyl-2-methylphenyl] (5-hydroxy-1-methyl-1H-pyrazole-4-yl) methanone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUYER (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 4539. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to the housing loan benefit program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 4540. A bill to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 4541. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for patient protections under the Medicare prescription drug program for residents of long term care facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 4542. A bill to repeal the provision of title 46, United States Code, requiring a license for employment in the business of salvaging on the coast of Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 4543. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act and the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require an active tuberculosis screening for any individual seeking employment with meat processing facilities or poultry processing facilities, and to prohibit the hiring of any individual who is determined to have active tuberculosis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KIND, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GILCREST, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr.

BRADY of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 4544. A bill to require the issuance of medals to recognize the dedication and valor of Native American code talkers; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4545. A bill to target cocaine kingpins and address sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4546. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Acetoacetyl-2,5-dimethoxy-4-chloroanilide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4547. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 3-Amino-4-methylbenzamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4548. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Basic Blue 7; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4549. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Basic Violet 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4550. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 5-Chloro-3-hydroxy-2-methyl-2-naphthanilide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4551. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 5-Chloro-3-hydroxy-2-methoxy-2-naphthanilide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 4552. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Ortho-Phenylphenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 4553. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on O-Chlorotoluene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 4554. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Bayderm Bottom DLV-N; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 4555. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on certain ethylene-vinyl acetate copolymers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 4556. A bill to extend and modify the temporary suspension of duty on Iminodisuccinate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4557. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1-Propene, 1,1,2,3,3,3-hexafluoro-, oxidized, polymerized, reduced;

hydrolyzed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4558. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Ethene tetrafluoro-oxidized, polymerized reduced, methyl esters, reduced, ethoxylated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4559. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1, 1, 2,2-Tetrafluoroethene, oxidized, polymerized; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4560. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Methoxycarbonyl-terminated perfluorinated polyoxymethylene-polyoxyethylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4561. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Ethene, tetrafluoro-oxidized, polymerized reduced, methyl esters, reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4562. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Oxiranemethanol, polymers with reduced methyl esters of reduced polymerized oxidized tetrafluoroethylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4563. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1-Propene, 1,1,2,3,3,3-hexafluoro-oxidized, polymerized; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4564. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Ethene, tetrafluoro, oxidized, polymerized, reduced, decarboxylated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4565. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Vinylidene chloride-methyl methacrylate-acrylonitrile copolymer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4566. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1, propene, 1,1,2,3,3,3-hexafluoro-, telomers with chlorotrifluoroethene, oxidized, reduced, ethyl ester, hydrolyzed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4567. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Ethene, 1,1,2,2-tetrafluoro-, oxidized, polymd., reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4568. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Propanoic acid, 3-hydroxy-2-(hydroxymethyl)-2-methyl-, polymers with 5-isocyanato-1-(isocyanatomethyl)-1,3,3-trimethylcyclohexane and reduced methyl esters of reduced polymerized, oxidized tetrafluoroethylene, compounds with trimethylamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4569. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Diphosphoric acid, polymers with ethoxylated reduced methyl esters of reduced polymerized oxidized tetrafluoroethylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4570. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,2-Propanediol, 3-(diethylamino)-, polymers with 5-isocyanato-1-(isocyanatomethyl)-1,3,3-trimethylcyclohexane, propylene glycol and reduced Me esters of reduced polymd. oxidized tetrafluoroethylene, 2-ethyl-1-hexanol-blocked, acetates (salts); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4571. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for home water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 4572. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Prodiamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 4573. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Ortho-Nitro-Phenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BEAN (for herself and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 4574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain systems installed in nonresidential real property or residential rental property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 4575. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on certain reusable grocery bags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 4576. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Francis Collins, in recognition of his outstanding contributions and leadership in the fields of medicine and genetics; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 4577. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to strengthen student visa background checks and improve the monitoring of foreign students in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 4578. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic synthetic staple fiber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 4579. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic synthetic staple fiber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUNT:

H.R. 4580. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 3,6,9-Trioxaundecanedioic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUNT:

H.R. 4581. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 3-(trifluoromethyl) benzoate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUNT:

H.R. 4582. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Bentazon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUNT:

H.R. 4583. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 5-MPDC; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUNT:

H.R. 4584. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4-methylbenzotrile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUNT:

H.R. 4585. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4-(trifluoromethoxy) phenyl isocyanate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUNT:

H.R. 4586. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Propane-phosphonic acid anhydride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4587. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Olympus WG70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4588. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Spirotetramat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4589. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Flubendiamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4590. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on AE 0172747 Ether; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4591. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,3-Cyclohexanedione; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4592. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain mixtures containing Thien carbazole-methyl and Isoxadifen-ethyl and Isoxaflutole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4593. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Trichloroacetaldehyde; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4594. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4-Chlorobenzaldehyde; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4595. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Mixtures containing 4-(2-Methylsulfonyl-4-trifluoromethyl-benzoyl)-5-cyclopropyl soxazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4596. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Hydroxylamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4597. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Isoxaflutole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4598. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Iprodione; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4599. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2-Acetylbutyrolactone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4600. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on -Cyfluthrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4601. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Cyfluthrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4602. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Clothianidin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4603. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Ethoprop; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4604. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on product mixtures containing Foramsulfuron and Iodosulfuronmethyl-sodium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4605. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Isoxadifen-Ethyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4606. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Trifloxystrobin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4607. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Spiromesifen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4608. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Thien carbazole-methyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4609. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on FOE Hydroxy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 4610. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Tembotrione; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WATT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILLNER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WATERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. ROTHMAN):

H.R. 4611. A bill to prohibit racial profiling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 4612. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an investment credit for electric generation facilities with climate neutral combustion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 4613. A bill to suspend until December 31, 2012, the duty on ethylene-norbornene copolymer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4614. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on helium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4615. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Methanol, sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4616. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2-Ethylhexyl 4-methoxycinnamate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4617. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4618. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on a certain chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4619. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 10,10-

Oxybisphenoxarsine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4620. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on a certain ion exchange resin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4621. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on a certain chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4622. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on a certain chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4623. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on a certain ion exchange resin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4624. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Trichlorobenzene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4625. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on hydroxylamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 4626. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Commodity Exchange Act to promote legal certainty, enhance competition, and reduce systemic risk in markets for futures and over-the-counter derivatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOSSELLA:

H.R. 4627. A bill to provide for the penalty-free use of retirement funds for mortgage relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 4628. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on products containing (E)-N-[2-Chloro-1,3-thiazol-5-yl) methyl]-N-methyl[oxido(oxo)hydrazono]methanediamine or N-[(2-Chloro-1,3-thiazol-5-yl)methyl]-N-(E)-(methylamino) [oxido(oxo)hydrazono] methyl)-amine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 4629. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-(Methylthio)-4-(trifluoromethyl) benzoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 4630. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Chloro-6-(methylthio)toluene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 4631. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on products containing 3-Mesityl-2-oxo-1-oxaspiro[4,4]non-3-en-4-yl 3,3-dimethylbutyrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 4632. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures containing Pyrasulfotole: 5-Hydroxy-1,3-dimethylpyrazol-4-yl 2-mesyl-4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl ketone; and Bromoxynil Octanoate: 2,4-Dibromo-6-cyanophenyl octanoate; and Bromoxynil Heptanoate: 2,4-Dibromo-6-cyanophenyl heptanoate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 4633. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,3-Dimethyl-1H-pyrazol-5-ol and 1,3-Dimethylpyrazol-5-one; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 4634. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Products containing () -2-ethoxy-2,3-dihydro-3,3-dimethylbenzofuran-5-yl methansulfonate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 4635. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Product mixtures containing

Thien carbazole-methyl (Methyl 4-((3-methoxy-4-methyl-5-oxo-4,5-dihydro-1H-1,2,4-triazol-1-yl)carbonyl)amino) sulfonyl-5-methylthiophene-3-carboxylate) & Isoxadifenethyl (ethyl 4,5-dihydro-5,5-diphenyl-1,2-oxazole-3-carboxylate) & Isoxaflutole(5-Cyclopropyl-4-(2-Methylsulfonyl-4-Trifluoromethylbenzoyl)isoxazole)); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 4636. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Cyprosulamide: N-(4-[Cyclopropylamino) carbonyl]phenyl)sulfonyl-2-methoxybenzamide (CAS No. Cyprosulamide: 221667-31-8); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4637. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for the calculation of the minimum wage based on the Federal poverty threshold for a family of 3, as determined by the Census Bureau; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4638. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Paclotrazol Technical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4639. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on NOA 446510 Technical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4640. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on (IPN) Isophthalonitrile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4641. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Chloroacetone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4642. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Paraquat Technical + Emetic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4643. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Paclotrazol 2CS; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4644. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Brodifacoum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4645. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures or coprecipitates of yttrium oxide and europium oxide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4646. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on cerium sulfide pigments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4647. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures or coprecipitates of yttrium phosphate and cerium phosphate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4648. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures or coprecipitates of lanthanum phosphate, cerium phosphate, and terbium phosphate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4649. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Neodymium oxide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 4650. A bill to strengthen the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARE (for himself and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 4651. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to cover services provided to injured Federal workers by physician assistants and nurse practitioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 4652. A bill to direct each Federal agency to establish an Environmental Justice Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 4653. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on ACM; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 4654. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Oxadiazon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 4655. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on DMDPA; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 4656. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on DPA; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 4657. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Tetrakis(hydroxymethyl) phosphonium sulfate (THPS); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 4658. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Mixtures of N-[2-(oxoimidazolidine-1-yl)ethyl]-2-methylacrylamide, methacrylic acid, aminoethyl ethylene urea and hydroquinone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 4659. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures of polyvinyl alcohol and polyvinyl pyrrolidone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 4660. A bill to require the videotaping of strategic interrogations and certain other interactions between detainees and members of the Armed Forces, intelligence operatives, and contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. KAGEN:

H.R. 4661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on capital loss applicable to individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAGEN:

H.R. 4662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the exclusion for qualified scholarships shall apply to

allowances for room, board, and special needs services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 4663. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain air pressure distillation columns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUHL of New York:

H.R. 4664. A bill to provide for investment and protection of the Social Security surplus; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, 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. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4665. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Pigment Brown 25; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4666. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Ammonium polyphosphate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4667. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Pigment Red 187; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4668. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on zinc diethylphosphinate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4669. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on VAT Orange 7; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4670. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Phosphinic acid, diethyl-, aluminum salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4671. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Phosphinic acid, diethyl-, aluminum salt with synergists and encapsulating agents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4672. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Acid Blue 80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4673. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1-Oxa-3, 20-diazadispiro [5.1.11.2] heneicosan-21-one 2,2,4,4-tetramethyl, reaction products with epichlorohydrin, hydrolyzed and polymerized; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4674. A bill to modify the provisions of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to returned property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4675. A bill to provide for duty free treatment for certain United States Government property returned to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H.R. 4676. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to remove the 100 percent tariff imposed on soups and broths from France and Germany; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 4677. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Cyclopropylaminocotinic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4678. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on N-Cyclohexylthiophthalimide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4679. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4,4-

Dithiodimorpholine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4680. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Tetraethylthiuram Disulfide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4681. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Tetramethylthiuram Disulfide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4682. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on N-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 4683. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to repeal certain superfluous sections of criminal law which may be subject to prosecutorial abuse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 4684. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the employee portion of Social Security taxes imposed on individuals who have been diagnosed as having cancer or a terminal disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 4685. A bill to establish the Minerals Reclamation Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 4686. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify the tariffs of engines to be installed in work trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 4687. A bill to extend and amend the temporary duty suspension on certain thin fiberglass sheets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan):

H.R. 4688. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide equitable access for foster care and adoption services for Indian children in tribal areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 4689. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to increase the maximum amount of assistance to individuals and households, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 4690. A bill to direct the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to issue motor vehicle safety standards for motorcoaches, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for associated expenses incurred by motorcoach operators complying with such standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Small Business, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4691. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on nPBAL; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4692. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Grilamid TR 90; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4693. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Grilbond IL 6-50%F; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4694. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Primid QM-1260; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4695. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Primid XL-552; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4696. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1-Nitroanthraquinone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4697. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Leucoquinizarin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4698. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Quinaldine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4699. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Nonwoven air filter and diffusion media comprising tackifier-coated polyester fibers (2 to 10 decitex, with a length of 40 mm or more, but not more than 80 mm), weighing 400 to 700 grams/square meter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4700. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain structures, parts, and components for use in an isotopic separation facility in southern Ohio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4701. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain structures, parts, and components for use in an isotopic separation facility in southern Ohio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 4702. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to include all public clinics for the distribution of pediatric vaccines under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 4703. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the Public Health Service Act to ensure a sufficient supply of vaccines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 4704. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of federally recommended vaccines under Medicare part B; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 4705. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the availability of vaccines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BUYER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr.

AKIN, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HARE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FARR, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. GOODE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CASTOR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HILL, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHULER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ISSA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WATT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. KIND, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. INGLES of South Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. HULSHOF, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms.

ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. FOXX, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WICKER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BRUN of Georgia, Mr. BACA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution congratulating the Army Reserve on its centennial, which will be formally celebrated on April 23, 2008, and commemorating the historic contributions of its veterans and continuing contributions of its soldiers to the vital national security interests and homeland defense missions of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. JONES of Ohio (for herself, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOLT, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H. Res. 874. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congressional Philanthropy Caucus was established in July 2007 to provide a platform that can be used to communicate and highlight issues that face the philanthropic sector and allows Members of Congress to discuss common legislative objectives that affect the foundation community; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 875. A resolution honoring and supporting the Hadley School for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. BEAN:

H.R. 4706. A bill to provide for the reliquidation of certain drawback claims relating to certain speakers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4707. A bill to reliquidate certain entries of gemifloxacin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 594: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 636: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 822: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 848: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 861: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 882: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 888: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1000: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1014: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1032: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1078: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1103: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1133: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 1198: Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

H.R. 1225: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1237: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KIRK, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 1246: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 1298: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1303: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1304: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 1363: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1366: Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 1376: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 1386: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1390: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1407: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1440: Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 1459: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1514: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1537: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1552: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 1609: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1610: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BACA, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SPACE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1614: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1747: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1791: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1843: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1845: Mr. BRUN of Georgia and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1881: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1884: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1919: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1992: Mr. HONDA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2122: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 2123: Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAULO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2164: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 2205: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2370: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 2550: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2564: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 2580: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 2593: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2634: Mr. CAPUANO and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2659: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 2702: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2706: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 2744: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 2802: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2818: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LAMPSON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

H.R. 2851: Mr. CLAY, Mr. HARE, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 2864: Mr. FILNER, Mr. BARROW, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

- H.R. 2943: Mr. WYNN and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
- H.R. 3036: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. REYES.
- H.R. 3098: Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 3168: Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 3179: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
- H.R. 3202: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 3232: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico and Ms. DELAURO.
- H.R. 3282: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 3298: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 3329: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 3363: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 3368: Mr. GORDON.
- H.R. 3406: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
- H.R. 3430: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
- H.R. 3434: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. EHLERS.
- H.R. 3464: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 3507: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 3544: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
- H.R. 3663: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 3689: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
- H.R. 3698: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 3750: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
- H.R. 3781: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 3784: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 3793: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 3817: Mr. TERRY and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H.R. 3829: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 3852: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
- H.R. 3896: Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 3905: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 3928: Ms. SUTTON.
- H.R. 3955: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 3980: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 4001: Mr. McNULTY.
- H.R. 4008: Mr. FEENEY.
- H.R. 4040: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PASTOR, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
- H.R. 4044: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
- H.R. 4053: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 4054: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
- H.R. 4061: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 4105: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
- H.R. 4107: Mr. HARE.
- H.R. 4114: Mrs. CAPPS.
- H.R. 4116: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. GOODE, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
- H.R. 4119: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mr. HENSARLING.
- H.R. 4129: Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 4133: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 4137: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 4138: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. SHAYS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 4160: Mr. FEENEY.
- H.R. 4185: Mr. LEWIS of California.
- H.R. 4201: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
- H.R. 4204: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FARR, and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 4221: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
- H.R. 4223: Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 4226: Mr. WALSH of New York.
- H.R. 4264: Mr. FEENEY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 4265: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. INSLER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. KAGEN.
- H.R. 4286: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
- H.R. 4297: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 4318: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
- H.R. 4355: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 4368: Mr. CARTER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. PICKERING.
- H.R. 4454: Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky.
- H.R. 4462: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.J. Res. 59: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.J. Res. 64: Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. HIRONO.
- H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
- H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
- H. Con. Res. 239: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. FEENEY.
- H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. RANGEL.
- H. Con. Res. 249: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Mr. FEENEY.
- H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. TERRY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GOODE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. PASCRELL.
- H. Res. 37: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. FATTAH.
- H. Res. 163: Mr. HONDA.
- H. Res. 537: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
- H. Res. 607: Mr. HENSARLING.
- H. Res. 638: Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H. Res. 653: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HONDA, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HINCHEY.
- H. Res. 700: Mr. ROSS, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. RADANOVICH.
- H. Res. 748: Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H. Res. 758: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. WEINER.
- H. Res. 783: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H. Res. 805: Mr. FEENEY.
- H. Res. 852: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. REICHERT.
- H. Res. 854: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LINDER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SEXTON, and Mr. COHEN.
- H. Res. 857: Mr. POE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
- H. Res. 863: Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
- H. Res. 866: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
- H. Res. 867: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIREN, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. HILL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. REYES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. HOLT.
- H. Res. 868: Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BACA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. MATSUL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HODES, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BECERRA.

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. 1201: Mr. PITTS.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 4, by Mr. ADERHOLT on House Resolution 748: Charles W. "Chip" Pickering, Judy Biggert, Ginny Brown-Waite, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Zach Wamp, and Jo Bonner.